

2.6 Individual Responses to Comments from Regional Agencies

2.6.1 Bay Area Water Supply and Water Conservation Agency

- BAWSCA-1** [See page 5-25 for the original comment] See Master Response 1, which discusses why a program EIR was prepared at this stage of project review and explains that subsequent site-specific development proposals, including approvals related to the proposed water supply agreement and site remediation, will require subsequent project-level CEQA evaluation. Also see Master Response 29, which reviews the potential impacts to the SFPUC system and the wholesale customers addressed in the program EIR and outlines the potential impact issues to be addressed in more detail in subsequent, project-level CEQA review.
- BAWSCA-2** [See page 5-25 for the original comment] See Master Response 29.
- BAWSCA-3** [See page 5-25 for the original comment] Please see Master Response 29 for a discussion of subsequent project-level CEQA review of the proposed OID water transfer.
- BAWSCA-4** [See page 5-26 for the original comment] See Master Response 29.
- BAWSCA-5** [See page 5-26 for the original comment] See Master Response 29.
- BAWSCA-6** [See page 5-26 for the original comment] See Master Response 29.
- BAWSCA-7** [See page 5-26 for the original comment] See Master Response 29.
- BAWSCA-8** [See page 5-26 for the original comment] See Master Response 29.

This page intentionally left blank

2.6.2 Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

Caltrain-1 [See page 5-27 for the original comment] Comment Caltrain-1 provides an introduction to subsequent comments, and does not raise any significant environmental issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR or its analyses and conclusions.

Caltrain-2 [See page 5-27 for the original comment] The second bullet on page 3-37 is revised to read as follows:

- Interagency Cooperation Agreements will be needed to coordinate and implement public facilities and infrastructure improvements with various agencies, as follows:
 - City and County of San Francisco.
 - Specific roadway alignments and transit facilities improvements will need to be designed and approved;
 - Design of sewer and water supply infrastructure improvements connecting the Baylands to the SFPUC’s sewer system via BSD.
 - Design of water infrastructure improvements connecting the Baylands to the SFPUC supply via the City of Brisbane.
 - BSD. In addition to an onsite recycled water plant, specific recycled water supply improvements will need to be designed and approved.
 - City of Daly City. Specific improvements will need to be designed and approved for the new Bayshore Boulevard/Geneva Avenue intersection.
 - NCFAs. Expansion of fire facilities will be necessary to implement the fire service performance standards of the NCFAs as set forth in this EIR to provide adequate fire protection to support development of the Baylands. This may require a review of services and fire service demands for the NCFAs’ overall service area to determine the best method of meeting applicable fire service performance standards.
 - Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)
 - Agreements with Caltrain will be needed for all project features and construction activities occurring over, through, or under Caltrain right-of-way. Agreements with Caltrain will also be needed for planning, design, and construction related to the Bayshore Intermodal Station and associated access to the station.

- San Francisco County Transportation Authority. Engineering and architectural studies, as well as funding agreements, will be required to define specific transportation corridor alignments and transit facilities improvements.
- San Mateo County Congestion Management Agency. Engineering and architectural studies will be required to define specific designs for regional transportation facilities and roadway improvements.

The sixth bullet on page 3-80 (Permits and Approvals Required from Other Agencies) is revised to read as follows:

- Interagency Cooperation Agreements to coordinate and implement roadway and utility improvements as follows:
 - BSD: utility relocation coordination;
 - City and County of San Francisco: Expansion of the Recology site, roadway and transit facilities improvements, bus route realignments, sewer and water supply infrastructure improvements.
 - City of Daly City: Bayshore Boulevard roadway and Bayshore Boulevard/Geneva Avenue intersection improvements and transit facilities improvements.
 - NCFA: expansion of fire facilities.
 - San Francisco County Transportation Authority: Transportation corridors and transit facilities improvements.
 - Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain): Project features and construction activities occurring over, through, or under Caltrain right-of-way (e.g., bridge crossings, utilities); improvements related to the Bayshore Intermodal Station.
 - San Mateo County Congestion Management Agency: Regional transportation facilities and roadway improvements.
 - San Mateo County Transportation District: bus route realignments and transit facilities improvements.

Caltrain-3 [See page 5-28 for the original comment] See Response Caltrain-2.

Caltrain-4 [See page 5-28 for the original comment] See Response Caltrain-2.

Caltrain-5 [See page 5-28 for the original comment] The Draft EIR recognizes that station enhancement plans are at a conceptual stage, and that substantial planning and design work would be necessary prior to construction of any improvements to the Bayshore station.

- Caltrain-6** [See page 5-28 for the original comment] See Responses Caltrain-2 and Caltrain-5.
- Caltrain-7** [See page 5-29 for the original comment] Comment Caltrain-7 expresses concurrence with the inclusion of a TDM program for the Baylands and does not raise any significant environmental issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR or its analyses and conclusions.
- Caltrain-8** [See page 5-29 for the original comment] See Responses Caltrain-9, Caltrain-10, and Caltrain-11.
- Caltrain-9** [See page 5-29 for the original comment] The “Transit Capacity Utilization” methodology used in the Draft EIR, as well as the basis for the existing and cumulative transit numbers used in the analysis, was based first on review of San Francisco screenlines. Screenline analysis to determine transit impacts is included in San Francisco’s October 2002 Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines. The Guidelines’ cumulative analysis has been recently updated to 2030 conditions as part of the analysis of the San Francisco Planning Department’s downtown Transit District Center project. Screenline methodology is described on page F-1 of the Guidelines, as follows:

Screenline analysis assumes that there are identifiable corridors or directions of travel that are served by a grouping of transit lines. It is assumed that someone traveling on transit in that direction will choose one of the transit lines that collectively serve the corridor or that direction of travel. It also assumes that if one line is overloaded, the transit user will shift to another line headed in the same general direction. A screenline is selected that intercepts a group of transit lines at or near their maximum load point. The capacity of a transit line is determined by the type of vehicles used and the frequency of service. The capacity of the transit system for a particular direction of travel is, therefore, assumed to be the sum of the capacity for all the transit lines identified with a particular screenline. Likewise, the loading of the transit system for a particular screenline is assumed to be the sum of the passengers on all the transit lines associated with a screenline. The screenline analysis is most suitable for use in the greater downtown area, which is a focal point for transit service, especially for peak hour work trips.

The updated screenline network analysis, which projected future screenline ridership for Muni, BART, Caltrain, SamTrans, AC Transit, and Ferries, is documented in the February 2, 2009 memorandum Transit Center District Plan – Transit Network Analysis by AECOM. Existing Caltrain screenline ridership is based on February 2011 Caltrain Annual Passenger Counts (<http://www.caltrain.com/Assets/Stats+and+Reports/Ridership/2011+Caltrain+Ridership+Counts+FINAL.pdf>). Cumulative 2030 Caltrain screenline ridership is

the projected net increase in ridership from the updated screenline analysis contained in the Transit Center District Plan – Transit Network Analysis added to the February 2011 ridership, which results in higher project ridership in 2030 than in the updated screenline analysis, which provides a conservative basis for estimating impacts.

Caltrain-10 [See page 5-29 for the original comment] Comment Caltrain-10 is correct that the Draft EIR does not assume an increase in service at the Bayshore Caltrain Station as part of Project Site development. The expected ridership demand at the Bayshore Caltrain Station generated by Project Site development and adjacent developments would require changes to Caltrain operations in order to serve demand that would be created by Project Site development. The transit impact analysis focused on determining whether Project Site development would cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service; or cause a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts in transit service levels could result (e.g., require additional buses or trains due to Project Site development transit trips).

Based on this criterion, the operational changes required to serve the demand at the Bayshore Caltrain Station would be commensurate with the level of service provided to other, high-ridership stations, as Caltrain would be expected to modify its stop pattern to meet new and or increased demand for its service. Service adjustments are part of ongoing planning processes performed by transit providers to better meet the needs of their customers. This finding does not require an increase in the total number of trains operated by Caltrain, which is projected to be six trains per hour per direction in the peak period and two trains per hour per direction in the off-peak period following electrification planned for 2021. Prior to electrification, service will remain at its current level of five trains per hour in the peak period and one train per hour per direction in the off-peak period. Caltrain capacity would not need to be changed to accommodate this demand nor would substantial increase in delays or operating costs result from schedule adjustments to increase service at the Bayshore Caltrain Station. If all, or most, trains would stop at Bayshore Caltrain Station, this would result in an operational impact to Caltrain because it would no longer be able to utilize the four-track segment as a strategic “passing zone” for Baby Bullet service. However, service following electrification is expected to follow a skip-stop pattern and would not require passing tracks under its future service structure, which was the basis for the finding of a less than significant impact.

Caltrain-11 [See page 5-30 for the original comment] The fourth full paragraph on page 4.N-134 of the Draft EIR is revised to read as follows:

In addition, the added Caltrain ridership (approximately 3 million annual trips) would generate a substantial increase in “farebox” revenue for Caltrain (a beneficial impact), potentially generating several million dollars annually. ~~Based on the CPP and CPP-V scenario ridership forecasts, approximately three million annual trips would be made via Caltrain to/from the Bayshore Station, potentially generating over \$10 million in annual revenue (while the DPP and DPP-V scenarios could generate over \$6 million in annual revenue).~~

Caltrain-12 [See page 5-30 for the original comment] Comment Caltrain-12 raises no significant environmental issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR or its analyses and conclusions.

This page intentionally left blank

2.6.3 City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County / Airport Land Use Commission Letter Dated July 31, 2013

C/CAG 1-1 [See page 5-31 for the original comment] Because the Baylands Project Site is located more than two (2) miles from San Francisco International Airport and is not located within the 65 dB noise contour of the airport, the Draft EIR concluded that impacts in relation to airport operations and noise would be less than significant. While Comment C/CAG-1 correctly notes that the Baylands Project Site is within Airport Influence Area A – Real Estate Disclosure Area, and person(s) offering real property for lease or sale are required to provide an airport disclosure statement, no physical environmental impacts are associated with such disclosure statements. Thus, the comment does not raise any significant environmental issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR or its analyses and conclusions.

The first paragraph on page 4.G-101 is revised to read as follows:

The Project Site is located more than 2 miles from the nearest public airport, the San Francisco International Airport, or airstrip, and is not located within ~~the 65 dB noise contour of the airport-an airport land use plan.~~ The Project Site is within Airport Influence Area A – Real Estate Disclosure Area, and person(s) offering real property for lease or sale are required to provide an airport disclosure statement. Development under any of the proposed scenarios would not conflict with an airport land use plan nor present any other impact related to a public airport use or private airstrip.

C/CAG 1-2 [See page 5-32 for the original comment] As noted in Comment C/CAG 1-2, the Baylands Project Site is located outside of Area B – Policy/Referral Area, and is therefore not subject to formal review by the County Airport Land Use Commission or C/CAG. Thus, the comment does not raise any significant environmental issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR or its analyses and conclusions.

C/CAG 1-3 [See page 5-33 for the original comment] The Draft EIR recognizes that the Brisbane area, including the Baylands Project site, is subject to frequent overflight and related noise from commercial aircraft departing from Oakland International Airport and from San Francisco International Airport. Although the Baylands is not located within the 65 dB noise contour of San Francisco International Airport, the Draft EIR notes “As evidenced by the high proportion of noise complaints received by SFO from Brisbane residents, single event noise

levels from aircraft are a community concern.” The appropriateness of locating noise-sensitive uses within the Baylands will be considered as part of the City’s planning review and decisionmaking.

C/CAG 1-4 [See page 5-33 for the original comment] Because the FAA Notice of Proposed Construction extends into the Brisbane Lagoon and not into any area within the Baylands where structures are proposed, this comment does not raise any significant environmental issues regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR or its analyses and conclusions.

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Letter Dated November 12, 2013

C/CAG 2-1 [See page 5-38 for the original comment] As stated in Comment C/CAG 2-1, Section 4.N, *Traffic and Circulation*, is consistent with the provisions of the San Mateo County Congestion Management Program, “which requires mitigation measures for land use changes and development projects that are projected to significantly impact or generate more than 100 new, net peak hour trips on the CMP roadway network.”

C/CAG 2-2 [See page 5-38 for the original comment] Mitigation Measures 4.N-3f and 4.N-4 require fair share contribution from Project Site development for Bi-County improvements. Mitigation Measure 4.N-13 requires preparation of a TDM program, including submission of the program to C/CAG for approval.