Brisbane City Council hearing on Baylands Traffic impacts, January 24, 2017

Comments by Anja Miller

Before considering <u>any</u> development on the Baylands, your Council must focus on the unavoidable, significant traffic impacts generated by our neighboring cities.

Those impacts will drastically affect Brisbane residents' and businesses' daily lives and work and movements in and out of town.

The Baylands EIR cites more than 25,000 new housing units and millions of square feet of commercial development already planned and approved in San Francisco's Hunter's Point, Candestick and Schlage Lock projects as well as in Daly City's Geneva Corridor. These numbers are public, but most of the people you represent are not familiar with them or realize the numbers of vehicles these developments will add to our local arteries and Hwy 101, and a much heavier burden on an already near capacity public transit. It would be senseless to add a large development load to this by allowing more from the Baylands than your Planning Commission has recommended. Also recommended by the Planning Commission is a utility-scale renewable energy installation that will not generate any traffic while providing a significant public benefit.

The main mitigation measure offered for the impacts of this huge added traffic in the Bi-County transportation study of 2013 and the submitted Baylands plan is the so-called Geneva Extension with its rapid bus transit. Brisbane's share of this "bi-county" regional infrastructure is estimated to be \$126 million. But under the Planning Commission's recommendation this 9-lane massive, very expensive overpass would not really be needed by Brisbane, and your Council should be resisting any further efforts to burden your taxpayers with that cost.

Another much-touted argument, particularly by outside special interests, in favor of the plans you are considering is "transit-oriented development" with a focus on increased

access and use of the CalTrain Bayshore station and the Muni T Line. That approach is already amply represented by the Schlage Lock plan's housing of 1,600 units immediately adjacent to the station, and anticipated bus connection from Hunter's Point/Candlestick. There have been many indications of doubt that CalTrain, even after its electrification, will be able to accommodate that added ridership. For Brisbane train users the result will be even more restricted transit access.

Our current General Plan does not allow any development that causes traffic congestion at the level of service (LOS) to fall below C at our crucial intersection of Bayshore/Old County Road. Because the recently completed traffic study for Sierra Point shows that cumulative regional development will already cause that level to fall to level F, why would we unnecessarily add to that unacceptable situation?

Furthermore, the current efforts to measure traffic by vehicle miles traveled (VMT) may help in ascertaining green house gas (GHG) emissions, but it doesn't measure congestion in the way that level of service (LOS) does. Additionally, as the proportion of alternative fuel vehicles increases, the GHG emissions may decrease but congestion will stay the same or even increase. Therefore, both measures are necessary.

FIGURE 1-7 Urban Design Concept Plan



