



Responses to Public Comment and Questions Regarding Draft Transportation Parameters
Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (CAC) - November 30, 2015 Meeting

The following matrix contains City staff responses to questions regarding the draft Transportation parameters. Public comment was raised during the 11/30/2015 CAC meeting and in written form before or after the meeting. The original draft parameters and latest revisions can be found at sf-planning.org/brcac.

Principle #1: *Design site access and circulation to minimize the development’s congestion impacts, especially on adjacent areas, while also maximizing pedestrian and bicyclist safety.*

| | Question/Comment | City Response |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Creating walkability, explain presentation Slide 17 [principle 1, connect pedestrian routes] | Breaking down size of the block to create a connected grid of streets makes it easier and more appealing to walk; San Francisco is fairly good at accomplishing this. The principles are written to ensure Balboa Reservoir benefits from walkable blocks, safe routes for pedestrians and an inviting walking experience. |
| 2 | Ocean Avenue frontage for City College is a barrier, how can that be solved? | Ocean Avenue presents many challenges in getting from Balboa BART to Balboa Reservoir, e.g. the hill, sidewalk obstructions and limited right-of-way. The design of City College’s Ocean Campus is being revisited in City College’s master plan process, which will begin in 2016. While the City College Master Plan is distinct from the Balboa Reservoir, the City is coordinating with City College, in particular around transportation. Our goal is to have complementary and coordinated plans on both sites. |
| 3 | Any street design should think about permeability and where storm water will go. Plymouth Avenue floods frequently. | Agreed and DPW is an important partner in street design. See next comment (4). |
| 4 | Pavement creates a storm water issue and there should be coordination with SFPUC. | SFPUC has rigorous standards for storm water management. All developments are required to reduce existing stormwater runoff from their site. There are many projects taking place in the neighborhood now to improve flooding (e.g. Holloway). See sustainability parameters for further guidelines. |
| 5 | Principle 1, Take into account congestion and parking impacts to Sunnyside streets on the north and east side of the reservoir – to Judson, | Congestion impacts are taken into account in Principles 1 and 3. The underlying intent of Principles 2 and 3 is to invite fewer cars to the |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>Circular, and Monterey Boulevard and the narrow neighborhood streets that feed into them.</p> | <p>neighborhood. While parking management on surrounding streets is not included in the Balboa Reservoir project, neighborhoods have the option of joining a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) zone, which limits neighborhood street parking to residents only. Or, under certain circumstances, they can join initiate an RPP pilot project. For more info, see www.sfmta.com/neighborhoodparking Also, neighborhood parking conditions and management will be explored in the 2016 Balboa Area Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Principle 1(a) “Provide the right number of cut outs”</p> | <p>While the City aims to balance all the competing needs for a limited amount of infrastructure, there is not an objectively “right number” of cut outs or curb cuts. However, the parameter is worded for access points that “will best manage congestion impacts.” The community will have several opportunities to improve and comment on any proposal selected through the RFP process.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Parameter 1(a) Access to BR is extremely limited. Lee and Brighton are limited/no access to cars. Access from Plymouth via San Ramon is not viable. This leaves Phelan, which is already too congested.</p> | <p>The Balboa Reservoir community design process and proposals will look at adding access routes and improving some of the limited access connections to the site, for vehicles, pedestrians, bikes and/or emergency vehicles. Not all roads will be designed equally, but connections to the site will be added.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Parameter 1(b): Zeroing in on details without seeing big picture: The goal of minimizing congestion can only be achieved by minimizing housing density. The BR site's internal circulation design will not be able to alleviate congestion on Phelan outside of the BR site. BR residents' cars will add to congestion on Phelan.</p> | <p>As congestion is a community concern, community members have also identified affordable housing and open space as priorities. Minimizing housing density may put these priorities at risk or render affordable housing infeasible. Thus the RFP principles are designed to balance such priorities with the transportation needs of current and future residents, students and City College staff.</p> <p>It has been acknowledged that free or reduced price parking incentivizes driving. Many individuals currently driving would choose not to drive if given commensurate incentives for other options. This has been borne out by a number of TDM studies, university campaigns and employee transportation programs. Thus, incenting these alternative means of transport can help minimize congestion. The TDM project will look at ways to incentivize alternative means and lower the barrier to trying new ways of</p> |

| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>getting around.</p> <p>With regard to future residents, studies show that more and more people are choosing to forgo owning their own vehicles. The TDM measures herein are designed to help people make sustainable transportation choices for most trips. TDM strategies work best when there are a suite of them—individually they may not deliver tremendous shifts in behavior. But, together, they can provide incentives and tools that help residents get where they need to go without having to own their own vehicle. And, developments with many transportation amenities attract residents for whom this lifestyle is appealing.</p> |
| <p>9</p> | <p>Failure to see big picture: Congestion impact is a function of residential density. Access and circulation design will have relatively little effect because essentially all car traffic has to feed into Phelan.</p> | <p>Congestion is a function of many cars in a limited right-of-way. It is the goal of the TDM plan and Balboa Reservoir project to provide more alternatives and fair choices when traveling to and from the area, thus reducing cars in the limited amount of streets that we have. The TDM plan is intended to take a step back at the big picture, beyond the Balboa Reservoir.</p> |
| <p>10</p> | <p>More traffic flowing on Ocean is a big concern. I want to see the transportation improvements start now.</p> | <p>A significant number of transportation projects in the Balboa Park area have been completed, initiated or designed in the last two years, and will continue to be implemented. They focus on increasing transit access, walkability and pedestrian safety to and near the Balboa Park Station. See:</p> <p>Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design Study www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3740</p> <p>Balboa Park Station Area and Plaza Improvements www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/balboa-park-station-area-and-plaza-improvements</p> <p>Vision Zero projects https://www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/vision-zero</p> <p>8 Bayshore improvements https://www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/8-bayshore-transit-priority-project</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | <p>Other Muni Forward improvements https://www.sfmta.com/muniforward</p> <p>The TDM Plan is intended to go beyond these current improvements. Without space to build more roads or lanes, the best way to address traffic is to reduce it. The TDM plan will coordinate strategies with City College and neighborhoods to reduce traffic in the area, independently of the Balboa Reservoir project.</p> |
| 11 | Phelan/Ocean/Geneva intersection has been rated “F.” Motorists report taking a half hour or more to get from Judson to turn onto Ocean. | See comments 8-10. |
| 12 | Parameter 1(a) Streets adjacent to the property are at capacity. Neighbors in Sunnyside and Westwood Park have to deal with the overflow. Phelan and Ocean Avenue are the main arteries and are at capacity. | See comments 8-10. |
| 13 | Parameter 1(a) Site access is a critical issue since every access point will feed traffic into local streets. Those streets were heavily congested even before they had to absorb traffic - and parking pressure -- from the Avalon development on Ocean Avenue. In addition, with the exception of Ocean and Phelan, adjacent streets which may be designated for access are narrow and difficult to traverse with existing traffic levels. This parameter aims to "best manage congestion impacts" but local streets are at capacity and there is no "managing" that will change that constraint, nor the fact that it is neighbors in adjacent areas who will bear the brunt of delays and parking demand. | See comments 8-10. |
| 14 | Parameter 1(b) It is difficult to envision how street design and other factors cited here will address or prevent congestion on nearby streets including Phelan and any others designated as access points. Those often narrow streets are taxed by residential traffic and the very significant traffic generated by City College, Riordan High School, and neighborhood elementary schools. | See previous comment. In addition, without a safe, dignified way to walk, bike, take transit or otherwise not drive alone – people have every reason to drive alone. Creating safe street designs encourage walking and biking. Managing parking (through pricing, controls, and supply) will reduce the need for drivers to circulate in search of parking, thereby adding to congestion. Residential parking permits can reduce non-residents parking in surrounding neighborhoods. There are many tools with which |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | the City and neighbors can affect change. |
| 12 | Principle 1(c) Five Schools in the immediate vicinity; how do we balance the two TDMs? | Parameter 1(c) has been revised to include schools and streets within ½ mile. |
| 13 | Parameter 1(c) Judson Avenue, immediately to the east of the reservoir property in Sunnyside, must be included in the list of streets to which particular attention must be paid. | See comment 12 |
| 14 | Principle 1(d) More safe bike connections; SF Better Street Plans | Noted. The SFMTA Bicycle Plan calls for connecting Judson Avenue to a future Lee Avenue extension, and thereby connecting to the bike route on Holloway Ave. The RFP calls for this North-South Lee Avenue connection. Street designs must comply with Better Streets Plan recommendations. |
| 15 | Parameter 1(d) Given the proximity of City College, a high school and elementary schools, not to mention reservoir and neighborhood residents, it is critical that pedestrians and bicyclists have good options to move through the site, bypassing Phelan. Specific approaches could include dedicated bicycle tracks, designated bicycle routes, high visibility crosswalks, pedestrian/bicyclist crossing signals, very low speed limits, and traffic calming measures such as narrow lanes, bulb-outs and planted medians. | Noted. These are all possible tools developer teams can propose and partner with the SFMTA to implement. |
| 16 | Parameter 1(e) Street design standards should include those specified in NACTO's Urban Street Design Guide in addition to the Better Streets Plan. Sidewalk and path widths must accommodate multiple users, including pedestrians walking side by side. | Agreed. Recommended sidewalk widths are ten feet for the street types included in the plan. Parameter has been revised to include the NACTO guide. |
| 17 | Open site up for walking to Balboa Park Station. | Concurs with Parameters 1(a), 1(d) and 2(c) |
| 18 | Connecting the site with area across from 280. | See comment 17 |
| 20 | No deck as suggested in Balboa Park Station plan. | This is presumably in reference to the deck over I-280 suggested in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, Objective 2.3. This objective is beyond the scope of Balboa Reservoir, but these and other improvements included in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan are still being considered by the City in their work with the Balboa Park Station Area CAC. |
| 21 | Safety on Ocean Avenue is paramount. Light rail vehicles and cars share the street; cars | Pedestrian safety is a top priority for the SFMTA and City; it is cited in several parameters. For more info |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | don't respect the yield even with transit islands. | on pedestrian planning in the City, https://www.sfmta.com/visionzero And Balboa Park Station Area improvements www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/balboa-park-station-area-and-plaza-improvements |
| 23 | No east west access across the site. | Parameters 1(a), 1(b), 1(d), 2(d) and 2(f) all strongly encourage additional connections, while accounting for impacts on adjacent streets. Proposals fulfilling these parameters will perform the best in the RFP process. |
| 24 | Curved streets in Westwood Park help with the wind and create a nice feeling. | Noted. |
| 25 | If you want to walk, the most basic thing hasn't been addressed, walking. We need to have these issues addressed before this project starts. | The Parameters under Principles 1, 2 and 4 all seek to maximize ease, safety and accessibility for pedestrians. Also, see comment 10. |
| 27 | Pedestrian paths separated from bicycle paths to maximize safety. | Specific designs will be explored at a later stage, but the principles seek to maximize pedestrian safety. |
| 28 | Create a safe bicycle path through the Balboa site, and remove Phelan bicycle lanes; need a north south bicycle route that will work | Bicycle access to connect surrounding bike lanes is consistent with SFMTA policy. Parameter 2(d) requires a North-South bicycle connection. |
| 30 | A left turn arrow at the intersection of Ocean Avenue and Juniper Serra so that people going south on 280 might go West instead of East past the Bart Station | Noted. |
| 31 | The more traffic is decreased on Ocean Avenue, the more traffic will spill over into residential streets. (The old saying "If you damn a river, the water must go somewhere".) This over flow is already a problem on residential streets. The development of the Balboa Reservoir should not add to the problem. | The City agrees the Reservoir should not add to the problem of congestion on residential streets. The goal of the parameters is to balance many community priorities, including affordable housing, open space and access to City College, while providing direction in the RFP. In support of these larger priorities, TDM measures are designed to encourage alternatives to driving alone and therefore reduce the demand for parking and roadway. At the same time, traffic calming measures, signal coordination and intersection re-designs can help reduce flow into residential streets. Also, see comments 8-10. |
| 22 | Difficult to make a left turn on Ocean. | Traffic options surrounding the site will be considered in the TDM project. Mitigation measures |

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>for environmental impacts will also be required in any future project’s environmental review.</p> |
| <p>32</p> | <p>Implement immediate school, and pedestrian safe crossing painted zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross Walks at transit platforms and transfer points • Striped Intersections and crossings near schools | <p>The Balboa Park Station Area improvements and the Ocean and Geneva Corridor Design study include a number of improved crossings, markings and pedestrian amenities. The same intent and consideration for pedestrian crossings will be applied to the Balboa Reservoir site.</p> |
| <p>33</p> | <p>Increase funding for pedestrian safety on par with Bike and TEP funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Install signage, and slow zone alterations, Flashing crosswalks - Train approaching signage + sounds <p>Look at new strategies to inform drivers of vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians of the rules of the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flyers to schools - Look before you leap / slow at the schools / “bee-safe” school crossings / PEDESTRIANS = OUR #1 PRIORITY <p>Increase public awareness of areas where children cross, and transition zones occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signage (temporary to permanent) – Art Project, or Street Interventions and Increased funding for enforcement. <p>Think outside the box solutions. Look at a proven installed system or alternative and “tweak” it for Balboa</p> | <p>While program funding is beyond the scope of this project, supporting City efforts to increase pedestrian and bike safety funding is consistent with Parameter 2(c) and 2(d).</p> <p>Several pedestrian safety features have been added and will continue to be implemented in the Balboa Park Station area. See www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/balboa-park-station-area-and-plaza-improvements</p> <p>Principle 4 includes a number of amenities and the general requirement of coordinating programming, design and communications. All of the strategies suggested by the public commenter are on the table and can be explored by the developer partner in partnership with the SFMTA. The RFP respondents will all have access to these public comments.</p> |

Principle #2: Create incentives for increasing transportation choices.

| | Question/Comment | City Response |
|----|--|---|
| 34 | <p>Parameter 2(a): There is no realistic way to stop residents from owning a car. Will voluntary "creative proposals" and incentives be sufficient to stop residents from owning cars? The only "creative proposal" that would work would be prohibition of car ownership. But would limiting/prohibiting car ownership be legally possible?</p> | <p>There is no intent of or known legal mechanism for prohibiting car ownership. However, studies show that more and more people are choosing to forgo owning their own vehicles.</p> <p>TDM measures are designed to help people make sustainable transportation choices for most trips. TDM strategies work best when there are a suite of them—individually they may not deliver tremendous shifts in behavior. But, together, they can provide incentives and tools that help residents get where they need to go without having to own their own vehicle. And, developments with many transportation amenities attract residents for whom this lifestyle is appealing.</p> |
| 35 | <p>Parameter 2(a) In the 60% break down what is the breakdown of the mode share?</p> | <p>A target of “60% automobile mode share at buildout” means that no more than 60% of residents in a future balboa reservoir development would be using a car for their journey to work.</p> |
| 36 | <p>Parameter 2(a) What is the overall target mode share for residents and what is the target date for compliance? If the maximum of 60% auto mode share at buildout is not met, what mitigation will be triggered?</p> | <p>All target mode shares (meaning, the “share” of travel by any specific travel mode, such as transit, driving alone, or walking) have not been determined. But the automobile share is the critical number in terms of reducing greenhouse gasses, congestion and other social costs of driving alone. The target date will be at buildout. A development agreement (DA) between the City and a developer partner will contain more specifics about when data should be collected or corrective measures implemented. The DA (and the TDM study) will include corrective measures and suggestions for achieving the stated target.</p> |
| 37 | <p>Parameter 2(a) What are performance measures? Who defines, monitors and reports them? Rather than creative strategies being encouraged, it is essential that the city accepts responsibility for not only monitoring the project in the long term and collecting and analyzing data, but for implementing specific countermeasures and corrective action when</p> | <p>Performance measures will be recommended in the TDM study (by a consultant), and will ultimately be approved by the SFMTA and Planning Department, consistent with current policy, and codified in a binding agreement between the City and a developer partner. The developer partner will report the data on a regular basis.</p> |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>targets are not met. Just as the TDM manager position should be funded by the developer, so should the data collection and analysis and corrective measures. Data and performance reports should be readily available to residents and neighbors in adjacent areas.</p> | <p>The comment is correct and concurs with standard practice that the developer fund data collection, analysis and corrective measures. Data and reporting will be managed by SF Planning or SFMTA, and will be public.</p> |
| 38 | <p>Parameter 2(b) Will a one-year carshare membership be enough to make residents sell their cars or keep them from getting cars, and will a resident end up buying a car after the one-year car-share freebie ends?</p> | <p>By including initial carshare membership as an included amenity, the project will make it easy for those who have not used carshare before to try it out. One of the barriers to shifting transportation behavior is getting people to try something new. The user will still need to pay for usage. If carshare is a valuable component to a household's transportation portfolio, the added cost of membership is a marginal addition over the usage.</p> <p>Carshare is a complement to transit, walking, and bicycling—enabling people who live car-free or car-light lives to have access to a car when they really need one. Carshare often supports households with one car that might otherwise have two cars. In aggregate, this also reduces the overall need for parking for second vehicles that only get driven on occasion.</p> |
| 39 | <p>Parameter 2(b). Carshare. If you're a working person and you take your car to work, your spot becomes open; a formal carshare program could be useful at City College; when people are working and driving to their jobs, their spots could be available to students or other users who are there for the day and vacate the spot for those returning from work; we need the data to support usage habits in the neighborhoods.</p> | <p>Noted. The concept proposed by the commenter is fundamental to shared parking. The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study will collect neighborhood parking and demographic data, and make recommendations regarding carshare. Data collected in the TDM study will inform related recommendations for the development and City College.</p> |
| 40 | <p>Parameter 2(b) If a resident retains car ownership and uses MUNI, Bart, biking, where will his car be stored?</p> | <p>Some parking will be provided onsite, but will be unbundled from residential units and overall is independent of a resident's use of other modes. Car storage will be up to the individual.</p> |
| 41 | <p>Parameter 2(b) Will a BR resident park in the surrounding neighborhoods instead?</p> | <p>While we cannot predict where people will park their cars, measures to prevent non-residents from parking in neighborhood streets are already available to communities. Neighbors can elect to create a residential parking permit zone and reduce the number of non-residents parking in their neighborhood.</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 42 | Parameter 2(c) How about using residents for these jobs? How about requiring residents to work in the neighborhood--CCSF, Balboa HS, Lick Wilmerding, Aptos, Denman? | While there is no legal mechanism to require residents to work in the neighborhood, the City has every intent of providing more housing and transportation access for the local workforce and school employees. In addition to providing affordable housing for low-income households, the Housing Parameters include targets for moderate income (typical workforce level) affordability – an unprecedented strategy for the workforce which is critically underserved in San Francisco. |
| 43 | Parameter 2(b) - A firm commitment to enacting all of these, not vague idea to pursue one or more, is required for any effective mitigation to take place. Guarantee that every household is provided with a minimum one-year car share membership | The one-year membership is currently a requirement, under Principle 2. |
| 44 | Parameter 2(b) In addition, the entire carshare program should be planned, implemented, evaluated and modified as necessary in conjunction with CCSF. Many City College students face considerable financial challenges and such a program could benefit students in specific situations. | Agreed. The intent of the TDM Study is to address transportation issues in the neighborhood in a holistic way and especially consider the shared needs of residents and City College students. |
| 45 | Parameter 2(b) In addition to exceeding the requirement, make carshare parking available to guests. | Carshare parking is typically limited to carshare vehicles. Carshare parking is one way of making carsharing a convenient, attractive alternative to private car ownership. . |
| 46 | Parameter 2(b) Spaces should be on the street and should be available at multiple locations in the reservoir property and on the CCSF campus. | Noted. The City is currently piloting carshare spaces on the street. As a development parameter, RFP respondents proposing street parking will perform better if they provide on-street carshare parking. |
| 47 | Parameter 2(b) - Last bullet should be strongly encouraged and promoted. | Bicycle parking for cargo and larger bicycles is required in Parameter 2(d) |
| 48 | Parameter 2(c) Strongly support the idea of making transit passes or the benefit allowance available to all residents. | Noted. |
| 49 | Parameter 2(c) A subsidized shuttle managed jointly by the developer and CCSF should be implemented to serve both the reservoir and the campus. This could have a significant effect on encouraging transit use, lessening parking demand, limiting air pollution, and reducing | Noted. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | traffic congestion. | |
| 50 | Parameter 2(d) Promote electric bicycles and do this in conjunction with CCSF and one or more local bicycle shops. Hold demo events, have e-bikes available as part of the bike share or car share programs, make information and incentives available, and have free, convenient charging at every bicycle parking space in the reservoir property and at multiple locations on the campus. | Noted. Electric bicycle charging stations are included in Principle 2. Principle 4 has been revised to include electric bicycle demonstrations among public outreach and demonstration events. . |
| 51 | Parameter 2(d) Replace the ill-conceived, poorly designed bike lanes on Phelan, which neighbors opposed from their inception, with a well-designed north-south dedicated cycle track which would connect to the larger bicycle network outside the development at both ends. | A north-south connection is required in the Balboa Reservoir RFP. The SFMTA will look into records of past traffic patterns at this location. If possible, an engineer will study current conditions, taking into account all modes traveling at this intersection/location. Residents will be informed of any potential changes that could be implemented and when they would take place. |
| 52 | Parameter 2(d) If such a facility is more than a location where repairs can be done, this effort should be pursued in conjunction with a local bicycle shop. | Noted. Other principles include parameters for complementing and supporting existing businesses. This facility need not be a retail shop, however. It is inclusive of providing only self-service tools. |
| 53 | Parameter 2(d) Regardless of whether a bike share pods are provided nearby, the developer must provide on-site access in order to promote usage. A pod also should be located on the CCSF campus. | Access to the site will be provided, as with any other public street. Bikeshare pods are expanding in 2016, and City College sites present a great opportunity for them if other pods are within biking distance. |
| 54 | Parameter 2(d) Require that memberships be provided for Bay Area Bike Share. Have program to encourage participation with information, incentives, etc. | Language has been added to Principle 4 to ensure that Bike Share participation is encouraged and easily accessed. RFP respondents who provide more incentives and opportunities for using bikeshare will perform better in this regard in the RFP process. |
| 55 | Parameter 2(f) It is not clear why the developer would not be required to fund off-site improvements as part of overall mitigation efforts. It is discouraging to see language such as, "...the City may wish to explore creative partnerships and funding arrangements during negotiations..." when a much more proactive stance should be taken: "...the City will require payment by the developer for such improvements." | The developer indeed will be funding mitigation efforts. Precedents such as the Schlage Lock, Park Merced and 5M all include significant requirements for the developer partner. Suggestions of partnerships or capital improvements would be <i>in addition</i> to required mitigations determined in environmental review. Without a site design proposal, it is too early to |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | understand the impacts they will be required to mitigate and too early to determine the most appropriate partnerships or improvements <i>in addition</i> to those mitigations. Only after the design is complete and impacts are studied, can mitigations, payments or projects be quantified and articulated in an agreement between the City and developer partner. This RFP sets the stage and expectations of potential developer partners. |
| 56 | Parameter 2(f) It is critical that this be clearly defined, both to accommodate the needs to residents who are commuting to work, attempting to get to medical appointments, etc., not to mention the number of schools in the vicinity. | It is too early to identify projects, especially without community design input, site design proposals, and further coordination with various City agencies. However, further in the process, the needs of commuters, residents and schools will be paramount in any discussion of capital improvements. See comment 55 |
| 57 | Parameter 2(f) It is critical that SFMTA do a thorough study of traffic and circulation at the Ocean Avenue and Phelan Avenue intersection to fully assess the effects of the bicycle lanes, installed several years ago, and the significant, complex changes resulting from the reconfiguration of the Phelan Bus Loop and implementation of transit signal priority. Traffic on Phelan Avenue has seen considerable congestion since the changes were implemented, beginning with the bike lanes. There appear to be problems with the timing of signals on the northern end of the street in addition to problems near the Ocean-Phelan intersection. | The SFMTA will look into records of past traffic patterns at this location. If possible, an engineer will study current conditions, taking into account all modes traveling at this intersection/location. Residents will be informed of any potential changes that could be implemented and when they would take place. |
| 58 | Parameter 2(f) Before the city compounds the existing bad traffic situation into a gridlocked nightmare, an intersection study and appropriate adjustments to existing signals is essential. | See comment 57 |
| 59 | Parameter 2(f) “Signal timing for transit” VTAG transit priority signaling is already active for 8 and 49 lines coming out of Phelan Loop. The 43 MUNI line will be subject to the same congestion that automobile traffic faces on Phelan. Any additional congestion coming from BR residents cannot be mitigated. | See comment 57. In addition, without a proposed design or impact analysis, it is too early to determine potential site impacts and how they can be mitigated. |
| 60 | Parameter 2(f) In addition to a dedicated north- | Agreed. Connecting the bicycle network is an SFMTA |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | south bicycle track within the development, the City must address this gap in bicycle routes. Extension of Lee and Brighton streets, with protected bicycles lanes, in order to reduce traffic conflicts and intense congestion on Phelan. | priority and bicycle gap planning will be coordinated with this project and the TDM study. |
| 61 | My guess is that Westwood Park folks wouldn't want more cars going through a narrow street like Plymouth to avoid a congested Phelan. | Noted. |
| 62 | There should be transit incentives for students; how realistic is this? SFSU has tried. There should be transit incentives for residents as well. | USF offers a Class Pass included with student registration fees which offers a discount on transit. After implementation, more people started using public transit. SFSU is also exploring a class pass. A similar recommendation or objective could be part of TDM Study or City College master plan recommendations (see 2004 master plan). |
| 63 | How will a TDM plan be updated? How will TDM be managed? Will there be a TDM manager? | Required TDM updates and monitoring will be included in any future development agreement between the City and a developer partner. . A TDM manager is required in parameter 2(a). Mission Bay and Parkmerced have TDM plans and managers that direct transportation planning toward meeting targets (e.g. reducing vehicle miles traveled, reducing single occupant vehicles). Martin. It is a shared responsibility of the developer to execute the plan and that of the City to continue to monitor progress. |
| 64 | Give example on how some TDM managers have succeeded. | Many university and college campuses have TDM managers. Successful TDM programs have been coordinated at Stanford University, UC Berkeley, University of Washington and Seattle Central Community College. SFSU is exploring a class pass in 2016 through their transportation office. Comparable developments in San Francisco such as Parkmerced and Schlage Lock also include a TDM coordinator. |
| 65 | How will transportation demand management (TDM) and new development impact areas outside of the development? Who will be managing impacts outside of the development? | If TDM programs are too insular they can do more damage. Thus, impacts and measures on the area are clearly defined and agreed to at the outset. Emery Go-Round is a great example of how a private TDM requirement can benefit residents and workers beyond the development site. In addition to TDM requirements for Balboa |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | Reservoir, Planning and SFMTA will lead a TDM study to address needs for surrounding neighborhoods, CCSF and the Reservoir site. Findings and recommendations can be incorporated into any future Reservoir agreement between the City and the developer partner. |
| 66 | Supporting on-site shuttles; are these incentives enough to encourage people to not have/use car? | <p>The site is within walking distance of a robust citywide and regional transit network. In the long term, that network will be stronger with a new bus rapid transit line terminating at Balboa Park, new light rail vehicles, and upgrades at Balboa Park Station.</p> <p>Often the most critical contributor to increased transit use is the first or last mile of an individual’s commute (for example, the walk from the front door to the transit stop, or the connection from a train stop to work). In the case of the Balboa Park Station area, if the walk or ride to the station is inconvenient or uncomfortable, a shuttle to and from the station can make a significant difference in affecting the decisions of students, seniors, families and others to take transit.</p> <p>See comments 34 and 38 regarding TDM.</p> |
| 67 | Include impacts to Sunnyside congestion, safety and parking in all monitoring and transportation performance reports. | <p>Impact studies and mitigation design will be conducted during environmental review. Site designs will anticipate the need to minimize these impacts. Only after the design is complete and impacts are studied, can mitigations be quantified and articulated.</p> <p>The TDM Plan will also anticipate impacts and propose mitigation measures for the site, City College and neighborhood as a whole.</p> |
| 68 | Facilitate adoption of 110 volt charging outlets for two-wheeled vehicles. | Vehicle and bicycle charging stations are included in Sustainability Parameter 5d |
| 69 | Need clarity around 60% build out; what is breakdown for mode share, % for City College | <p>See comment 35.</p> <p>While City College transportation targets are beyond scope of this project, TDM will explore what existing and target mode shares for the neighborhood, including City College.</p> |
| 70 | Car share—for City College as well; could help provide incentives for students in a real way; | Car sharing locations are always open to the public. The SFMTA is currently conducting a pilot program |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| | <p>what is the requirement by the City? Can we ensure for every household?</p> | <p>of on-street car-share parking spaces, which makes car sharing even more accessible. For developments of 201 units or more, Planning code section 166 requires 2 car share spaces for the first 200 units, plus 1 for every additional 200 dwelling units. Development Agreements between the City and a developer partner can include provisions for more or specific locations of car share parking. The City is discussing strategies to reduce need for driving trips with City College as well, and will include looking at the role of carshare in meeting the travel needs of CCSF’s population.</p> |
| <p>71</p> | <p>More transportation choices are great. But will these incentives be able to make residents give up their cars?</p> | <p>Studies show that more and more people are choosing to forgo owning their own vehicles. TDM measures are designed to help people make sustainable transportation choices for most trips. TDM strategies work best when there are a suite of them—individually they may not deliver tremendous shifts in behavior. But, together, they can provide incentives and tools that help residents get where they need to go without having to own their own vehicle. And, developments with many transportation amenities attract residents for whom this lifestyle is appealing.</p> <p>In addition, if transportation choices, incentives and parking costs are made clear to prospective households before units are leased or sold, residents will not have to necessarily “give up” a car. Rather, they would move in with expectations of travel behavior well-suited for a transit-oriented and walkable neighborhood, and would choose not to purchase a car in the first place.</p> <p>See comments 34 and 38 regarding TDM.</p> |

Principle #3: Manage parking availability for those residents who require it.

| | <p>Question/Comment</p> | <p>City Response</p> |
|-----------|---|--|
| <p>72</p> | <p>Ensure we have the appropriate supply of parking for our residents; we want the right amount of parking and we’re going to be smart about it. Recommend 1 spot per unit if we’re really building for families...Need right housing types for the intended residents.</p> | <p>The City agrees that the housing needs to be designed for the people we expect to occupy it. In that sense, it’s not a foregone conclusion that every unit will be a family or will need one parking space. For example, several public comments have asked for student housing – which typically has smaller</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | <p>units with less parking. In addition, there will be a minimum percentage of low-income affordable housing. These buildings typically do not provide parking, out of a desire to create more housing units for the same amount of funding. These are just two examples of units that may not require parking, thus reducing the average parking ratio under 1 per unit. Even with this lower ratio, the development can still ensure that each family unit triggers a 1 space per unit ratio.</p> <p>The parameters have been revised to ensure a ratio of 1 space per unit for family units.</p> <p>At the same time, parking is best managed by understanding the demand before designing the supply. With measures like market-rate parking, car sharing, transit incentives, or safe biking and walking alternatives, the “appropriate” supply of parking may be a lot lower than presumed.</p> <p>With regard to managing on-street parking, standard practice is to aim for 85% on-street parking “availability,” generally amounting to 1-2 available spots per block at any given time. This way, parking can generally be found quickly without being over-supplied. A subtle parking analysis will be included in the TDM study, as well as in any development proposal, to address the appropriate amount, pricing and availability of parking.</p> |
| 73 | Parameter 3. Performing arts center should have been built by now, which will require parking spaces. | Noted. Coordinating with City College, its master plan, and transportation is critical to this development. Additional Parameters specific to City College are included in the RFP draft. Additionally, the TDM study will examine future scenarios for the entire neighborhood, not just one piece of it. |
| 74 | Parking should be listed second to emphasize priority | Parameters will be revised to list parking second. |
| 75 | Parameter 3(a) Does the City require unbundled parking? | Yes |
| 76 | Parameter 3(b) How we do this will determine a lot, who is attracted, and who is coming to the site? | Yes. And this is why parking is so strongly incorporated into the RFP and TDM study. |
| 77 | Parameter 3(b) Change principle to read | See comment 72 regarding parking supply. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | “Ensure appropriate supply of parking for residents” and should include statement about mitigating impact to the local surrounding communities | See comment 67 regarding impact studies. |
| 78 | Sunnyside asked to be a part of SFMTA’s residential parking permit pilot programs. | SFMTA staff is aware, Sunnyside should contact SFMTA staff. See comment 93 for information. |
| 79 | We have voted to recommend a minimum of 1:1 parking ratio | The parameters have been revised to ensure a ratio of 1 parking space per unit for family units. See comment 72 |
| 80 | 0.5 parking spaces per unit is right on the mark | See comment 72 |
| 81 | What is the right ratio of units to parking spaces? Is that being done in the real world? | See comment 72 |
| 82 | Ordering of the principles, we should be leading with Principle 3 – Parking | Parking has been moved to up in the order of parameters. |
| 83 | How can neighborhood parking be managed with CCSF? | Through a joint-TDM Plan and the City College master plan. Ultimately, an MOU or agreement could potentially be developed between the City, City College and/or the future developer partner. In addition, neighborhoods currently have the option of joining a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) zone, which limits neighborhood street parking to residents only. Or, under certain circumstances, they can join initiate an RPP pilot project. For more info, see www.sfmta.com/neighborhoodparking |
| 84 | Create a parking balance, not too much parking and not too little. | If we know the intended households for whom we are building, we can make an educated decision based around parking based on housing type, e.g. senior, students, or family housing. See comment 72 for additional responses |
| 85 | How do you use pricing to change transit habits? | The personal costs and benefits of any transportation mode – including the price of gas, parking fees, transit fare, time traveled, or comfort – can be thought of as incentives or disincentives, depending on how the costs compare to available alternatives. For example, parking costs that are below market value or cheaper than transit can be thought of as incentives to drive and park. Similarly, pricing and programming for transit can incentivize taking transit. For example, a transit “class pass” could reduce the price and hassle of individual transit |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | fares, much like a semester-long parking pass does for parking. Alternatively, shuttles or safe bike routes could be the “last mile” solution that makes transit easy and affordable enough to choose over driving and parking. |
| 86 | If you’re charging for parking, does the money go back into parking management? | It can. For example, revenue from SFSU Shuttle goes back into that program. However, the parking management structure for the Balboa Reservoir site will ultimately be determined in any future development agreement between the City and a developer partner. City College’s parking revenue system is distinct from the Balboa Reservoir site. |
| 87 | Will bike parking be aboveground, structure, or underground? | All design alternatives are possible and will be up to the developer to propose the most appropriate type, depending on the needs and types of users. Typically, “Class 1” bike parking is designed for long parking periods at home or work, and is therefore protected or indoors. “Class 2” bike parking, designed for short visits like shopping or riding to a park, will be at street level and incorporated into street designs. |
| 88 | You’re not incentivizing people to stop driving by having to pay for parking if they can park on the street for free. | Free street parking is indeed an incentive to drive and park. This condition will be one of many explored in the TDM study. Neighborhoods currently have the option of joining a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) zone, which limits neighborhood street parking to residents only. Or, under certain circumstances, they can join initiate an RPP pilot project. See more at www.sfmta.com/neighborhoodparking |
| 89 | There are 1800 parking spots on the site and they’re generating traffic. They all have to go down Phelan. | The PUC-owned Balboa Reservoir site contains 1,005 parking spaces. Circulation and parking analyses, an impact study, and mitigation measures will be part of any future proposal. It is possible not all future City College related travel will induce trips down Phelan Avenue. This comment is one of the reasons the City is being intentional about parking management, supply and TDM strategies. |
| 90 | Electric charging outlets for every four-wheel vehicle parking space at a minimum of 220 volts | Vehicle and bicycle charging stations are included in Sustainability Parameter 5d. |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 91 | Principle 3(e) - Parking should be at affordable rates; just like housing. It should vary between owners, renters and different income levels. | Parking pricing analysis will be part of any future development proposal and the neighborhood-wide TDM study. See comment 72 |
| 92 | We should be in RPP pilot as it will help us considerably | Neighborhoods currently have the option of joining a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) zone, which limits neighborhood street parking to residents only. Or, under certain circumstances, they can join initiate an RPP pilot project. For more info, see www.sfmta.com/neighborhoodparking |
| 93 | Parking availability for students, staff, faculty will be reduced by the elimination of Western Reservoir parking lot | Parking analysis will be part of any future development proposal and the neighborhood-wide TDM study. In addition, City College is undergoing a master plan process which will include parking and transportation policy and plans. |
| 94 | Parameter 3. “Residents who require it.” How about parking availability for CCSF students, staff, faculty and neighborhood residents? | See comments 5,8, 72 and 94 |
| 95 | Parameter 3(b) How about for CCSF students, staff, faculty and surrounding residents? BR residents who own cars will end up parking in Sunnyside, Westwood Park, Ingleside instead. | See comments 5,8, 72 and 94 |
| 96 | Existing neighborhood parking should not absorb parking needs for the new site. | See comments 5,8, 72 and 94 |
| 97 | Mitigation of parking impacts by BR project residents are shifted to CCSF folks and surrounding residential neighborhoods. | See comments 5, 8, 72, 93 & 94 regarding parking See comment 67 regarding impacts See comment 72 regarding parking ratio |
| 98 | Sunnyside, Westwood Park and Ingleside folks will have a harder time finding parking because many BR residents will seek parking spaces outside of BR since BR itself will have insufficient parking for its own residents. | See comments 5, 8, 72, 93 & 94 regarding parking See comment 67 regarding impacts See comment 72 regarding parking ratio |
| 99 | Are BR [Balboa Reservoir] residents the only consideration for this Principle? | The principle encourages shared parking solutions which address City College affiliated parking demand. Neighborhood parking outside of the Reservoir site can currently be managed through Residential Parking Permit zones. See comment 93 See comment 84 regarding planning beyond BR |
| 100 | BR residents who own cars will end up parking in Sunnyside, Westwood Park, Ingleside instead due to the limited on-site parking in BR. | Parking is a resource that needs to be managed, and changing policies and behaviors can lead to different results. See comments 72 and 86 regarding parking |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| | See comment 93 regarding RPPs |
|--|-------------------------------|

Principle #4: Encourage the use of sustainable modes of transportation (walking, biking, transit ridership, car sharing and carpooling) through coordinated programming and communications.

| | Question/Comment | City Response |
|-----|---|--|
| 102 | Where would real-time transit information be posted? | Real time information should be located at critical decision points; e.g. places where one would decide to travel to a transit line over another. |
| 103 | When providing monthly transit passes is it every person in a household or just one per household? How is it funded? | Subsidy for transit would be based on how the project pencils out. Previous examples have included one per household. Funding is ultimately penciled out by developer and resolved in the development negotiation process. |
| 104 | Bicycle repair facilities – is this an invitation of commercial development? | No. It's a requirement for bicycle repair facilities, which may be self-service in a lobby or common area. The option to couple repair facilities with commercial space is up to the developer and the market. |
| 105 | Bike signage/wayfinding is confusing. | Noted. The community and CAC members will be consulted on future wayfinding. |
| 106 | With proximity to CCSF, pedestrian bicyclists need more routes. There is a need for High-visibility sidewalks and traffic calming measures. | Noted. |
| 107 | I want to improve the walk to BART. | Noted. |
| 108 | Electric Bike Transportation and charging stations should be included throughout | Noted. |
| 109 | Consider an electric vehicle day at which residents can learn about all forms of clean electric vehicles (e.g. bicycles, motorcycles, scooters, and cars); partnering with SF Environment, Change Across Town, and the Golden Gate Electric Vehicle Association | Noted. This could be part of the outreach and programming required in Principle 4. |
| 110 | I fail to see how these proposed [communications and outreach] actions are relevant to the development of an RFP. These should be part of the City's overall strategy to encourage alternative modes of transportation in San Francisco and not specific to this project. | <p>There is an overall City proposal to develop a TDM framework for the entire City. But the Balboa Reservoir proposal is emerging before the new framework will be in place.</p> <p>With regard to the relevance of programming and communications, studies show that targeted outreach efforts improve the effectiveness of TDM measures. In addition to City-wide efforts, targeting the specific needs of Balboa area residents,</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | | students, and employees will help ensure these programs are effective. If TDM incentives are in place, then the marginal cost of outreach and communications is worth the expense. |
| 111 | <p>Money isn't the motivator. It is expensive to own, operate, maintain, and insure a car and yet, people choose to have a car. A new paradigm is needed. One of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assurance that children can attend neighborhood schools • Confidence that the neighborhood school is good • Having a safe place for my child after school until I return from work • Quality day-care or pre-schools within walking distance • Easy access to dry cleaning, groceries, medical and other services • Access to modes of transportation at the beginning and end of trips • Predictable, safe & clean transit <p>We all have many time demands ... the auto makes meeting those demands possible when other modes aren't readily available or valued services are not convenient... This is a City wide challenge and won't be fixed with a localized development and therefore, this principle isn't appropriate for this exercise.</p> | <p>Noted. While this development cannot fix all the City's challenges, it can set a precedent and move the neighborhood in the direction the commenter suggests. For example, safe streets will help families walk or bike their children to neighborhood schools, services and first/last mile transit. Safe child care near schools, residences or neighbor can help reduce parents' transportation needs. All of these are part of an overall effort that will help encourage alternatives to driving alone during peak hours. See comment 110 regarding outreach and communication.</p> |

Additional Comments

| | Question/Comment | City Response |
|-----|---|--|
| 112 | The 2008 TOD technical assistance panel document noted the community's concerns regarding parking | Noted. The TDM Study, Balboa Park Area improvements, and City College coordination are all part of several efforts to reduce the demand for parking |
| 113 | What current Muni busses currently serve City College, are there going to be more busses? | <p>Major bus routes serving City College include the 8X/8BX Bayshore Express and the 49 Van Ness–Mission. Additional crosstown bus routes serving the site include the 29 Sunset, 43 Masonic. The Muni Metro K-Line also stops adjacent to campus.</p> <p>At Balboa Park Station, passengers can board BART, other Muni routes including the J Church, M Ocean View, 54 Felton, and 88 Mission–BART Shuttle.</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | | <p>Muni Forward is recommending increased frequencies on the lines that serve this area (29, 43 54, K Ingleside and J Church). On some routes, there has been or will be a change in route alignment. For more information see https://www.sfmta.com/muniforward</p> <p>Additional light rail vehicles will be added to the fleet in 2016, making Muni more reliable, comfortable and safe. A first phase of capital improvements near Balboa Park station will improve service for the 8 Bayshore to the area. A second phase will begin with public outreach and planning in 2016. In the long-run, the Geneva-Harney Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) will facilitate faster east-west connections across the southern part of San Francisco.</p> |
| 114 | Transportation Sustainability Program – change in how environmental review is conducted? | <p>As consistent with California’s reform to the 1970s California Environmental Quality Act, environmental review will be taking a new measurement of transportation impacts known as “vehicle miles traveled” or VMT. VMT takes into account more, and more positive, impacts to the transportation system than the current measure of automobile “Level of Service.” VMT also provides a more direct way of understanding the environmental effects of a project, including greenhouse gas emissions. See more under SF’s “Transportation Sustainability Program” online, www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=4115</p> |
| 115 | It’s difficult to understand the project beyond the abstract without a clear idea of what is proposed on the site. | <p>The current process is just about setting guidelines and goals in the request for proposals document. The more visual and concrete elements of design will come in the next step, when the developer and architects are at the table.</p> |
| 116 | We have to think about the larger collective set of interconnected systems. We have to create a process to address all of the issues. There should be an overarching piece of the principles dealing with all the different pieces. | <p>Noted. This is the intent of the RFP document.</p> |
| 117 | Principle 4 is a “nice to have” but it could be eliminated (or should be 3, 2, and 1); there is a lot of City investment. | <p>See comment 110 regarding outreach.</p> |
| 118 | Phelan Avenue needs to be fixed now, | <p>The SFMTA will look into records of past traffic</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | without this it will cause more community ill will; make Phelan Avenue work better. | patterns at this location. If possible, an engineer will study current conditions, taking into account all modes traveling at this intersection/location. Residents will be informed of any potential changes that could be implemented and when they would take place. |
| 119 | You're targeting middle-income people where parking is expensive. You're targeting a higher-income demographic when you have parking. If people want to be here but don't want a car you're targeting more moderate incomes. | Noted. The intent of the housing proposal is to maximize affordable housing for low and moderate income bands, while providing neighborhood-serving open space. See http://tinyurl.com/brhsng for more information on Balboa Reservoir affordable housing context. |
| 120 | I am concerned for my safety constantly especially when crossing Geneva. We are discussing transportation at great length but the outcome is not guaranteed. Ocean Avenue is a through street, and there are banklets [parklets], which are very unsafe; example, parklet in front of library. | Pedestrian safety is a top priority for the SFMTA and City; it is cited in several parameters. A significant number of transportation projects have been completed, initiated or designed in the area in the last two years. They will continue to be implemented in the area. The Ocean Geneva Corridor Study determined additional pedestrian infrastructure to be constructed in the next year West of Phelan, as well as long term improvements for Ocean and Geneva east of Phelan. |
| 121 | Surveys show concerns of Balboa Reservoir development: congestion and parking. | Noted. |
| 122 | The more money used on parking the less subsidy there is for moderate income housing for firefighters and those income-levels that need housing. More parking incentivizes more driving. | Noted. |
| 123 | Sent report that identifies all of the intersections that children use. Study doesn't deal with it in a larger context. | Noted. Will add to existing conditions for TDM study. |
| 124 | Public education needed for drivers and cyclists to improve safety. | Noted. |
| 125 | 280 is a scar. The 280 on-ramp is a bottle neck. | Noted. While I-280 is currently under study and is beyond the scope of the Balboa Reservoir site, congestion at local bottlenecks is a primary reason for the TDM study. These and other improvements included in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan are still being considered by the City in their work with the Balboa Park Station Area CAC. |
| 126 | How will we improve transportation when all the neighborhoods are at capacity? | See comments 8-10, 31 and 57. |
| 127 | What's the Ocean Avenue plan for safety? | See comment 21 |
| 128 | Transportation has to be in conjunction with CCSF because parking is so important to the students. A CCSF student is different than a | Noted. The TDM consultants and developer plan will have to address the subtle differences and needs of diverse students, employees, and |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | student at SFSU or USF; figuring out childcare on site might be a very effective way to alleviate transit issues, more than bike lanes; target mitigations to users | residents in the area. The City is prioritizing the coordination with City College on these matters, including obtaining and analyzing City College data, student travel behavior, and enrollment projections. |
| 129 | Need to more clearly understand demographic instead of proving faux-solutions that don't necessarily help the affected demographic | Agreed. Existing conditions, demographics and needs are the first part of the TDM study. The City is also prioritizing coordination with City College in order to best understand the demographics, travel behavior and priorities of students, faculty and staff. |
| 130 | The Transportation parameters that are going to be adopted need to fit in with the existing setting and character of the immediate vicinity. | Noted. |
| 131 | Both AECOM studies fail to sufficiently account for the substantial impacts upon surrounding neighborhoods, especially those beyond the boundaries of the Balboa Park Plan Area | See comment 67 |
| 132 | The neighborhoods of Westwood Park and Ingleside (except for the Ocean Ave commercial corridor which is part of the BPS General Plan), Sunnyside, Westwood Highlands, and even Monterey Heights will be substantially affected by the Reservoir project. However, since the Balboa Park Station's geographical boundaries are the western edge of the Reservoir on the west, and Riordan HS, Judson, Havelock on the north, these neighborhoods are given short shrift in the AECOM studies. | The AECOM studies are "Existing Conditions" reports. They focus on the current site conditions and context, and identify preliminary opportunities and constraints related to the site. See comment 67 regarding impacts of any future development. |
| 133 | Transportation parameters must be expanded to cover the effects on those neighborhoods' intersections and streets. | See comments 5 and 67 |
| 134 | Transportation parameters must not set up harmful impacts on CCSF's existing character of providing affordable and accessible education to the SF Bay Area community. | The goal of coordinating with City College is to maximize access by utilizing all modes of transportation. See comments 5 and 67 regarding impacts. See comments 84, 94 and 100 regarding CCSF. |
| 135 | Transportation parameters needs to reverse this inverted of priority of trying to place traffic and parking problems burdens on the existing community. Parameters need for BR project to adjust to the existing character and setting; not the other way around. | Noted. See comment 67. At the same time, open space and affordable housing have long been identified as a community need. The project is seeking to balance ways of addressing these needs, supporting CCSF's |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | | <p>enrollment goals, and providing community amenities that can improve quality of life for all nearby residents. Character comments are addressed more thoroughly in the Urban Design parameters.</p> <p>Parking by non-residents – a burden often cited in public comment – is something neighborhoods can change today. See comment 93</p> |
| 136 | <p>A fundamental principle is missing: Transportation design must take into account that City College is the central economic, educational and cultural focus of the area. Efforts to discourage car usage must not have the unintended consequence of discouraging students from going to school.</p> | <p>City College parameters require that the development not compromise City College’s mission or operations.</p> |
| 137 | <p>I know some people would like all cars to be gone from San Francisco. Before this occurs people need to realize that the city uses the car as a Cash Cow. Remember when street cleaning went to every other week? Well the MUNI budget had a major short fall due to decrease in parking tickets. This is not to suggest we keep cars just for the money they bring to the city but people need to know where the money for many services in the city comes from.</p> | <p>Noted. The SFMTA’s year-end report provides financial information regarding how funds are used. In addition, the Agency’s 2014-2015 Financial Audit is also available at https://www.sfmta.com/about-sfmta/investor-relations</p> |
| 138 | <p>Many people moved to this area of San Francisco because it was a nice quiet area for raising a family. Please consider the QUALITY of life of the present residents</p> | <p>Noted. Urban design and public realm principles in particular seek not only to protect, but to enhance the quality of life of existing and future communities in the area. For example, the Balboa Reservoir parameters include several acres of open space beyond typical neighborhood requirements, intended to serve families and residents throughout the area.</p> |
| 139 | <p>The proposed housing development in the Balboa Reservoir will have a significant impact on traffic and parking in adjacent neighborhoods -- Sunnyside, Westwood Park, Ocean Avenue, and Westwood Highlands. The area already is subject to intense traffic and parking pressure from tens of thousands of City College students, a high school, and two elementary schools. There is nothing in the Transportation parameters and accompanying documents, however that acknowledges the additional, area-wide impact of this large development and the resulting traffic</p> | <p>The broader issues are acknowledged early in the memo presenting the draft RFP principles and addressed in Principle 1. While a specific RFP response cannot address all neighborhood issues, City staff are recording all public comment for further exploration and incorporation into related studies, such as the TDM plan and collaborative efforts with City College.</p> <p>Regarding environmental impacts, please see comment 67</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | <p>congestion, parking pressures and air pollution. The collective negative impact that congestion and parking demand will have on residents who have enjoyed living in these neighborhoods for years is not addressed and no mitigation is offered for this loss of quality of life. This will distort the existing character of these neighborhoods.</p> | |
| 140 | <p>Another deep flaw is the lack of coordination with, or indeed, little acknowledgement of, City College of San Francisco, a quality, affordable educational institution serving students of all ages. Those students, often juggling jobs, child care and classes, need to access the campus and many depend on parking now provided on the reservoir site.</p> | <p>City College coordination has begun in a number of venues. The City will increase outreach efforts in the coming semester by coordinating meetings, input opportunities and a survey of City College affiliates.</p> <p>See the draft City College parameters for further language regarding the College.</p> |
| 141 | <p>I don't want to pass things over to developers if it's really the City's responsibility.</p> | <p>The track laid out by this RFP is consistent with other developments in the City. The City is taking initiative on TDM planning and ultimately the execution of planning, design and implementation on and around this site will comprise a joint effort of the future development partner and the City, like other agreements such as Schlage Lock or 5M.</p> |
| 142 | <p>Difficult to make a left turn on Ocean.</p> | <p>Traffic options surrounding the site will be considered in the TDM project. See comment 57.</p> |