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 EIR:

- Increased traffic volumes and congestion along Frida Kahlo Way, Ocean Avenue, and Lee Avenue;
- Alternative vehicular access at San Ramon Avenue or the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) easement;
- Pedestrian and bicycle safety along Frida Kahlo Way and Ocean Avenue;
- Effects of rideshare vehicles/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.

These comments and topics 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 Phelan Loop Site and the Kragen Auto Parts Site. 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 countywide travel demand was also used to develop the travel forecasts for new development under the proposed area plan. These additional project related trips were added to the 2025 Baseline values to determine 2025 transportation conditions with the area plan to conduct the program-level analysis.

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 Phelan Loop and Kragen Auto Parts sites.

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. Mitigation measures were identified 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

[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 February 2019).

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

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.

[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.

Parking

The PEIR did not identify impacts related to parking. Two scenarios were considered for the analysis of parking 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. However, the proposed bicycle lanes along Ocean Avenue 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.

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. As such, loading and construction impacts were not assessed.

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), and because 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.

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

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.

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).

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), 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**.

[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.

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	—

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.

TABLE 3.B-2
VEHICULAR COUNTS AT STUDY INTERSECTIONS

Number	Intersection	Number of Vehicles[a]	
		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/Gennessee Street	851	780
12	Monterey Boulevard/Gennessee 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.

NOTE:

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

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 walking were collected on Wednesday January 31, 2018, and Tuesday August 28, 2018, when City College was in session during the weekday a.m. (7:00 to 9:00 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.[4] There are high visibility marked crossings and pedestrian countdown signals provided at all signalized intersections adjacent to the project block.[5]

General impediments to walking observed 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.
- 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

---

4 The effective clear widths of the sidewalks vary depending on the presence of landscaping, utility poles, parking meters, and other street furniture. 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.

5 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.

  - Ocean Avenue/Granada Avenue, all crossings
  - Ocean Avenue/Miramar Avenue, all crossings
- Elevation changes and steep grades along Geneva Avenue between the project site and the Balboa Park Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)/Muni Station make 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**.

In 2014, San Francisco adopted a Vision Zero policy. The goal of the Vision Zero policy is to create a culture that prioritizes traffic safety and ensures that mistakes 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:[6]

- 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

[6] San Francisco Department of Public Health, Vision Zero High Injury Network: 2017, *http://sfgov.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=fa37f1274b4446f1bdddd7bdf9e708ff*, accessed January 10, 2019.

Pedestrian collision data from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Reporting System (2013–2017) reported five pedestrian-involved collisions, including one severe injury, and no pedestrian fatalities within the study area.[7]

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/Gennessee Street	19	26	37	32	**114**
12	Monterey Boulevard/Gennessee 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.

7 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/Gennessee Street	19	7	28	15	**69**
12	Monterey Boulevard/Gennessee 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:[8]

- **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 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Bike Network Map, are shown in **Figure 3.B-2, Existing Bicycling Network**, and described below:[9]

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

---

8 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.

9 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

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-8.

- Ocean Avenue, east of Frida Kahlo Way;
- Geneva Avenue, south of Frida Kahlo Way; and
- Monterey Boulevard, between St Elmo Way/Plymouth Avenue and Gennessee 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.[10]

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 bicyclists 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 bicyclists traveling along Ocean Avenue in the westbound direction and six bicyclists in the eastbound direction, and between five and eight bicyclists traveling 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 bicyclists 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**.

[10] 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/Gennessee Street	2	0	2	5	**9**
12	Monterey Boulevard/Gennessee 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/Gennessee Street	4	0	0	7	**11**
12	Monterey Boulevard/Gennessee 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**, presents the local and regional transit routes in the transportation study area.

Figure 3.B-3 Existing Transit Service

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.

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

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.)			
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, *https://www.sfmta.com/routes 2019*.

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.

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 loop 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. Egress onto Frida Kahlo Way is facilitated by actuated transit-only signals.

Muni transit operations in the study area were evaluated using transit delay analysis. Transit capacity utilization was conducted for informational purposes. The results of the transit delay analysis are 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. The results of the transit ridership and capacity analysis are provided in Attachment F (transit ridership and capacity analysis) of SEIR Appendix C2.

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.

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. 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.

Other Transit Service Providers

Commuter Shuttles

The SFMTA Board unanimously approved a Commuter Shuttle Program on February 12, 2017. The Commuter Shuttle Program provides permits to eligible commuter shuttle operators (e.g., those provided by employers, educational institutions, medical facilities, and various companies/office buildings) to use a network of designated streets and stops.

No designated shared Muni/commuter shuttle stops are located in the study area.[11] Ocean Avenue, Geneva Avenue, Frida Kahlo Way, Judson Avenue, Forester Street, and Monterey Boulevard east of Ridgewood Avenue are designated unrestricted arterials in the shuttle network. Plymouth Avenue, Faxon Avenue, Southwood, Northwood, Eastwood, and Westwood drives, Wildwood Way, and Monterey Boulevard west of Ridgewood Avenue are designated restricted streets in the commuter shuttle network.

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, San Francisco, CA 94112, 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 block the fire station driveway. 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

[11] SFMTA, *Commuter Shuttles Program Stop Locations & Permitted Streets*, February 23, 2017. The "a.m. and p.m. hours" refer to the time periods as defined by the Commuter Shuttle Program, *http://sfgov.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9fa72be4a92b449c92bcf832bb1da1f1*, accessed January 11, 2019.

2016. 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. In addition, on average, persons living or working in some areas of San Francisco result in lower amounts of VMT per person than persons living or working elsewhere in San Francisco. The city displays different amounts of VMT per capita geographically through transportation analysis zones (TAZs).[12]

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 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.[13,14,15]

---

12 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.

13 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.

Table 3.B-8, 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-8, 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-8
EXISTING DAILY VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED PER CAPITA

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

SOURCE: San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Information Map, *http://sfplanninggis.org/TIM/.*
NOTE:
Child care is treated as office for purposes of screening and analysis.

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 follow identifies any potentially or observed hazardous conditions or delays to public transit as a result of 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 Lee Avenue. Despite being signed as a no-stopping zone, curbside loading/unloading activities were observed to occur on both sides of Lee Avenue.

---

14 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, nonschool 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.

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

[Note to Reviewer: Additional observations and data collection of existing loading activity along Lee Avenue will be conducted. Findings from those observations will be included in ADSEIR-2.]

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 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 observation period, two drivers in TNC vehicles stopped in the surface lot to drop off passengers and one driver in a private vehicle waited to pick-up a passenger.

According to citywide data reported in the TNCs Today Data Explorer the peak weekday of TNC activity occurs on a Thursday.[16,17] According to TNCs Today Data Explorer report, 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

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.[18] 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. However, the San Francisco Planning Department acknowledges that parking conditions

16 SFCTA, TNCs Today Data Explorer, *http://tncstoday.sfcta.org/*, accessed February 8, 2019.

17 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.

18 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.

may be of interest to the public and the decision-makers. Therefore, this SEIR presents a parking supply and demand analysis for informational purposes only, and considers any secondary physical impacts associated with constrained supply (e.g., queueing by drivers waiting for scarce on-site parking spaces that affects the public right-of-way) as applicable in the following transportation impact analysis. A parking assessment was conducted by comparing the proposed parking supply to the parking demand generated by the proposed project uses.

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.

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.[19] 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.[20]

---

[19] 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.

[20] 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.

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.

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 Bay 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 facilities 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 (Objective 4.4) 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. Applicable objectives and policies include, but are not limited to:

Objective 1.4: Develop the reservoirs in a manner that will best benefit the neighborhood, the city, and the region as a whole.

Policy 1.3.2: Develop the west basin of the reservoir the greatest benefit of the city as a whole as well as for the surrounding neighborhoods.

Objective 2.4: Encourage walking, biking, public transit as the primary means of transportation.

Policy 2.4.2: Improve and expand bicycle connections throughout the plan area.

Objective 3.1: Establish parking standards and controls that promote quality of place, affordable housing, and transit-oriented development.

Policy 3.1.1: Provide flexibility for new residential development by eliminating minimum off-street parking requirements and establishing reasonable parking caps.

Objective 3.4: Establish parking policies to support the revitalization of the Ocean Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Policy 3.4.3: Explore the potential for merchants and their employees to park in the reservoir.

Policy 3.4.4: Consider the long-term need for additional public off-street parking only after all existing on and off-street parking opportunities have been exhausted.

Objective 4.4: Consider housing as a primary component to any development on the reservoir.

Policy 4.4.1: Develop housing on the west basin if it is not needed for water storage.

Objective 6.1: Create strong physical and visual links between the Transit Station Neighborhood, City College, and the Ocean Avenue Neighborhood Commercial District.

Policy 6.1.1: Large parcels should emphasize the existing street pattern, by extending Harold, Brighton, and Lee avenues south across Ocean Avenue.

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 San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (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

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 CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. The criteria for determining the significance of impacts in this analysis are consistent with the environmental checklist in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, as modified by the planning department. For the purpose of this analysis, the following questions were used to determine whether implementing the project would result in a significant impact on transportation and circulation. Implementation of the proposed project would have a significant effect on transportation and circulation if 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.

As part of implementing CEQA requirements within San Francisco, the City uses the following significance criteria, organized by transportation mode to facilitate the transportation analysis and address the aforementioned questions. The transportation significance criteria are similar to those in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G as listed above, except for the criteria related to traffic hazards and VMT. The department separates the significance criteria into construction and operation. The criteria are as follows.

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:

- Creates potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving or public transit operations;
- Interferes with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or results in inadequate emergency access;
- Substantially delays public transit;
- Causes 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
- Would 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.

The project site is not within an airport land use plan area,[21] nor is it near a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, and these criteria are not discussed further in this SEIR.

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 (child care 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 (child care and a

[21] San Francisco International Airport, *2019 Noise Exposure Map*, August 13, 2015, *https://media.flysfo.com/media/sfo/noise-abatement/sfo_p150_2019-nem-36x24-plot-signed_ada.pdf*, accessed January 23, 2019.

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 during Phase 1 and construction workers would be expected to park off-site during Phase 0 and Phase 2.

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-60.

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 east 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 6.5 feet wide and sidewalks on North, South, and West streets would be 6 feet wide. Raised crossings 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. 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

The Developer's Proposed Option would include three off-street freight loading spaces, eight on-street freight loading areas, and passenger loading areas along the internal streets.

The Additional Housing Option would include four off-street freight loading spaces, eight on-street freight loading areas, and 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 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 50 storage units, 50 cargo bikes and cargo bike parking spaces, and 100 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 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* (2018).[22] If the methodology differs than that in the guidelines, the following summarizes such differences.

Analysis Periods

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 other reasonably foreseeable development. Year 2040 was selected as the future analysis year because 2040 is the latest year for which travel demand forecasts are available from SF-CHAMP.

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. 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 C, Transportation Supporting Information. 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-9, 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.

[22] 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.

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

TABLE 3.B-9
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-9, 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.

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-10, Person-Trip Generation Estimates by Land Use**, presents the estimates 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-10
PERSON-TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES BY LAND USE

	Developer's Proposed Option			Additional Housing Option		
Land Use	**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, 2018. 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-11, 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-11
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, 2018; 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-12, 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-13, 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
PERSON-TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES BY MODE AND LAND USE

	Weekday A.M. Peak Hour				Weekday P.M. Peak Hour			
Mode	**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**
Vehicle Trips	*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**
Vehicle Trips	*24*	*30*	*275*	*329*	*31*	*30*	*362*	*423*

SOURCE: SF Guidelines, 2018. ITE, 10th Edition, 2017.

NOTES:

Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

TNC = Transportation Network Company

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-14, 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-14 on a map.

TABLE 3.B-13
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, 2018; 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.

TABLE 3.B-14
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, 2018.

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

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.

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-15, 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-15
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 and SF Guidelines, 2018

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 operators.

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.

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.

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

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 lines, if the project would result in transit delay greater than equal to four minutes or one-half headway, whichever is less, 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 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 has to stop to pick up and drop 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.

VMT 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;[23] 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. Child care is treated as office for screening and analysis.[24]

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; (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.[25]

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

---

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

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

25 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.

  - 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 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 within 250 feet of 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.

2040 Cumulative Conditions

The 2040 cumulative conditions assess the long-term impacts of the project in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects. The following summarizes future year modeling and reasonably foreseeable projects 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 reasonably foreseeable 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 based upon estimates of projections developed in preparation of Plan Bay Area (2017)

2040 Reasonably Foreseeable Projects

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 in the vicinity 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 reasonably foreseeable future projects. The following describes reasonably foreseeable 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 following development projects have been identified within the study area:

- 2340 San Jose Avenue (Upper Yard) (Planning Case No. 2017-012151). The proposed project would construct 131 affordable dwelling units, 3,900 square feet of retail space, 2,800 square feet of community space, and 4,000 square feet of child care.
- 2301 San Jose Avenue (Geneva Office Building) (Planning Case No. 2012.0262). The proposed project includes adaptive reuse of the Geneva Car Barn and Power House from an existing office and industrial building to a 19,882-square-foot community facility, retail space, and restaurant.
- 1601–1635 Ocean Avenue and 1271–1275 Capitol Way (Planning Case Nos. 2006.0592 and 2009.1050). The proposed project would demolish five commercial buildings and construct a new four-story building containing 54 dwelling units, 5,869 square feet of retail space. The project site was identified in the PEIR and assumed to include 31 dwelling units and 23,529 square feet of commercial use.
- 350 Ocean Avenue (Planning Case No. 2017-001961). The proposed project would demolish the existing 7,824-square-foot commercial building and construct 24 residential dwelling units with 1,226 square feet of ground floor retail space.

The Developer's Proposed Option, completed projects, and reasonably foreseeable development projects in the pipeline, would represent a net increase of 1,582 residential units and

69,399 square feet of commercial development. This is 198 fewer residential units and 35,221 fewer square feet of commercial space than what was assumed in the PEIR.

The Additional Housing Option, completed projects, and reasonably foreseeable development projects in the pipeline, would represent a net increase of 2,032 residential units and 69,399 square feet of commercial development. This is 258 more residential units and 35,221 fewer square feet of commercial space than what was assumed in the PEIR.

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.**[26] 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.**[27] 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. 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

[26] SFMTA, Ocean Avenue Safety Project website, *https://www.sfmta.com/projects/ocean-avenue-safety-project*, accessed January 10, 2019.

[27] 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.

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 & 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.[28,29,30] Completion estimated in September 2020.
- **28 19th Avenue Rapid Project**.[31] 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**.[32] 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**.[33] 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.

---

28 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-122.45238622810 78&z=18*, accessed January 10, 2019.

29 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.

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

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

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

33 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.

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 (CalMod), expanded ferry service from WETA, and various capacity upgrades to BART—including the Train Control Modernization Program (TCMP) 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 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 reasonably foreseeable projects identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, p. 3.A-1. 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 reasonably foreseeable projects identified in SEIR Section 3.A, Impact Overview, p. 3.A-1. The evaluation uses the same methodology as described above for existing plus project conditions.

Public Transit Delay

The evaluation uses the same methodology, quantitative threshold of significance, 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 cause 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 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. Child care is treated as office use for purposes of screening and analysis.

Loading

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.[34] 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

[34] 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.

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.[35] 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-16, 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.

TABLE 3.B-16
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY BY PHASE

Construction Phase[a]	Duration	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	0/0
1 – Townhome, Inner Blocks[b]	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.

NOTE:

[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 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 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:[36]

- 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

[35] San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, Frequently Asked Questions, November 2014, http://sfdbi.org/frequently-asked-questions, accessed June 12, 2018.

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

These truck routes are consistent with freight traffic routes identified in the general plan and designated street restrictions.[37,38] 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, potential impacts would be considered less than significant due to their temporary and limited duration and to the fact that the majority of construction activity would occur during off peak hours, when traffic volumes and the potential for conflicts are substantially lower. While there may be some occasional disruption to circulation as a result of on-road construction vehicles or construction-related truck traffic during the weekday a.m. or p.m. peak periods, 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 (average during Phase 0 under both project options) to 460 workers per day (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 during Phase 0. When vehicle parking for construction workers is not provided onsite (i.e., during Phase 1 and Phase 2), any construction workers driving to or from the site would be expected to make their own parking arrangements in area parking facilities, as needed. Given the project's location in close proximity to high-quality local and regional transit services, a substantial portion of construction workers would be expected to take public transit when traveling to and from the site. 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), and no special travel arrangements would be necessary.

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.[39] 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. These requirements are intended to

---

37 San Francisco Planning Department, General Plan Freight Traffic Routes, *https://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/images/I4.transportation/tra_map15.pdf*, accessed February 11, 2019.

38 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.

39 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*, accessed June 12, 2018.

minimize the 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 vehicle staging and 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 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 within off-street facilities or proposed on-street staging areas and 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, in order to minimize the potential for hazardous conditions and to ensure safe travel in and around the site. The proposed project construction activities would not constitute a permanent condition. 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 temporary and limited 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.

While the proposed project's construction-related impacts would be less than significant, **Improvement Measure I-TR-1, Construction Management Plan**, may be recommended for

consideration by City decision makers to further reduce the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts related to construction activities.

> **Improvement Measure I-TR-1: Construction Management Plan**. The project sponsor will develop and upon review and approval by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and Public Works, implement a Construction Management Plan, addressing transportation-related circulation, access, staging and hours of delivery. The Construction Management Plan will disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruption and ensure that overall circulation in the project area is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring transit, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity. The Construction Management Plan would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by the SFMTA, Public Works, or other City departments and agencies, and the California Department of Transportation. The Construction Management Plan, will include, but not be limited to, the following:
>
> - **Construction Truck Routing Plans**. Identify optimal truck routes between the regional facilities and the project site, taking into consideration truck routes of other development projects and any construction activities affecting the roadway network.
> - **Maintenance of Transit, Vehicle, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Access**. The project sponsor/construction contractor(s) will meet with Public Works, SFMTA, San Francisco Fire Department, Muni Operations, and other City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to maintain access for transit, vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. This will include an assessment of the need for temporary transit stop relocations or other measures to reduce potential traffic, bicycle, and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during construction of the project.
> - **Carpool, Bicycle, Walk and Transit Access for Construction Workers**. The construction contractor will include methods to encourage carpooling, bicycling, walking and transit access to the project site by construction workers. Methods may include providing transit subsidies to construction workers, providing secure bicycle parking spaces, participating in free-to-employee ride matching program from *www.511.org*, participating in emergency ride home program through the City of San Francisco (*www.sferh.org*), and providing transit information to construction workers.
> - **Construction Worker Parking Plan**. The location of construction worker parking will be identified 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 will be discouraged. All construction bid documents will include a requirement to identify the proposed location of construction worker parking. If on-site, the location, number of parking spaces, and area where vehicles would enter and exit will be required. If off-site parking is proposed to accommodate construction workers, the location of the off-site facility, number of parking spaces retained, and description of how workers would travel between off-site facility and project site will be required.

- **Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents**. To minimize construction impacts on access to nearby institutions and businesses, the project sponsor will provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities, and any travel or parking lane closures, and sidewalk closures. At regular intervals to be defined in the Construction Management Plan, a regular email notice will be distributed by the project sponsor and will provide current construction information of interest to neighbors as well as contact information for specific construction inquiries or concerns.

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. 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. As such, 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.

To further reduce less-than-significant construction-related transportation impacts of individual projects within the plan area, the PEIR identified the following improvement measure specifically intended to be undertaken by sponsors of subsequent development projects within the plan area:

> **PEIR Improvement Measure (Construction)**: To minimize disruption of general traffic flow on adjacent streets during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods, limit truck movements to the hours between 9 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. (or other times, if approved by SFMTA). In addition, have all construction contractors meet with representatives of SFMTA and the planning department to determine feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including transit disruption and pedestrian and bicycle circulation impacts during construction of individual projects within the plan area.

The PEIR Improvement Measure (Construction) would apply to the project's construction-related impacts and along with implementation of Improvement Measure I-TR-1, would further reduce the proposed project's less-than-significant 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 with Mitigation)

[Note to Reviewer: Analysis of possible signal timing and geometry modifications at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue is being conducted along with evaluation of potential reconfiguration of freight loading and delivery vehicle access along Lee Avenue. Findings will be included in ADSEIR-2.]

The project does not involve any changes to the roadway network 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 and would not include modifications to curb lines along the adjacent street frontages.

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-45 to 3.B-51. Access to the project site would be provided at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road. An evaluation of vehicle volumes and 95th percentile queues 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. The 95th percentile queue is defined to be the queue length (in vehicles) that has only a 5 percent probability of being exceeded during the analysis time period. The detailed analysis and calculation worksheets are provided in Attachment E, Queue Analysis Synchro Worksheets, of SEIR Appendix C2, Transit Assessment Memorandum.

Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue

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.

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 can extend to Harold Avenue and may occasionally block the City College Terminal entrance and SFFD Station 15 driveway on Ocean Avenue. Under existing conditions, there are 38 vehicles on the southbound approach 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 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 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) 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, queue lengths would remain about 12 vehicles in length (or 240 feet) during

the weekday a.m. peak hour and 14 vehicles (or 280 feet) in the weekday p.m. peak hour and would continue to be metered by the upstream signal. The 95th percentile queue length on the southbound approach would increase from two vehicles to about eight vehicles (approximately 160 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from three vehicles to about 13 vehicles (approximately 250 feet) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. With the Developer's Proposed Option, the southbound queues would extend past the Whole Foods exit driveway on Lee Avenue.

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, queueing at the westbound approach would increase up to about 15 vehicles (approximately 300 feet) during the weekday p.m. peak hour and would continue to be metered by the upstream signal. The 95th percentile queue length on the southbound approach would increase from two vehicles to about 10 vehicles (approximately 200 feet) during the weekday a.m. peak hour and from three vehicles to about 11 vehicles (approximately 220 feet) during the weekday p.m. peak hour. With the Additional Housing Option, the southbound queues would extend past the Whole Foods exit driveway on Lee Avenue.

While the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option do not involve any changes to the roadway network or include any design features that could cause major traffic hazards, both project options would increase overall traffic levels at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue such that queues would extend past the Whole Foods loading dock and exit driveway and would result in potentially significant hazardous conditions for traffic. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, Restripe Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue to Provide Two Southbound Approach Lanes**, would reduce hazardous traffic conditions to a less-than-significant level.

> **Mitigation Measure M-TR-1: Restripe Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue to Provide Two Southbound Approach Lanes**. SFMTA shall restripe the southbound Lee Avenue approach to Ocean Avenue to provide two southbound approach lanes. The project sponsor shall reimburse SFMTA for the cost of restriping. This mitigation measure shall be implemented after construction of and prior to occupancy of Phase 2. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measure would require review and approval by SFMTA.

Additionally, implementing the planning department's standard conditions of approval regarding queue abatement, **Improvement Measure I-TR-2, Queue Abatement**, would further reduce the impact related to queueing at the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection.

Improvement Measure I-TR-2: Queue Abatement. The project sponsor shall implement the planning department's Queue Abatement measure, tailored with specific measures to the proposed project:

- The project sponsor shall ensure that vehicular turning movements into the site or recurring vehicle queues do not substantially affect public transit operations on the public right-of-way along Ocean Avenue near the site entrance. A vehicle queue is defined as one or more vehicles (destined to the project site) blocking any portion of the street (including the sidewalk) for a consecutive period of three minutes or longer on a daily or weekly basis.
- If a recurring queue occurs, the owner/operator of the parking facility shall employ abatement methods as needed to abate the queue.
- Suggested abatement methods include but are not limited to the following: employment of additional parking attendants; installation of LOT FULL signs with active management by parking attendants; use of valet parking or other space-efficient parking techniques; use of offsite parking facilities or shared parking with nearby uses; use of parking occupancy sensors and signage directing drivers to available spaces; transportation demand management strategies such as those listed in the San Francisco Planning Code Transportation Demand Management Program.
- If the Planning Director, or his or her designee, suspects that a recurring queue is present, the Department shall notify the property owner in writing. Upon request, the owner/operator shall hire a qualified transportation consultant to evaluate the conditions at the site for no less than seven days. The consultant shall prepare a monitoring report to be submitted to the Department for review. If the Department determines that a recurring queue does exist, the facility owner/operator shall have 90 days from the date of the written determination to abate the queue.

Other Impacts on Traffic Safety

Impacts on traffic safety related to people walking and bicycling are discussed in Impact TR-3, impacts on traffic safety related to loading (including freight loading/service vehicles and passenger loading), are discussed in Impact TR-6.

Comparison of Impact 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. Because the proposed project's impacts would be less than significant with mitigation, the project would not result in new or substantially more-severe significant impacts than was previously identified in the PEIR.

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 and would not include modifications to curb lines along the adjacent street frontages.

Walking and Bicycling

As discussed in "Walking Network Features," p. 3.B-34, and "Bicycle Network Features," p. 3.B-34, 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, 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 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-12, p. 3.B-40, 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 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. Potential conflict points associated with the project would be most concentrated at these site access points.

Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue

Under existing conditions, there are about 700 people walking and 19 people bicycling across the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection 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 II bikeway along the Lee Avenue extension. Eastbound left turns are prohibited at Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue. This is not expected to create a substantial hazard for people walking or bicycling, however, as drivers would generally have unobstructed sightlines and/or substantial 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, there are about 180 people walking and 12 people bicycling across the Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road intersection 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) 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. This is not expected to constitute a substantial hazard for bicyclists, however, as drivers entering/exiting the Access Road would generally have unobstructed sightlines and/or substantial sight distance to see approaching bicyclists, and drivers would need to wait for a green light and/or be required to 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 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 on these movements (less than 30 vehicles), would not interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the site, although they may cause some temporary disruptions or obstructions to circulation for people walking and bicycling.

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 create hazards for people walking or bicycling or interfere with access or circulation.

Emergency Access

Emergency access to the project site and nearby emergency treatment centers would be similar to existing conditions. 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. Additionally, internal streets would provide a 26-foot (minimum) clear width. Clear widths would be sufficient to accommodate emergency vehicles and meet fire department requirements.[40] Although there would be a general increase in vehicle traffic from the additional activity at the site, 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 emergency treatment centers.

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, the project sponsor would conduct additional coordination of the design details with the police and fire departments for final review and approval, as required, to minimize the potential for impacts on emergency vehicle access to the project site or adjacent locations.

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.

While the proposed project's impacts on walking/biking, accessibility, and emergency access would be less than significant, the following improvement measure may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers to further reduce the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts. Implementing the planning department's standard conditions of approval regarding queue abatement, **Improvement Measure I-TR-2, Queue Abatement**, would further reduce the less-than-significant impact related to queueing at the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection.

Improvement Measure I-TR-2 Queue Abatement (Impact TR-2, p. 3.B-68).

[40] San Francisco Fire Code section 503.2.1, *http://sf-fire.org/501-street-widths-emergency-access*, accessed May 25, 2018.

Comparison of Impact TR-3 to PEIR Impacts Analysis

Impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists were not identified and emergency access was 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. As such, 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.

To further reduce less-than-significant impacts related to the anticipated increase in the number of people walking, the PEIR identified the following improvement measure specifically intended to be undertaken by SFMTA in coordination with sponsors of subsequent development projects within the plan area:

> **PEIR Improvement Measure (Walking/Accessibility).** 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.

There are existing pedestrian countdown signals at signalized intersections serving the project site (i.e., Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road). Therefore, the improvement measure identified in the PEIR is not applicable to the project.

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.

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 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 C, Transportation Supporting Information, and summarized in this section.

Developer's Proposed Option

Vehicle trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option would increase transit delay by a maximum of five seconds along Frida Kahlo Way, six seconds along the Ocean Avenue corridor, and one second along the Geneva Avenue corridor, and would not result in any additional transit reentry delay during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Transit riders generated by the Developer's Proposed Option would increase passenger boarding delay by an average of three seconds per bus during the weekday a.m. peak hour and four seconds per bus during the

weekday p.m. peak hour. Transit riders generated by the Developer's Proposed Option would increase passenger boarding delay by a maximum of seven seconds per bus during the weekday a.m. peak hour and nine seconds per bus during the weekday p.m. peak hour on the 43 Masonic line.

Additional Housing Option

Vehicle trips generated by the Additional Housing Option would increase transit delay by about one second along Frida Kahlo Way, a maximum of eight seconds along the Ocean Avenue corridor, and one second along Geneva Avenue corridor, and would not result in any additional transit reentry delay during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Transit riders generated by the Additional Housing Option would increase passenger boarding delay by an average of three seconds per bus during the weekday a.m. peak hour and five seconds per bus during the weekday p.m. peak hour. Transit riders generated by the Additional Housing Option would increase passenger boarding delay by a maximum of eight seconds per bus during the weekday a.m. peak hour and ten seconds per bus during the weekday p.m. peak hour on the 43 Masonic line.

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 C, Transportation Supporting Information, 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 do not extend to the City College Terminal during weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option, the queue lengths for westbound movements would increase by about one vehicle length (between 17 and 23 feet) during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The increase in 95th percentile queue lengths would not result in 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.

Additional Housing Option

Under existing conditions, vehicle queues on the westbound approach at the intersection of Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue do not extend to the City College Terminal during weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. With the addition of vehicle trips generated by the Additional Housing Option,

the queue lengths for westbound movements would increase by between two and five vehicle lengths (between 36 and 90 feet) during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. The increase in 95th percentile queue lengths would not result in 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.

While the proposed project's impacts on transit delay would be less than significant, the following improvement measure may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers to further reduce the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts. Implementing the planning department's standard conditions of approval regarding queue abatement, **Improvement Measure I-TR-2, Queue Abatement**, would further reduce the less-than-significant impact related to queueing at the Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue intersection.

Improvement Measure I-TR-2 Queue Abatement (Impact TR-2, p. 3.B-68).

Comparison of Impact 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 capacity and ridership increases are no longer considered a significant impact.[41] The PEIR did not identify impacts related to transit delay. Therefore, no relevant mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. As such, the proposed project would not have any new or substantially more-severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to transit impacts.

---

[41] San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update, Public Transit Memo and Appendices, February 2019, *San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review – Update*, accessed February 14, 2019.

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-8, p. 3.B-25, 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.[42,43]

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, which also indicates the project's uses would not cause substantial additional VMT.

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-31.

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:

- 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

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

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

- Addition of transportation wayfinding signage
- Removal of off-street parking spaces

These features fit within the general types of projects that 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 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. As such, 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 would not result in a loading deficit. (Less than Significant)

[Note to Reviewer: Additional data collection of loading operations along Lee Avenue and analysis of possible reconfiguration of freight loading and delivery vehicle access along Lee Avenue is being conducted. Findings will be included in ADSEIR-2.]

Proposed loading facilities are described in "Loading Features," p. 3.B-34, 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-15, p. 3.B-43.

Developer's Proposed Option

The Developer's Proposed Option would include three off-street freight loading spaces, eight on-street freight loading (yellow curb) spaces, and 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 three off-street and eight on-street loading/service vehicle spaces would satisfy the average and peak hour freight loading demand.

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 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.

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 are 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-13, p. 3.B-41, 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.

Additional Housing Option

The Additional Housing Option would include four off-street freight loading spaces, eight on-street freight loading (yellow curb) spaces, and 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 four off-street and eight on-street loading/service vehicle spaces would satisfy the average and peak hour freight loading demand.

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 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.

Daycare Drop-Off and Pick-Up

As under the Developer's Proposed Option, the child care 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 are 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-13, p. 3.B-41, 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.

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.

Mitigation: None required.

Although freight loading impacts would be less than significant, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would increase traffic volumes along Lee Avenue, which may conflict with freight loading activities related to the adjacent developments. Implementation of **Improvement Measure I-TR-3, Monitor Loading Activity and Implement Loading Strategies as Needed**, would further reduce the less-than-significant impacts related to freight loading.

> **Improvement Measure I-TR-3**: **Monitor Loading Activity and Implement Loading Strategies as Needed**. The project sponsor will coordinate with adjacent property owners at Avalon Ocean Avenue/Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts Site) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (Phelan Loop Site) to monitor loading activity along Lee Avenue. If warranted, the project sponsor will coordinate with the Avalon Ocean Avenue/Whole Foods at 1150 Ocean Avenue (Kragen Auto Parts Site) and 1100 Ocean Avenue (Phelan Loop Site) property owners to implement relevant improvements identified in the PEIR, 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 will:
>   - 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; and
> - Work with SFMTA to enforce on-street parking prohibitions along Lee Avenue.

Comparison of Impact TR-5 to PEIR Impact Analysis

The PEIR did not assess loading impacts at the program level, and did not require any mitigation measures. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to loading are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project.

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

> **PEIR Improvement Measure (Phelan Loop 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

These loading improvement measures are similar to Improvement Measure I-TR-3 identified for the proposed project. Therefore, on the basis of the facts discussed above, the project would not have any new or substantially more-severe effects than those identified in the PEIR related to loading impacts.

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-5. The cumulative impacts analysis takes into account reasonably foreseeable probable future development projects in the study area that would contribute to use of the transportation system. The 2040 future cumulative scenario was established based on a review of planned and reasonably foreseeable future projects and SF-CHAMP travel demand model forecasts. Additional discussion of the land use development and transportation network assumptions is provided in "2040 Cumulative Conditions," p. 3.B-55.

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

As discussed under Impact TR-1, p. 3.B-60, the project would not result in significant construction-related impacts under existing plus project conditions.

The construction of the proposed project or project variant may overlap with construction of other reasonably foreseeable future 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 reasonably foreseeable future 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, each development project 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.

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 would also be required to conduct construction in accordance with City requirements, the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable developments in San Francisco, would result in *less-than-significant* cumulative construction-related transportation impacts.

Mitigation: None required.

While the proposed project's construction-related impacts would be less than significant, the following improvement measures may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers to further reduce the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts related to construction activities.

Improvement Measure I-TR-1: Construction Management Plan (Impact TR-1, p. 3.B-64).

PEIR Improvement Measure (Construction): Limit Hours of Construction Truck Activity (Impact TR-1, p. 3.B-65).

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. As such, 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 past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not create traffic hazards. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact TR-2, p. 3.B-65, the project would not create traffic hazards under existing plus project conditions.

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. This would generally be expected to lead to an increase in the potential for traffic hazards. 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 such as those located along Ocean Avenue west of the project site and the City College Facilities Master Plan 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 MuniForward

improvements that would include design features that enhance safety, and promote walking, bicycling and transit use.

Overall, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would contribute to an increase in vehicle activity on surrounding streets but does not propose any features that would preclude or inhibit the future implementation of transportation network changes and improvements to traffic safety. As such, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable 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. As such, 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 past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not interfere with accessibility. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact TR-3, p. 3.B-69, the project would not interfere with accessibility to the project site, adjoining areas, or emergency access under existing plus project conditions.

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. 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 does not propose any features that would preclude or inhibit accessibility and would not generate activities that would create hazards for people walking or bicycling or interfere with emergency access or circulation.

Given the considerations outlined above, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable 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. As such, 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.

To further reduce less-than-significant impacts related to the anticipated increase in the number of people walking, the PEIR identified the following improvement measure specifically intended to be undertaken by SFMTA in coordination with sponsors of subsequent development projects within the plan area:

> **PEIR Improvement Measure (Walking/Accessibility)**. 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.

There are existing pedestrian countdown signals at signalized intersections serving the project site (i.e., Ocean Avenue/Lee Avenue and Frida Kahlo Way/Access Road). Therefore, the improvement measure identified in the PEIR is not applicable to the project.

Impact C-TR-4: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future 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-72, the project would not substantially delay public transit. Under cumulative conditions, vehicle activity 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 increase in vehicle volume would result in an associated increase in delay at intersections within the study area, which may result in substantial delays to public transit. However, the incremental increase in delay associated with vehicle trips generated by the Developer's Proposed Option or Additional Housing Option would be similar to the project-related delay incurred under existing plus project conditions (Impact TR-4).

Given the considerations outlined above, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable cumulative development in the project vicinity may substantially delay public transit, but the project would not contribute considerably to those impacts.

> **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 capacity and ridership increases are no longer considered a significant impact.[44] The PEIR did not identify impacts related to transit delay. Therefore, no relevant mitigation measures were identified in the PEIR. As such, 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 past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future 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-75, 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-17, 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.[45,46]

---

44 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.

45 Ibid, footnote 4.

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

TABLE 3.B-17
2040 DAILY VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

Land Use	Bay Area Regional Average	Project TAZ (TAZ 915)
Residential (per capita)	16.1	10.8
Child care (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:
Child care 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. As such, 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 past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant loading impacts. (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact TR-6, p. 3.B-76, the project would not result in significant loading impacts under existing plus project conditions.

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. While there would be a general increase in vehicle traffic and freight and passenger loading demand associated with planned and reasonably foreseeable development, loading impacts would be localized and site-specific and would not contribute to impacts from other development projects near the project site.

The proposed supply of freight loading/service vehicle spaces and passenger loading spaces would satisfy the estimated average and peak hour demands generated by the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option. Overall, because loading tends to occur as close to the delivery or drop-off/pick-up point as possible, it is expected that loading demand associated with the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would be accommodated by proposed loading facilities. Furthermore, because loading would occur near

the delivery or drop-off/pick-up site, it is not likely that any unmet loading demand from other cumulative projects within the study area would interfere with the project site.

Given the considerations outlined above, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable cumulative development in the project vicinity would not result in significant cumulative loading impacts.

Mitigation: None required.

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. Consequently, no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce project impacts related to loading are identified or required with respect to the currently proposed project.

Parking Information

[Note to Reviewer: This section will be expanded to complete sections as described and include data and information obtained from areawide parking counts scheduled for February 2019.]

This section includes a discussion of the existing parking supply, the overall availability of parking in the broader study area and the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option parking supply. The Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option meet the public resources code criteria as a residential, mixed use infill project in a transit priority area and therefore parking is not an environmental impact for the purposes of CEQA. As such, this section is provided for informational purposes only.

Parking conditions are not static, as parking supply and demand vary from day to day, from day to night, from month to month, etc. Hence, the availability of parking spaces (or lack thereof) is not a permanent physical condition but changes over time as people change their modes and patterns of travel. While parking conditions change over time, a substantial deficit in parking caused by a project that creates hazardous conditions or major delays to traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians could adversely affect the physical environment. Whether a deficit in parking creates such conditions will depend on the magnitude of the shortfall and the ability of drivers to change travel patterns or switch to other travel modes. If a substantial deficit in parking caused by a project creates hazardous conditions or major delays in travel, such a condition also could result in secondary physical environmental impacts (e.g., air quality or noise impacts cause by congestion), depending on the project and its setting.

The absence of a ready supply of parking spaces, combined with available options other than auto travel (e.g., transit service, taxis, bicycles, or walking) and a relatively dense pattern of urban development, induces many drivers to seek and find alternative parking facilities, shift to other modes of travel, or change their overall travel habits. Any such resulting shifts to transit service

or other modes (walking and biking) would be in keeping with the City's Transit First Policy and numerous general plan policies, including those in the transportation element, as discussed previously in Section 3.B.5, Regulatory Framework, p. 3.B-27. Additionally, the City's Transit First Policy, established in the City's Charter article 8A, section 8A.115, provides that "parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation."

Existing Parking Conditions

This section provides an inventory of existing parking provided on the project site as well as parking provided on streets within the study area.

On-Site Parking

The project site is currently occupied by a 1,007-space surface parking lot (the west basin) accessed by two driveways on Frida Kahlo Way. The west basin serves as overflow parking for the City College's 1,167-space east basin, which is accessed from the same two driveways on Frida Kahlo Way. Parking supply and occupancy counts were collected at both the west and east basins when City College was in session. Parking inventory and occupancy data was collected on Thursday December 7, 2017, Wednesday January 31, 2018, and Wednesday April 18, 2018, on an hourly basis between 7 a.m. and 9 p.m.

The peak hour of utilization for both the west and east basins was observed to occur between 11 a.m. and 12 p.m. in both the west and east basins. During this time, there were 335 cars parked (672 spaces available) in the west basin and 1,071 cars parked (96 spaces available) in the east basin. The facility (west and east basins) was 65 percent occupied during this peak utilization time with a total of 1,406 vehicles parked and 768 vacant spaces available.

On-Street Parking

A summary of the on-street parking within the neighborhood will be provided in this section.

Off-Street Parking

A summary of the off-street parking facilities within the neighborhood will be provided in this section.

Proposed Parking Supply

Developer's Proposed Option

Under the Developer's Proposed Option, a 750-space public parking garage would be constructed on the site and would help to offset the loss of the approximately 1,000-space west basin. The public parking garage would be located on the southern end of the site and would be accessible from Lee Avenue.

Additional Housing Option

Under the Additional Housing Option, the project would not provide any replacement public parking.

Estimated Parking Demand

The daily parking demand generated by the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option will be estimated using the methodology described in the SF Guidelines. A summary of the estimated vehicle parking demand generated by the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option will be provided in this section.

Parking Supply and Demand Assessment

The evaluation of whether a parking deficit is substantial and could result in hazardous conditions or delays considers whether the parking demand could be met by the overall supply of parking in the general vicinity and whether the project site is adequately served by other modes of transportation. The analysis accounts for potential secondary effects, such as cars circling and looking for parking spaces in areas of limited parking supply, by assuming all drivers would attempt to find parking at or near their destination. The secondary effects of drivers searching for parking are typically offset by a reduction in vehicle trips due to others who are aware of constrained parking conditions and choose to use another mode to reach their destination.

On-street parking is provided on streets near the project site and there are multiple public parking facilities within 1 mile of the site. Given the project's location in proximity to high-quality local transit services with connections to regional transit, the implementation of transportation demand management measures, and the availability of on- and off-street public parking facilities, the Developer's Proposed Option and Additional Housing Option would not create a substantial parking deficit.

The planning commission has wide latitude for decisions regarding the amount of parking that should be approved for a development and may use discretion to reduce the amount of parking provided onsite if the reduction would not lead to a substantial parking deficit,[47] or significant impact. At times, the Planning Commission does not support the parking ratio proposed by a project sponsor and the ratio is substantially reduced. In some cases, particularly when the proposed project is in a transit-rich area, the Planning Commission does not support the provision of any off-street parking spaces. If the proposed project or project variant would substantially reduce its off-street parking, this would most likely not result in a substantial parking deficit for the various factors that affect travel behavior described above and the available parking in the vicinity. Even if substantial reduction would result in a substantial parking deficit, which is unlikely, any unmet parking demand associated with the proposed

[47] San Francisco Planning Department, *California Environmental Quality Act: Vehicle Miles Traveled, Parking, For-Hire Vehicles, and Alternatives*, February 23, 2017, *http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/California%20Environmental%20Quality%20Act_Vehicle_Miles_Traveled_Parking_For-Hire_Vehicles_Alternatives.pdf*, accessed May 25, 2018.

project or project would not result in hazardous conditions for traffic, transit, bicycles or pedestrians or in significant delays affecting transit, also because of the various factors that affect travel behavior.

This page intentionally left blank