

File No. 220543 Committee Item No. 4  
Board Item No. 8

**COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee Date July 11, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date July 26, 2022

**Cmte Board**

- |                                     |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Motion                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Resolution                                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Youth Commission Report                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | MOU  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Information Form                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Grant Budget                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Subcontract Budget                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Contract/Agreement                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Form 126 – Ethics Commission                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Award Letter                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Application                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Public Correspondence                        |

**OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)**

- |                                     |                                     |                                |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>PW Order No. 205457</u>     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>SUR Map 2021-006 072721</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Legal Description</u>       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>PLN GPR 033121</u>          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Referral FYI 051822</u>     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Hearing Notice 071222</u>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>PW Affidavit 062422</u>     |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u> </u>                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u> </u>                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u> </u>                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u> </u>                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u> </u>                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <u> </u>                       |

Completed by: Erica Major Date July 7, 2022

Completed by: Erica Major Date July 14, 2022

1 [Summary Street Vacation - Michigan Street in Connection with MUNI Metro East  
2 Improvements - Interdepartmental Property Transfer]

3 **Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street,**  
4 **generally bounded by Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west,**  
5 **Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south,**  
6 **conditioned upon the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (“SFMTA”)**  
7 **Board of Directors’ approval of the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area to**  
8 **SFMTA, to facilitate the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility;**  
9 **approving the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area from Public Works to**  
10 **SFMTA, subject to the approval of the SFMTA Board of Directors; affirming the**  
11 **Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act;**  
12 **adopting findings that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are consistent with**  
13 **the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and**  
14 **authorizing official acts in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein.**

15 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.  
16 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.  
17 **Deletions to Codes** are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.  
18 **Board amendment additions** are in double-underlined Arial font.  
19 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.  
20 **Asterisks (\* \* \* \*)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code  
21 subsections or parts of tables.

22 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

23 Section 1. Findings.

24 (a) California Streets and Highways Code Sections 8300 et seq. and San Francisco  
25 Public Works Code Section 787(a) establish the process for the Board of Supervisors to  
vacate a street, highway, or public easement. Streets and Highways Code Sections 8334 and

1 8334.5 provide that the legislative body of a local agency may summarily vacate an excess  
2 right-of-way of a street, under certain circumstances. The actions contemplated in this  
3 ordinance are being taken in accordance with Streets and Highways Code Sections 8300 et  
4 seq. and Public Works Code Section 787(a).

5 (b) The location and extent of the area to be vacated is a portion of Michigan Street  
6 that is generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west,  
7 Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, as  
8 depicted on Department of Public Works ("Public Works") SUR Map No. 2021-006, dated May  
9 3, 2021 (the "Vacation Area"). A copy of this map is on file with the Clerk of the Board of  
10 Supervisors in File No. 220543 and is incorporated herein by reference.

11 (c) The Vacation Area is a paved portion of Michigan Street that terminates in front of  
12 the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's ("SFMTA") MUNI Metro East  
13 maintenance facility ("MUNI Metro East"). The Vacation Area is not necessary for active  
14 street purposes now or in the future as: (1) the Vacation Area has been impassable and has  
15 not been maintained using public funds for five consecutive years; (2) all properties that abut  
16 the Vacation Area to the west and the north are already part of MUNI Metro East and are  
17 intended to be improved along with the Vacation Area after the Vacation Area is transferred  
18 from Public Works to SFMTA; (3) the Vacation Area has never been used, and is not useful,  
19 as a nonmotorized transportation facility under Streets and Highways Code Sections 892 and  
20 8314 as there are other such facilities available in close proximity; (4) MUNI Metro East is  
21 served by several roadways, so the Vacation Area is excess right-of-way; (5) there are no in-  
22 place functioning public utility facilities in the Vacation Area; and (6) Public Works sent notice  
23 of the proposed street vacation to the Department of Technology, SFMTA, the Fire  
24 Department, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the San Francisco Planning  
25 Department, AT&T, Sprint, Comcast Cable Corp., Point to Point, Inc., XO Communications,

1 Verizon Communications, Inc., CenturyLink/Level Three Communications, Shasta Consulting  
2 Group, Inc., ExteNet Systems, Inc., and Pacific Gas and Electric. No City agency, utility  
3 company, or other notice recipient objected to the proposed vacation. Based on these  
4 factors, the Vacation Area may be summarily vacated in accordance with Streets and  
5 Highways Code Sections 8334 and 8334.5.

6 (d) The vacation of the Vacation Area, and the jurisdictional transfer of the Vacation  
7 Area from Public Works to SFMTA, would facilitate improvements and upgrades to and the  
8 expansion of MUNI Metro East.

9 (e) In Public Works Order No. 205457, the Interim Director of Public Works determined  
10 that: (1) the Vacation Area may be summarily vacated based on the factors identified in  
11 subsection (c) above and the other findings set forth below; (2) the Vacation Area is  
12 unnecessary for the City's present or prospective public street, sidewalk, and service  
13 easement purposes; (3) there will be no physical public or private utilities affected by the  
14 vacation of the Vacation Area, based on the absence of any objections from any utility  
15 company and notice recipient, and the fact that the public interest, convenience, and  
16 necessity do not require any easements or other rights be reserved for any public or private  
17 utility facilities that may be in place in the Vacation Area; (4) any rights based upon any public  
18 or private utility facilities shall be extinguished automatically upon the effectiveness of the  
19 vacation; and (5) it is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors to approve the  
20 interdepartmental property transfer of the Vacation Area from Public Works to SFMTA. A  
21 copy of this Public Works Order is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.  
22 220543 and is incorporated herein by reference.

23 (f) In Order No. 205457, pursuant to California Streets and Highways Code Sections  
24 892 and 8314, the Interim Director of Public Works also found that the Vacation Area is  
25 currently not accessible to or necessary for non-motorized transportation because there are

1 adjacent streets available for such transportation, and because those members of the public  
2 availing themselves of non-motorized transportation will not be inconvenienced by the street  
3 vacation.

4 (g) The Interim Director of Public Works recommends that the Board of Supervisors  
5 adopt as its own the recommendations set forth in Public Works Order No. 205457 concerning  
6 the vacation of the Vacation Area and other actions in furtherance thereof. The Board hereby  
7 incorporates such recommendations and findings by reference as though fully set forth herein.

8 (h) In a letter dated March 31, 2021, (the "Planning Letter"), the Planning Department  
9 determined that the proposed vacation of the Vacation Area and other actions contemplated  
10 in this ordinance are consistent with the General Plan and priority policies of Planning Code  
11 Section 101.1. A copy of said letter is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File  
12 No. 220543 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board of Supervisors adopts as its  
13 own the findings in the Planning Letter.

14 (i) In the Planning Letter, the Planning Department also determined that the Project is  
15 within the scope of the project evaluated under the Third Street Light Rail Project/Central  
16 Subway Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Final Supplemental  
17 Environmental Impact Report adopted in August 2008 (Planning Case No. 1996.281E) ("Third  
18 Street Light Rail Project/Central Subway FSEIS/FSEIR") pursuant to the California  
19 Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). A  
20 copy of the Third Street Light Rail Project/Central Subway FSEIS/FSEIR is on file with the  
21 Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 210548. The Board of Supervisors further finds  
22 that no substantial changes are proposed by the Project or the circumstances under which the  
23 Project is undertaken that would cause new significant environmental effects or any increase  
24 in the severity of previously identified significant effects. The Board further finds that there is  
25 no new information of substantial importance showing that the Project would have any

1 significant effects not discussed in the Third Street Light Rail Project/Central Subway  
2 FSEIS/FSEIR, or that significant effects would be substantially more severe, or that new or  
3 different mitigation measures or alternatives would substantially reduce one or more  
4 significant effects of the Project. Consequently, the Board hereby adopts the Planning  
5 Department's environmental findings in the Third Street Light Rail Project/Central Subway  
6 FSEIS/FSEIR as its own for purposes of this ordinance.

7

8 Section 2. Summary Street Vacation.

9 (a) The Vacation Area, as shown on SUR Map No. 2021-006, is hereby ordered  
10 summarily vacated pursuant to California Street and Highways Code Sections 8300 et seq.,  
11 including Sections 8334 and 8334.5, and San Francisco Public Works Code Section 787(a).  
12 The vacation of the Vacation Area shall not take effect until: (1) the SFMTA Board of Directors  
13 has approved the interdepartmental transfer of the Vacation Area to SFMTA, and (2) Public  
14 Works and SFMTA have provided written confirmation that they are prepared to have the  
15 Vacation Area transferred into the jurisdiction of SFMTA.

16 (b) The Board of Supervisors finds that the Vacation Area is unnecessary for present  
17 active public street use or prospective public street use.

18 (c) The public interest and convenience require that the vacation be done as declared  
19 in this ordinance.

20

21 Section 3. Interdepartmental Property Transfer from Public Works to SFMTA.

22 Notwithstanding the requirements of Administrative Code Chapter 23, the Board of  
23 Supervisors hereby approves the interdepartmental property transfer of the Vacation Area  
24 from Public Works to SFMTA subject to the SFMTA Board of Directors' approval of the  
25 transfer, and directs the Director of the Division of Real Estate to modify the City's records

1 concerning City property ownership and jurisdiction accordingly. Until such transfer occurs,  
2 the Vacation Area shall remain under the jurisdiction of Public Works.

3

4 Section 4. Official Acts in Connection with this Ordinance.

5 (a) The Mayor, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Interim Director of Public Works,  
6 Acting City and County Surveyor, and the Director of the Division of Real Estate are hereby  
7 authorized and directed to take any and all actions which they or the City Attorney may deem  
8 necessary or advisable to effectuate the purpose and intent of this ordinance (including,  
9 without limitation, the filing of this ordinance in the Official Records of the City and County of  
10 San Francisco and modification of the City's property ownership designation in accordance  
11 with the interdepartmental property transfer).

12 (b) Immediately upon the effective date of this ordinance, this ordinance shall be  
13 recorded.

14

15 Section 5. Effective Date.

16 This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs  
17 when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not  
18 sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the  
19 Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

20

21 APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
22 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

23 By:                         /s/                          
24 Christopher Tom  
Deputy City Attorney

25 n:\legana\as2021\2100486\01551949.docx

## LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Summary Street Vacation - Michigan Street in Connection with MUNI Metro East Improvements - Interdepartmental Property Transfer]

**Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, conditioned upon the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") Board of Directors' approval of the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area to SFMTA, to facilitate the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility; approving the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area from Public Works to SFMTA, subject to the approval of the SFMTA Board of Directors; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; adopting findings that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and authorizing official acts in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein.**

### Existing Law

The area to be vacated is a portion of Michigan Street that is generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south ("Vacation Area"). The Vacation Area consists of a paved portion of Michigan Street that terminates in front of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's ("SFMTA") MUNI Metro East maintenance facility ("MUNI Metro East"). The Vacation Area is currently under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works ("Public Works").

### Amendments to Current Law

By this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors would make findings and take actions required to vacate the Vacation Area subject to certain conditions. The vacation would not take effect until: (1) the SFMTA Board of Directors has approved the interdepartmental transfer of the Vacation Area to SFMTA, and (2) Public Works and SFMTA have provided written confirmation that they are prepared to have the Vacation Area transferred into the jurisdiction of SFMTA.

### Background Information

The vacation of the Vacation Area and the jurisdictional transfer to SFMTA would facilitate improvements and upgrades to and the expansion of MUNI Metro East.

n:\legana\as2021\2100486\01567615.docx





San Francisco Public Works  
General – Director’s Office  
49 South Van Ness Ave., Suite 1600  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(628) 271-3160 [www.SFPublicWorks.org](http://www.SFPublicWorks.org)

**Public Works Order No: 205457**

**Determination to recommend: 1) the summary street vacation of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, as part of the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility, pursuant to California Streets and Highways Code Sections 8300 *et seq.* and Public Works Code Section 787; and 2) the interdepartmental transfer of the vacated area to SFMTA.**

WHEREAS, The location and extent of the area to be vacated is a partially paved portion of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor’s Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, as depicted on San Francisco Public Works (“Public Works”) SUR Map 2021-006, dated July 2, 2021 (the “Vacation Area”); and

WHEREAS, the Vacation Area is owned by the City and County of San Francisco and is within Public Works’ jurisdiction as shown on Official Grade Map number 328, titled “Record of Survey” filed March 31, 1998 in Book Z at Page 71, and Street Vacation Map, titled “SUR 12001”; and

WHEREAS, The Vacation Area terminates in front of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency’s (“SFMTA”) MUNI Metro East maintenance facility (“MUNI Metro East”); and

WHEREAS, The Vacation Area is unnecessary for the City’s present or prospective public street, sidewalk, and service easement purposes, and Vacation Area may be summarily vacated according to Streets and Highways Code Sections 8334 and 8334.5 because: (A) this area is a paper street that constitutes excess right-of-way which is no longer needed for street purposes now and in the future; (B) the street area has been impassable to vehicular travel and has not been maintained using public funds for five (5) consecutive years; (C) all properties that abut the Vacation Area to the west and the north are already part of MUNI Metro East and are intended to be improved along with the Vacation Area after the Vacation Area is transferred from Public Works to the SFMTA; (D) the Vacation Area has never been used, and is not useful, as a nonmotorized transportation facility under Streets and Highways Code Sections 892 and 8314 as there are other such facilities available in close proximity; (E) MUNI Metro East is served by several roadways, so the Vacation Area is excess right-of-way; and (F) there are no in-place functioning utilities in the street segment; and

WHEREAS, The vacation is being carried out pursuant to San Francisco Public Works Code Section 787; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to the California Streets and Highway Code, Public Works (Bureau of Street Use and Mapping) has initiated the process to vacate the Vacation Area; and

WHEREAS, Public Works sent notice of the proposed street vacation, a draft SUR Map drawing, and a Public Works referral letter to the Department of Technology, SFMTA, the Fire Department, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the San Francisco Planning Department, AT&T, Sprint, Comcast Cable Corp., Point to Point, Inc., XO Communications, Verizon Communications, Inc.,

CenturyLink / Level 3 Communications, Shasta Consulting Group, Inc., ExteNet Systems, Inc., and Pacific Gas and Electric.

No City agency, utility company, or other notice recipient objected to the proposed vacation, and the Vacation Area is unnecessary for the City's present or prospective public street purposes; and

WHEREAS, On March 10, 2021 the San Francisco Fire Department provided notice that they had reviewed and had no objections to the proposed vacation; and

WHEREAS, On April 13, 2021 the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency provided notice that they had reviewed and had no objections to the proposed vacation; and

WHEREAS, In a letter dated March 31, 2021, the Planning Department found that the proposed Vacation and the transfer of the Vacation Area are on balance in conformity with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1. The Planning Department letter states that the Project received CEQA clearance under the Third Street Light Rail Project/Central Subway Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (FSEIS/FSEIR), adopted in August 2008 (Planning Case No. 1996.281E); and

WHEREAS, The public interest, convenience, and necessity require that no other easements or other rights should be reserved by City for any public or private utilities or facilities that may be in place in the Vacation Area and that any rights based upon any such public or private utilities or facilities are unnecessary and should be extinguished upon the effectiveness of the vacation; and

WHEREAS, Transferring the Vacation Area to the SFMTA will allow SFMTA to expand and improve their MUNI Metro East maintenance facility by including an additional Light Rail Vehicle track, which aims to improve SFMTA's services; and

WHEREAS, It is within the policy discretion of the Board of Supervisors to approve the interdepartmental transfer of the Vacation Area from Public Works to the SFMTA.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED THAT:**

The Director hereby approves the following documents either attached hereto or referenced herein:

1. Ordinance to summarily vacate the Vacation Area
2. Vacation Area SUR Map No. 2021-006

The Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the ordinance to vacate said Vacation Area.

The Director recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the interdepartmental property transfer of the Vacation Area from Public Works to SFMTA.

X

DocuSigned by:

*Ryan, James*

Ryan, James 368042466DEB4E8...

Acting City and County Surveyor

X

DocuSigned by:

*Carla Short*

Short, Carla 073CF73A4EA6486...

Interim Director

**Exhibit "A"**  
(Vacation of a Portion of Michigan Street)

Street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street lying within the City of San Francisco, County of San Francisco, State of California described as follows:

**Beginning** at the east terminus of that certain course on the north line of Cesar Chavez Street (Formerly Army Street) shown as "S. 86°49'04" W 240.00'" on Record of Survey filed in Book Z, Page 71 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, said terminus also being the intersection of said certain course with the centerline of Michigan Street (80' Wide); thence along the vacation of Michigan Street per Ordinance No. 140-03 recorded June 24, 2003 as Document No. 2003-H469148 of Official Records of said County and said centerline North 03°10'56" West 121.00 feet; thence continuing along said vacation North 41°49'04" East 56.57 feet to the to the east line of said Michigan Street; thence along said east line South 03°10'56" East 161.00 feet to said north line; thence along the westerly prolongation of said north line South 86°49'04" West 40.00 feet to the **Point of Beginning**.

**Containing:** 5640 Square Feet, more or less.

**SUR Map 2021-006** attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This property description was prepared by me, or under my supervision, in accordance with the requirements of the Professional Land Surveyor's Act.






James M. Ryan, PLS 8630  
Acting City and County Surveyor



7-12-21

Date

Jawong Jul 02, 2021 - 4:19pm J:\Survey\STREET VACATION & EASEMENT\AB 4298 Michigan St Vacation\SUR 2021-006\AB 4298 LOT 002.dwg



NOT TO SCALE

**LEGEND**

- 4298
  - 002
  - APN
  - P.O.B.
  - ROS
- 
- 
- 


ASSESSORS BLOCK NUMBER  
 ASSESSORS LOT NUMBER  
 ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER  
 POINT OF BEGINNING  
 RECORD OF SURVEY  
 PROPERTY LINE

STREET AREA TO BE VACATED

**MAP REFERENCES:**

STREET VACATION MAP TITLED "SUR 12001" DATED DECEMBER 3, 2001 ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.  
  
 "RECORD OF SURVEY" FILED MARCH 31, 1998 IN BOOK Z AT PAGE 71, SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY RECORDS  
  
 OFFICIAL GRADE MAP NO. 328 ON FILE WITH OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.



APPROVED:  
  
 JAMES M. RYAN, PLS 8630  
 ACTING CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR

07-02-2021  
 DATE

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC WORKS  
 SUBDIVISION AND MAPPING**

STREET VACATION OF A PORTION OF MICHIGAN STREET AT THE INTERSECTION OF CESAR CHAVEZ STREET, FRONTING AB 4298 LOT 002 & AB 4310 LOT 003

FILE: SUR 2021-006	SHEET 1 OF 1	SCALE: 1" = 30'	REVISION
-----------------------	--------------	-----------------	----------



## GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL

March 31, 2021

**Case No.:** 2021-002724GPR  
**Block/Lot No.:** Public ROW fronting 4298/002  
**Project Sponsor:** San Francisco Public Works: Bureau of Street Use and Mapping  
**Applicant:** Jason Wong – (628) 271-2646  
Jason.c.wong1@sfdpw.org  
San Francisco Public Works  
49 South Van Ness. Ave., Suite #900,  
SF, CA 94103  
**Staff Contact:** Jeremy Shaw – (628) 652-7449  
[jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org](mailto:jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org)

**Recommended By:**   
Rich Hillis, Director of Planning

**Recommendation:** Finding the project, on balance, is **in conformity** with the General Plan

### Project Description

Project is a proposed vacation of a piece of public Right-of-Way (ROW) from SF Public Works to SFMTA, for the purposes of incorporating into SFMTA's maintenance yard. This piece of ROW was left over from a previous ROW vacation approved in 2003.

### Environmental Review

The project received CEQA clearance under the Third Street Light Rail Project/Central Subway Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (FSEIS/FSEIR), adopted in August 2008 (Planning Case No. 1996.281E).

## General Plan Compliance and Basis for Recommendation

As described below, the proposed vacation is consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and is, on balance, in conformity with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan.

Note: General Plan Objectives are shown in **BOLD UPPER CASE** font; Policies are in **Bold** font; staff comments are in *italic* font.

### TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

#### OBJECTIVE 14

**DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A PLAN FOR OPERATIONAL CHANGES AND LAND USE POLICIES THAT WILL MAINTAIN MOBILITY AND SAFETY DESPITE A RISE IN TRAVEL DEMAND THAT COULD OTHERWISE RESULT IN SYSTEM CAPACITY DEFICIENCIES.**

**Policy 14.3 - Improve transit operation by implementing strategies that facilitate and prioritize transit vehicle movement and loading.**

*The proposed project supports the improvement of transit vehicle operations at the Muni Metro East Maintenance Facility.*

#### OBJECTIVE 21

**GIVE FIRST PRIORITY TO IMPROVING TRANSIT SERVICE THROUGHOUT THE CITY, PROVIDING A CONVENIENT AND EFFICIENT SYSTEM AS A PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE TO AUTOMOBILE USE.**

**Policy 21.1 - Provide transit service from residential areas to major employment centers outside the downtown area..**

*The proposed project supports the operations of Muni service from residential areas to major employment centers outside the downtown area.*

**Policy 21.2 - Where a high level of transit ridership or potential ridership exists along a corridor, existing transit service or technology should be upgraded to attract and accommodate riders.**

*The proposed project supports the upgrading of transit service or technology taking place at the Muni Metro East Maintenance Facility.*

### Planning Code Section 101 Findings

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes Eight Priority Policies and requires review of discretionary approvals and permits for consistency with said policies. The Project is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies as set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1 for the following reasons:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

*The Project would not have a negative effect on existing neighborhood-serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.*

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

*The Project would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.*

3. That the City’s supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

*The Project would not have an adverse effect on the City’s supply of affordable housing.*

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

*The Project would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening streets or neighborhood parking.*

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

*The Project would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.*

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

*The Project would not have an adverse effect on City’s preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.*

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

*The Project would not have an adverse effect on the City’s Landmarks and historic buildings.*

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

*The Project would not have an adverse effect on the City’s parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.*

**Recommendation: Finding the project, on balance, is in conformity with the General Plan**

**Attachments:**

GPR , Case No. 96.281R



September 7, 1999

Mr. Dennis Tsai, Senior Project Manager  
MUNI Third Street Light Rail Project  
1145 Market Street, Fifth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Case No. 96.281R  
MUNI Third Street Light Rail Project, Initial Operating Segment

Dear Mr. Tsai:

The Planning Department received your request for a *General Plan* referral for the engineering elements of the MUNI Third Street Light Rail Project Initial Operating Segment. *General Plan* referral is required for such projects by Section 4.105 of the *City Charter* and Sections 2A.52 and 2A.53 of the *City Administrative Code*.

This referral is based upon MUNI's *Third Street Light Rail Project Conceptual Engineering Design Draft Plans* dated December 1998, MUNI's *Third Street Light Rail Project Urban Design Improvements* dated July 30, 1999 (for review of site plans for the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal only), and subsequent review and coordination between Planning Department and Public Transportation Departments staffs. Substantive changes from these documents may require additional analysis as to their conformance to the City's *General Plan*.

This *General Plan* referral covers only the engineering elements of the 5.4-mile initial operating segment south of King Street. A subsequent *General Plan* referral would address the urban design issues of the initial operating segment. Future referrals would need to deal with other phases of the project. All elements of the project lie within the

City and County of San Francisco.

In addition to construction of the light rail facility and related improvements within the Third Street Corridor right-of-way, this referral also addresses the acquisition of real property, development of the site for the new Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility near Twenty-Fifth and Illinois streets east of Third Street, development of the site of the intermodal terminal at the Caltrain Bayshore Station, and utility relocations that seem prudent to complete concurrent with the construction of the project.

**Environmental Review.** Environmental review for this project began in August 1996. The San Francisco Public Transportation Commission selected the Light Rail Build Alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative in June 1998. The City Planning Commission certified the project's *Environmental Impact Report* on December 3, 1998. The Federal Transit Administration's Record of Decision on the project's *Environmental Impact Statement* was issued on March 16, 1999.

**Eight Priority Policies.** The project has been reviewed for consistency with the eight priority policies of Section 101.1 of the City's *Planning Code*. The project was found to be consistent with all priority policies.

**General Plan Consistency.**

With several exceptions, we find the project to be in conformance with the City's *General Plan*. Those exceptions are summarized below, as are ways that they could be brought into substantial conformance with the *General Plan*. Addressing all of the proposed changes as described would bring the entire project in conformance with the City's *General Plan*.

**Elements of the Project Not In Conformance As Currently Planned**

**Pedestrian Environment.** There are a number of elements of the project that would produce a less-than-ideal pedestrian environment, and that are not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* as they are currently planned.

**Narrow Sidewalks.** The quality of the pedestrian environment would be unacceptable at a number of intersections within the corridor where

sidewalks would be reduced to 9-foot-widths to accommodate turn lanes, and where simultaneously no curb-side on-street parking would be accommodated and no street trees would be planted to help buffer pedestrians from moving traffic.

Locations where the quality of the pedestrian environment as currently proposed are not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* due to narrow sidewalk widths are listed on page 28 of the accompanying staff report. These areas could be brought into substantial conformance with the *General Plan* by inter-planting new street trees between any existing street trees that are retained, so as to produce a regularly spaced planting of trees at approximately 20 feet on center. An alternate solution would be to install a curb-side barrier such as a railing to physically separate pedestrians from traffic.

**Discontinuous Sidewalks.** The pedestrian environment also will be unacceptable in those areas of the corridor where there are light rail platforms at or near "gore point" intersections that form indirect crossings or odd triangles of land adjacent to Third Street, or both. In these places, pedestrians walking along Third Street would be expected to veer away from Third Street rather than to proceed directly along it.

Locations where the quality of the pedestrian environment as currently proposed is not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* due to discontinuous sidewalks are listed on page 29 of the accompanying staff report. These areas could be brought into substantial conformance by continuing to work closely with the Department of Parking and Traffic to develop the safest possible, most direct system to accommodate pedestrians on Third Street and especially to platforms. Safe, graceful pedestrian accommodation in these areas should be balanced against the need to ensure the appropriate priority for and accommodation of the proposed light rail system.

**Lack of Crossings.** There are no pedestrian crossings over Third Street at a number of intersections. Locations where the quality of the pedestrian

environment is not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* due to this lack are listed on page 30 of the accompanying staff report. These areas could be brought into substantial conformance by continuing to work closely with the Department of Parking and Traffic to develop safe pedestrian crossings balanced against the need to ensure the appropriate priority for and accommodation of the proposed light rail system.

**Surface Parking at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal:** The plans to provide on-site parking, if it accommodates long-term parking, and especially if it accommodates single-occupancy vehicle parking at the intermodal station, are not supported by the City's *General Plan*. As a result, the plans for on-site parking at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal as currently proposed are not in conformance with the policies of the City's *General Plan*. The provision of parking at the terminal could be brought into conformance with the *General Plan* if it were managed for other than long-term commuters in single-occupancy automobiles.

**Signalization.** The proposed signalization program for the project has the potential to impede pedestrian and bicycle traffic moving within and across the corridor, the potential to present unsafe conditions to these pedestrians, or both. As a result, the signalization program, on balance, is not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* policies regarding signalization.

The signalization program could be brought into substantial conformance with the City's *General Plan* by ensuring that the movement of pedestrians and bicyclists is not impeded (preferably by not using demand-activated traffic signals in the corridor, and especially not in neighborhood commercial areas), that timing and phasing of signals balance the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists as well as transit and traffic, and that signals are timed to allow sufficient time for pedestrians to cross the full width of the street at a moderate pace. This can be achieved by continuing to work closely with the Department of Parking and Traffic to develop the greatest level of safe, graceful pedestrian crossing accommodation, balanced against the need to ensure the appropriate priority for and accommodation of the proposed light rail system. See page 41 of the accompanying staff report for a thorough discussion of signalization.

Please call David Alumbaugh at 558-6601, or Stephen Shotland at 558-6308, if you have questions or concerns with this referral, or if you need clarifications.

Sincerely,

Gerald G. Green  
Director of Planning

Attachments: Section 101.1 Findings  
General Plan Referral Case Report

*I:\Citywide\General Plan\General Plan Referrals\1996\1996.281R Third Street Light Rail Project Initial  
Operating Segment 96281R.doc*

## General Plan Policy Analysis

### Overview of this Referral

The Planning Department received a request from MUNI for a general plan referral for the engineering elements of the initial operating segment of the Third Street Light Rail project. General plan referrals for such projects are required by *Section 4.105* of the City Charter and *Sections 2A.52* and *2A.53* of the Administrative Code. These statutes require that the Planning Department prepare a report analyzing conformity or non-conformity with *General Plan* policies for projects that include—but are not limited to—acquisition, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, relocation, vacation, abandonment, sale, or change in use of any public way, transportation route, ground, open space, building or structure.

*General Plan* objectives, policies, and supporting text quoted in this referral are shown in italics.

This referral is organized as follows:

- Project Overview:** Summarizes the project and its separate elements.
- Street Reconfiguration:** Summarizes the way the Third Street corridor overall and its various segments would be reconfigured to accommodate the project.
- Corridor Functions:** Summarizes the multiple functions of the corridor, describing how each function is now accommodated in the corridor, how each is intended to be accommodated according to the *General Plan* and other relevant planning documents, how each would or would not be supported by the project, and how the project’s proposed accommodation of each function does or does not conform to the City’s *General Plan* policies. Where the project proposes accommodation of a function that does not conform to a *General Plan* policy in a significant way, measures to make it conform more closely to it are presented.
- Other Project Elements:** Summarizes separately other related elements of the project. The

elements described separately are as follows:

- signalization;
- the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility;
- Bayshore Intermodal Terminal;
- traction power substations;
- property acquisition, and
  - utility relocation.

### **Project Overview**

The initial operating segment of the Third Street Light Rail line would run on surface streets south of King Street along the Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard Corridor to the southern city limits. The line would begin at Fourth and King streets adjacent to the existing Caltrain King Street station. It would run south on Fourth Street, cross the Fourth Street Bridge, run on an extension of Owens Street between Fourth and Third Street, and south on Third Street through Mission Bay, the Central Waterfront, and the Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhoods. The line would cross over U.S. Highway 101 on a reconfigured freeway overpass and run within Bayshore Boulevard through Visitacion Valley to Sunnydale Avenue. It would terminate at the Caltrain Bayshore Station at the City's southern border. The entire initial operating segment would be 5.4 miles long. When the line is in operation, it would operate as an extension of one of MUNI's five light rail lines, most likely the J-Church line.

**Light Rail Track.** Through most of the corridor, the light rail track typically would consist of two parallel tracks in a 24-foot-wide exclusive right-of-way in the center of the street. For short sections in the vicinity of the Fourth Street Bridge and in the Bayview Commercial Core between Kirkwood and Thomas avenues, the light rail tracks would run in a "mixed-flow" configuration in which light rail vehicles would share lanes with vehicular traffic.

Within exclusive rail right-of-way areas, the rail right-of-way be at street grade but separated from it by curbs. Vehicular traffic would generally be able to cross the tracks at intersections, but not between intersections. Only light rail vehicles and emergency vehicles would be allowed on the exclusive rail right-of-way. Within mixed-flow areas, the rail would be at street grade, without curbs separating it from vehicular lanes.

**Stations.** The line's nineteen stations would be spaced at approximate one-quarter-mile intervals along the corridor except within the Bayview Commercial Core, where stations would be more closely spaced. Stations would be either center-platform or side-platform types. In either configuration, platforms would be "high-level" platforms, 34 inches above the top of rail exclusive of platform furnishings such as the shelters.

A center platform would accommodate both northbound and southbound light rail vehicles, which would stop on both sides of the platform. Center platforms would generally be 15 feet wide, and would vary in length from 172 to 215 feet, including access ramps. Platforms would be long enough to accommodate a two-car train. Center platforms would have access from one or both ends, depending upon block length. In the shorter blocks in Mission Bay North and the Bayview Commercial Core, center platforms would occupy the entire block length and have access ramps at either end. In the longer blocks in Visitacion Valley, a center platform would occupy only a part of the block length and would have access only via a ramp at the end of the platform nearest the intersection.

A side platform would accommodate either northbound or southbound vehicles, but not both. Therefore, there would be two platforms at each stop; one to accommodate each direction of travel. Side platforms would be 7 feet 7 inches wide outside of Mission Bay South, and 10 feet wide within Mission Bay South. They would vary in length from 185 to 215 feet, including access ramps. Platforms would be long enough to accommodate a two-car train. Side platforms would have access from one or both ends, depending upon block length. In the shorter blocks north and south of the Bayview Commercial Core, side platforms would occupy the entire block length and have an access ramp on one end and stairs but no ramp on the other. In the longer blocks in Mission Bay South and in the Central Waterfront, side platforms would occupy only a part of the block length, and would have access only via a ramp at the end of the platform nearest the intersection.



Platforms would include a shelter or canopy structure, wind screens, seating, public telephones, lighting, signs (including “talking signs”), closed-circuit television cameras, trash receptacles, advertising panels, and ticket vending machines. Some would include public art. The design of the platforms, their furnishings, and public art would be the subject of the subsequent urban design referral.

**Strain Poles.** Strain poles would be spaced at approximately 100-foot intervals. They would support catenary wires, street lights, and traffic signals and signs.

Throughout most of the corridor, strain poles would be placed opposite one another in the adjoining sidewalk. The centerline of the strain pole would be 2.0 feet back from the face of the curb. Exceptions would be on the Islais Creek Bridge, where the strain poles would be placed in the median; in the retained cut and fill sections adjacent to U.S. Highway 101, where the strain poles would be integrated into the retaining walls; and on the reconfigured U.S. Highway 101 overpass, where the strain poles would be integrated into the traffic barriers.

**Mission Bay Turn-Around.** A loop of tracks would be constructed within the 18th, 19th, and Illinois streets rights-of-way to allow light rail vehicles to turn back at Mission Bay. The turn-around is intended to allow MUNI to run an additional light rail line, most likely the N-Judah line, to provide additional service to Mission Bay when ridership there warrants it. The turn-around also would provide a holding area for two to three light rail vehicles at times.

**Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility.** A new maintenance and storage facility, the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility, would be designed and constructed on a site to be acquired at 25<sup>th</sup> and Illinois Streets east of Third Street. This facility would provide MUNI a second facility for storage and maintenance of light rail vehicles.

**Bayshore Intermodal Terminal.** A new intermodal station, the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal, would allow passengers to transfer between MUNI light rail and Caltrain

commuter rail service at the Bayshore Caltrain Station. This station also would provide bus parking, 45 automobile parking spaces intended for MUNI patrons, a passenger drop-off area, and access and facilities for bicycles. A structured parking facility was considered in early stages of project planning, but is not proposed as part of the initial operating segment and is not addressed in this referral.

**Traction Power Substations.** Six traction power substations would be constructed to supply power to the overhead catenary wire system. They would be housed in small structures spaced approximately one mile apart along the corridor. Two of the traction power substations would be located within the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility.

**U.S. Highway 101 Overpass and Ramps.** The U.S. Highway 101 overpass and ramps would need to be reconfigured to accommodate the light rail line and vehicular traffic. Currently, the northbound off-ramp is shared by traffic bound for Third Street or Bayshore Boulevard. To maintain northbound access to Third Street from U.S. Highway 101, an exclusive Third Street off-ramp would be constructed. It would merge onto northbound Third Street from the right, instead of from the left as it does now. The portions of the existing off-ramp now providing access to northbound Third Street would be eliminated, but the portions of the off-ramp providing access to Bayshore Boulevard would be retained. The overpass itself would be widened approximately 25 to 30 feet. All changes would be within the Caltrans right-of-way. All overpass and ramp improvements would be designed and built by MUNI but with approvals by Caltrans.

**Property Acquisition.** The project would require the City to purchase six parcels of land to accommodate various features of the project outside the public right-of-way.

**Utility Relocation.** The development of the Light Rail project makes it prudent simultaneously to relocate, reconfigure, or replace existing below-ground utilities within the construction zone. Private above-ground utilities in the Bayview and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods may be placed underground through an undergrounding district as the project is constructed (utilities in the Bayview Commercial Core already are undergrounded), should the Board of Supervisors decide to establish an undergrounding

district for these areas. In addition, a concrete duct bank for power feed cables will be constructed below grade in the vehicle travel lane. A communication system for optical fibers will be run in a duct for the length of the project, and a similar duct will be constructed for the light rail power system.

**Trees.** Trees in the public right-of-way would be replaced if they are removed as a result of the construction of the light rail line. However, street trees will be planted at consistent intervals within the Bayview Commercial Core, and within the median in the Visitacion Valley neighborhood.

**Public Sidewalks.** Public sidewalks and the sidewalk area from property line to property line within the Bayview Commercial Core would be reconstructed as part of the project. The design would be articulated as part of the urban design of the street, and would be the subject of a subsequent urban design referral.

#### **Description of the Reconfigured Corridor Overall**

The Third Street Light Rail corridor is a public right-of-way that, like most streets in the City, functions in multiple ways. The corridor accommodates, or is planned to accommodate, the following multiple functions:

- Transit;
- Vehicular Traffic;
- Pedestrians;
- Bicycles;
- Truck Traffic; and
- On-Street Parking.

The proposed reconfiguration of the corridor to accommodate the light rail line would vary in the way it affects the ability of the corridor to handle these multiple functions. The *General Plan* is clear in its intent that the Third Street corridor continue to function in multiple ways, and the corridor's ability to continue to do so or not are of central interest in this referral.

Except as described below, the Third Street Light Rail project would be contained within

the area of the existing street right-of-way, and, except for strain poles that will be placed on the adjacent sidewalk, construction generally would be limited to the area within the track right-of-way.

The Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility, the Mendell and Oakdale left-turn accommodation, the Keith Street extension, the U.S. Highway 101 overpass and ramps, and the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal, however, would require reconfiguration of the street system surrounding these facilities, and of the selected parcels outside of the corridor on which they would be constructed.

North of 16th Street, the corridor now typically carries two lanes of traffic in each direction. South of 16th Street, it generally carries three lanes of traffic in each direction. Left turns generally are allowed at most intersections. The corridor south of Mission Rock Street has sidewalks on each side of the street, but there are no sidewalks on either Third or Fourth streets north of Mission Rock Street. Essentially the entire corridor accommodates on-street parking at the curb wherever possible. There are no signed nor painted bicycle facilities within the corridor, nor are there any developed recreational trails along its length at this time.

With the completion of the light rail line, the corridor generally would carry two lanes of traffic in each direction. It would accommodate left-turns in fewer places than currently, and would limit right turns for trucks onto Third Street in more places than currently.

The project would result in the net loss of 309 on-street parking spaces (excluding the 377 on-street parking spaces in the corridor in Mission Bay, where separate agreements between the City and the Mission Bay developer have determined that there should not be on-street parking on the street segments that accommodate the light rail line). On-street parking gains and losses by corridor segment are shown in Table 1, which appears later in this referral.

The project would provide at least the minimum accommodation of pedestrians along the entire length of the corridor. It would require that bicycle traffic use less-direct routes parallel to the corridor along most of its length, and would provide no accommodation of

bicycles on the Fourth Street or the Islais Creek bridges, for a stretch of the corridor between Carroll and Paul avenues, and for segments along Bayshore Boulevard. In these segments of the corridor, bicyclists would need to use vehicular travel lanes if they are to ride on Third Street.

Within the entire corridor, there are few if any visual obstructions across the right-of-way either mid-block or at intersections. Physical movement across and through the corridor generally is not now impeded by cuts, fill, walls, or other physical obstructions.

### **Description of the Reconfigured Corridor by Segment**

The following characterizes the reconfigured corridor by segment.

**Mission Bay North (King Street to Owens Street).** The Fourth Street right-of-way north of the Fourth Street Bridge currently is 88.5 feet wide. The Fourth Street Bridge is 61 feet wide (the roadway on the bridge is 40 feet wide curb to curb). Currently, Fourth Street between Berry and King streets carries two lanes of traffic southbound and one lane of traffic northbound. There are no left turn lanes southbound onto Berry Street, and no left-turn lanes northbound onto Berry Street. Between Berry and King streets, there is on-street parking along both sides of Fourth Street, and on-street parking on Fourth Street south of Berry Street.

Once reconfigured for the project, the light rail line would occupy the center of a 102-foot-wide street right-of-way on Fourth Street north of Berry Street, narrowing to the 61-foot width of the Fourth Street Bridge. Light rail vehicles would occupy an exclusive right-of-way north of Berry Street, but would share lanes with vehicular traffic as the line approaches and crosses the Fourth Street Bridge.

With the completion of the light rail line, Fourth Street would carry two traffic lanes in each direction north of Berry Street as at present, would accommodate left turns southbound onto Berry Street, but would not accommodate on-street parking at either curb as it does now. South of Berry Street, Fourth Street would carry two lanes of traffic southbound and one lane of traffic northbound, but would not accommodate on-street parking along the west curb. It would have a loading zone along the east curb.

To accommodate Mission Bay development, the light rail project, the platform on Fourth Street, and vehicular and bicycle traffic, the and the Mission Bay developer will widen Fourth Street from 82.5 feet to 112.8 feet by setting back the property line by 15.0 on the west side and 15.3 feet on the east side of Fourth Street. The Mission Bay developer and MUNI will each be responsible for one-half of the costs of widening and improving this section of Fourth Street. The street would be reconfigured to accommodate two lanes of traffic and a bicycle lane in each direction. This block would not accommodate curb-side on-street parking. The sidewalks on both sides of this block would each be widened from 10 feet to 12 feet. (Subsequent plans for Mission Bay have proposed widening the Fourth Street right-of-way even further to allow for 16-foot-wide sidewalks on each side of Fourth Street.) The light rail project would be built within this widened street right-of-way.

In addition to the changes within this block of Fourth Street, Berry Street would be narrowed both east of and west of its intersection with Fourth Street. West of Fourth Street, the and the Mission Bay developer will narrow Berry Street from 82.5 feet to 65 feet by vacating 17.5 feet of the Berry Street right-of-way on the north side (and an even greater right-of-way width at mid-block). East of Fourth Street, the and the Mission Bay developer will narrow Berry Street by vacating a portion of the Berry Street right-of-way on the north side.

One center platform would be constructed in this segment of the corridor.

On the Fourth Street Bridge, the light rail tracks would be in a mixed-flow configuration in the center of the bridge. On the bridge and at its approaches, light rail vehicles would share lanes with vehicular traffic. After leaving the bridge to the north, there would be a left-turn lane on the light rail right-of-way, to accommodate left turns westbound onto Berry Street. The bridge would carry one lane northbound and two lanes southbound, but, as today, would not accommodate on-street parking at either curb.

**Mission Bay South (Owens Street to Mariposa Street).** Third Street currently carries two lanes of traffic in each direction north of 16th Street, and three lanes of traffic in each direction south of there. There are sidewalks along Third Street and Fourth Street south

of Mission Rock Road, but none north of it. These sidewalks are 10 feet wide, except on the east side between Alameda and 16th streets, where they are 15.5 feet wide. This segment of the corridor accommodates on-street parking along both curbs, where they exist, or on the shoulders north of Mission Rock Street where there currently are no curbs.

As part of agreements between the City and the Mission Bay property owner for development of Mission Bay, Owens Street east of Fourth Street (which currently does not exist in its planned alignment) would be extended east as a new 92-foot-wide right-of-way.

North of Mission Rock Street, the Third Street right-of-way currently is 88.5 feet wide. There are no sidewalks along this segment of Third Street, and on-street parking is informal and parallel to the street. The project would acquire a 17.5-foot wide portion of Seawall Lot 337 on the east side of Third Street, and the Mission Bay developer will set back the property line on the west side of Third Street by 5.0 feet to widen the Third Street right-of-way to 111 feet. The project would construct a 15-foot sidewalk on the east side of this segment of Third Street. When the remaining portions of this segment of Third Street ultimately are improved by the Mission Bay developer, the remaining segments of sidewalks would be widened to their planned 12-foot-wide width along the full length of Owens, Third, and Fourth streets.

South of Mission Rock Street, the Third Street right-of-way currently is 100 feet wide. Except in front of the historic fire house, the Mission Bay developer will set back the property lines on each side of Third Street in this segment to increase the right-of-way to 110 feet overall. As it would be widened equally on both sides, the current Third Street centerline would not change.

Exceptions would be at Mission Rock Street, South Street, and Mariposa Street. At Mission Rock and Mariposa streets, platform construction and left turn pockets would require that the existing curb be moved back three feet and the street widened by an equal amount. Adjacent to the South Street platform on the east side of Third Street, the current 15.5-foot-wide sidewalk would need to be narrowed 8.5 feet. All would result in

the sidewalks in these three locations being cut back to 7-foot widths. This 7-foot width would be further constricted by the strain poles that would be placed with their center lines 2.0 feet back from the face of the new curb. At these locations, unobstructed sidewalk widths would be a maximum of 4.5 feet.

In all but the three places described above, the existing sidewalks on Third Street south of Mission Rock Street would be retained in their current configuration until the street is improved as part of the Mission Bay development. When the remaining portions of this segment of Third Street ultimately are improved by the Mission Bay developer, all sidewalks would be constructed to their planned 12-foot-wide width.

At 16th Street, future left turn pockets on the southeast side of the intersection would require that the existing curb be moved back 10 feet and the street width widened by an equal amount. A new 15-foot-wide sidewalk would be built.

The actual construction or reconstruction of Third and Owens streets is the responsibility of the Mission Bay developer. The Third Street Light Rail project is expected to be constructed ahead of these street improvements. To accommodate the later planned changes to these two Mission Bay streets and to construct the light rail project, the tracks would be built in an exclusive 24-foot-wide right-of-way centered in the existing centerline of Third and Fourth streets and on the planned centerline of Owens Street, and strain poles would be placed in the alignment of the future sidewalks. Except as described above, project construction in Third Street would be limited to an area within the current 100-foot-wide street right-of-way, and the current curb would not be removed.

When improvements are complete, Third Street would carry two lanes of traffic in each direction. However, left turn lanes northbound and southbound lanes would be limited, and the street is not planned to accommodate on-street parking along either curb (as per the agreement between the City and the Mission Bay developer and not due entirely to the Third Street Light Rail project).

Independent of this project, the Mission Bay developer will widen Mariposa Street and will set back the north curb line and the development on the north side to accommodate a



widened pedestrian space there.

Six side platforms would be constructed in this segment of the corridor (two at each of three locations).

**Mariposa Street to Kirkwood Avenue.** Except where it crosses Islais Creek, this segment of the corridor now carries three lanes of traffic in each direction, with left turns allowed at most intersections. On-street parking is generally accommodated along both curbs, and there are 10-foot-wide sidewalks along its length. Where it crosses the Islais Creek Bridge, the street section now carries three lanes of traffic each direction, but does not accommodate curb-side on-street parking

Except at Islais Creek, tracks in this segment of the corridor would occupy an exclusive 24-foot-wide right-of-way in the center of the generally 100-foot-wide street right-of-way. With the completion of the light rail line, this street segment would carry two lanes of traffic in each direction. Left turns, however, would be limited. On-street parking would be reduced by about 213 spaces. The sidewalks along both sides of the street would be retained, but would be narrowed to 9 feet at those intersections where left-turn lanes would be provided.

Where the line crosses the Islais Creek Bridge, the light rail tracks would be in an exclusive right-of-way straddling the median in the center of the 98.77-foot right-of-way (80-foot roadway width curb to curb). With the completion of the light rail line, the Islais Creek Bridge would carry two lanes of traffic in each direction, and would continue not to accommodate on-street parking on either side.

Independent of this project, the is widening Cesar Chavez Street west and east of Third Street in order to accommodate anticipated levels of traffic on this street.

The Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility would be constructed adjacent to this segment of the corridor at 25th and Illinois streets east of Third Street.

Eight side platforms (two at each of four locations) and one center platform (at Hudson

Avenue) would be constructed in this segment of the corridor.

**Bayview Commercial Core (Kirkwood Avenue to Thomas Avenue).** In its current configuration, this street segment carries three lanes of traffic each direction, with left-turn lanes permitted at most intersections. It accommodates on-street parking along most of its length on both sides of the street, and has 10-foot-wide sidewalks along its entire length.

Within the Bayview Commercial Core, the 100-foot right-of-way would be reconfigured to include a 12- to 15-foot-wide median that intermittently accommodates landscaping, platforms, and left-turn lanes; two lanes of traffic in each direction; on-street parking along each curb where possible; and 12-foot-wide sidewalks on each side. Light rail vehicles would share the center lanes with vehicular traffic in a mixed-flow configuration. Left turns would be permitted at two intersections. Depending on the block, the median would accommodate either a station platform, landscaping, or a left turn lane. The project would result in a net gain of about 15 on-street parking spaces in this segment of the corridor.

Three center platforms would be constructed within this segment of the corridor.

**Thomas Avenue to U.S. Highway 101.** In its current configuration, this segment of the corridor is similar to the Bayview Commercial Core, as described above. Within this segment of the corridor, the 100-foot right-of-way would be reconfigured to include two lanes of traffic in each direction, on-street parking along each curb where possible, and 10-foot sidewalks on each side. Light rail vehicles would run within an exclusive 24-foot right-of-way in the center of the street. Left turns would be prohibited at most intersections, except within the retained cut area, which is described below.

Third Street becomes grade-separated both northbound and southbound at Jamestown Avenue. A retaining wall prevents any pedestrian crossings of Third Street south of Key Avenue. This same wall and grade separation forces southbound traffic on to Meade Avenue westbound and back to LeConte Avenue.

For 900 feet from just south of Jamestown Avenue to just south of Meade Avenue, the

light rail line would run within a retained cut that would be as much as 8 feet below the level of the street. This retained cut would limit the ability of traffic and pedestrians to cross the street. Pedestrians would be able to cross Third Street at Key Avenue. The project would result in the loss of about 116 on-street parking spaces in this segment of the corridor.

Six side platforms and one center platform would be constructed in this segment of the corridor.

**U.S. Highway 101 Overpass.** In its current configuration, the U.S. Highway 101 overpass carries three lanes of traffic northbound.

The U.S. Highway 101 overpass and ramps would need to be reconfigured to accommodate the light rail line. Currently, the northbound off-ramp is shared by traffic bound for Third Street or Bayshore Boulevard. To maintain northbound access to Third Street from U.S. Highway 101, an exclusive Third Street off-ramp would be constructed. It would merge onto northbound Third Street from the right, instead of from the left as it does now. The portions of the existing off-ramp now providing access to northbound Third Street would be eliminated, but the portions of the off-ramp providing access to Bayshore Boulevard would be retained. The overpass itself would be widened by approximately 25 to 30 feet. All changes would be within the Caltrans right-of-way. All overpass and ramp improvements would be designed and built by MUNI.

Where it crosses over U.S. Highway 101, the corridor would vary in the way it accommodates the light rail tracks, vehicular traffic, and pedestrians. Where it is narrowest on the overpass itself, the tracks would occupy an exclusive right-of-way in the center of the 74.28-foot-wide overpass with its 64.28-foot-wide roadway width curb to curb. On the overpass, the corridor would accommodate three lanes of traffic northbound, in addition to on- and off-ramps. It would not accommodate on-street parking. The reconfigured overpass would provide a 6-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side. There would be no pedestrian accommodation on the north side of the over crossing.

With the retained cut along Third Street, there would be no left turns into and out of Key

and Le Conte avenues. To retain access to the residences along this street, a one-way extension of Keith Street would be constructed along the Caltrans-owned Jamestown/Bayshore connector, extending between the existing portion of Keith Street and Third Street. The overpass does not provide on-street parking now, and no on-street parking would be lost.

No station platforms would be constructed on the overpass.

**U.S. Highway 101 to Sunnydale Avenue Along Bayshore Boulevard.** In its current configuration, this street section carries three lanes of traffic in each direction, left-turn lanes at intervals, on-street parking on each side of the street, and 12-foot-wide sidewalks.

Where it runs within Bayshore Boulevard, the light rail track alignment would consist of two parallel tracks straddling a generally 8-foot-wide center median in the center of the 125-foot-wide street right-of-way. With the completion of the light rail line, Bayshore Boulevard would carry two lanes of traffic in each direction, left-turn lanes at intervals, on-street parking at each curb, bicycle lanes on both sides of the street along much of its length, and 12.5-foot-wide sidewalks on each side of the street.

For 600 feet from just north of Hester Avenue (south) to just south of Tunnel Avenue, the light rail line would run within a retained fill that would be as much as 6 feet above the level of the street itself. This retained fill would limit the ability of traffic and pedestrians to cross the street. Pedestrians would be able to cross Third Street at Hester Avenue (north). The project would result in the gain of about 5 on-street parking spaces in this segment of the corridor.

Two center platforms would be constructed in this segment of the corridor.

**Bayshore Intermodal Terminal.** The project includes the development of a new terminal for the Third Street Light Rail line at the current Caltrain Bayshore Station. The southern terminal would be designed as an intermodal facility to facilitate transfers between the Third Street light rail line, Caltrain, SamTrans, MUNI bus services and possibly a shuttle

connecting with the proposed new 49ers stadium and Candlestick Mills mall.

Where it turns from Bayshore Boulevard into the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal at the city's southern limits, the light rail track alignment would consist of two parallel tracks within a 24-foot-wide exclusive track right-of-way in a generally 66-foot-wide street right-of-way. With the completion of the light rail line, it would carry one lane of traffic in each direction. It would not accommodate on-street parking at either curb line.

The intermodal facility would include a center platform for de-boarding and a side platform for boarding the light rail line, bus bays for drop-off and pick-up of passengers and queuing for buses, a curbside drop-off area for transit riders, and surface parking. Ticket vending machines, sheltered boarding areas and other passenger amenities would be included. The development of the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal area would provide a sidewalk on the north sides of the extension of Sunnydale Avenue.

One center and one side platform would be constructed at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal.

### 1. Transit Functions of the Reconfigured Corridor

Third Street currently carries the MUNI #15-Third diesel bus line. The project is intended to replace this diesel-bus service with an electrified fixed-rail transit line. *General Plan* maps designate the Third Street Corridor as a *Transit Preferential, Transit Important Street*. Reconfiguring the Third Street Corridor for fixed-rail transit would retain and strengthen this function. Reconfiguring the corridor for fixed-rail transit also would bring the corridor into conformance with its planned function as a *future rail/fixed guideway transit corridor*.

#### General Plan Policies Related to Transit

The major issues related to transit functions in the Third Street Corridor relate to whether fixed-rail transit is appropriate in this corridor, whether the other functions of the street are able to continue appropriately, whether accommodation of the light rail line would support proper land use, and whether it would be supportive of and enhance neighborhood character.

*General Plan* policies that address transit in the Third Street corridor are as follows:

#### **Commerce and Industry Element**

The Commerce and Industry Element addresses the support needed for a vital employment and service base. This element's policies for viable industry in San Francisco include the following:

##### ***Policy 4.7***

*Improve public and private transportation to and from industrial areas.*

Comment: Construction of the light rail system along the City's eastern waterfront, much of which is currently zoned for industrial use, meets this policy.

#### **Transportation Element**

The Transportation Element supports provisions of public transit and alternative transportation choices for residents of the City and the region.

##### ***Objective 1***

*Meet the needs of all residents and visitors for safe, convenient and inexpensive travel within San Francisco and between the city and other parts of the region while maintaining the high quality living environment of the Bay Area.*

##### ***Policy 1.1***

*Involve citizens in planning and developing transportation facilities and services, and in further defining Objectives and policies as they relate to district plans and specific projects.*

##### ***Policy 1.3***

*Give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as the means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs, particularly those of commuters.*

##### ***Policy 1.5***

*Coordinate regional and local transportation systems and provide for interline transit transfers.*

##### ***Policy 1.6***

*Ensure choices among modes of travel and accommodate each mode when and where it is most appropriate.*

*Policy 1.7*

*Assure expanded mobility for the disadvantaged.*

Comment. The project would provide both strong local transit service as well as connections to the regional transit system. As such, it would strongly support this objective and its related policies.

**Guiding Development and Improving the Environment.** The Transportation Element supports using the City's transportation system to guide development and to improve the environment.

*Objective 2*

*Use the transportation system as a means for guiding development and improving the environment.*

*Policy 2.4*

*Organize the transportation system to reinforce community identity, improve linkages among interrelated activities and provide focus for community activities.*

Comment: The Third Street Light Rail corridor passes through both existing and planned residential neighborhoods and through much of the City's remaining industrially zoned lands. It will provide transit service in the planned new neighborhood of Mission Bay and would be expected to help serve as a catalyst for development there. It is being developed not only to provide transit service for those living in and adjacent to the Bayview Commercial Core, but is also to serve as one of the main focuses of the revitalization of the Bayview Commercial Core. It will serve other residential areas along the corridor, as well. As such, the project would be expected to support development within these neighborhoods of the city.

In addition, the project passes through much of the City's remaining industrially zoned lands. With proper land use controls, there is nothing inherent in the project that would undermine the industrial uses in those portions of the City's industrially zoned lands through which it passes. Indeed, like its residential uses, the City's industrial uses would be expected to benefit from improved transit service. The project would provide transit support to these industrial uses.

**Regional Transit Hub.** The Transportation Element supports maintaining and enhancing the links between the local and regional transportation system, and the

City as the regional, city-centered transit hub.

***Objective 3***

*Maintain and enhance San Francisco's position as a regional destination without inducing a greater volume of through automobile traffic.*

***Objective 4***

*Maintain and enhance San Francisco's position as the hub of a regional, city-centered transit system.*

***Policy 4.1***

*Rapid transit lines from all outlying corridors should lead to stations and terminals that are adjacent or connected to each other in downtown San Francisco.*

***Policy 4.2***

*Increase transit ridership capacity in all congested regional corridors.*

***Policy 4.4***

*Integrate future rail transit extensions to, from, and within the city as technology permits so that they are compatible with and immediately accessible to existing BART, Caltrain or MUNI rail lines.*

***Policy 4.5***

*Provide convenient transit service that connects the regional transit network to major employment centers outside the downtown area.*

Comment: The project links to the regional Caltrain system at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal and at the King Street Station, thereby linking the eastern part of the city to the regional system.

Transit First. The Transportation Element's Transit First policy is aimed at restoring balance to the City's transportation system, and making transit the primary mode of transportation in the city.

***Objective 11***

*Establish public transit as the primary mode of transportation in San Francisco and as a means through which to guide future development and improve regional mobility and air quality.*

***Policy 11.2***



*Continue to favor investment in transit infrastructure and services over investment in highway development and other facilities that accommodate the automobile. Every decision to direct expenditures toward improving congestion and parking conditions should first consider the improvement of transit operations.*

***Objective 20***

*Give first priority to improving transit service throughout the city, providing a convenient and efficient system as a preferable alternative to automobile use.*

***Policy 20.1***

*Give priority to transit vehicles based on a rational classification system of transit preferential streets.*

***Policy 20.9***

*Improve inter-district and intra-district transit service.*

***Policy 20.11***

*Promote the electrification of bus operation.*

***Objective 21***

*Develop transit as the primary mode of travel to and from downtown and all major activity centers within the region.*

***Policy 21.1***

*Provide transit service from residential areas to major employment centers outside the downtown area.*

***Policy 21.2***

*Where a high level of transit ridership or potential ridership exists along a corridor, existing transit service or technology should be upgraded to attract and accommodate riders.*

***Policy 21.7***

*Make convenient transfers between transit lines, systems and modes possible by establishing common or closely located terminals for local and regional transit systems and by coordinating fares and schedules.*

***Policy 21.10***

*Ensure passenger and operator safety in the design and operation of transit vehicles and station facilities.*

Comment: The project would reconfigure the Third Street Corridor to give primacy to the Third Street Light Rail line while continuing to accommodate the private automobile and the pedestrian.

#### **Central Waterfront Area Plan**

##### ***Objective 7***

*Improve the transportation accessibility of the subareas .*

##### ***Policy 7.1***

*Improve citywide and regional transit access to the subareas.*

##### ***Policy 7.4***

*Extend a Light-Rail Vehicle line through the Central Waterfront along the Third Street corridor connecting to the Caltrain and the MUNI Metro extension light rail service which provides access to downtown San Francisco.*

##### ***Policy 8.3***

*Encourage the use of public transit, carpooling/vanpooling, and jitney service to minimize the consumption of scarce industrial land for commuter parking lots. Where demand for parking can be clearly established, give preference to parking structures as opposed to open lot parking.*

#### **South Bayshore Area Plan**

##### ***Objective 4***

*Develop and maintain a system for the easy movement of people and goods, taking into account anticipated needs of both local and through traffic.*

##### ***Policy 4.2***

*Develop the necessary improvements in public transit to move people efficiently and comfortably between different South Bayshore neighborhoods, to and from Candlestick Park, and to and from Downtown and other parts of the region.*

##### ***Policy 4.3***

*Give special consideration to light rail along Third Street as the nucleus for public transit improvements and for stimulating wider public transit usage and*

*social/economic revitalization.*

***Objective 7***

*Encourage healthy retail reuse in the existing commercial core of third street and complementary growth in adjacent sections.*

***Policy 7.1***

*Make the commercial blocks on Third Street between Kirkwood Avenue to the north and Thomas and Thornton Avenues to the south the core of new commercial growth.*

***Objective 8***

*Strengthen the role of south Bayshore industrial areas in the overall economy of the district, the city, and the overall region.*

***Objective 11***

*Improve definition of the overall urban pattern of south Bayshore*

***Policy 11.1***

*Recognize and enhance the distinctive features of South Bayshore as an interlocking system of diverse neighborhoods.*

Comment: The project supports the objectives and policies of these two area plans.

**Analysis of Transit Functions**

The *General Plan* is clear in its support for the development of the light rail along the Third Street Corridor and for the reconfiguration of the corridor to accommodate it. The project is in conformance with the objectives and policies of the *General Plan*.

## 2. Vehicular Functions of the Reconfigured Corridor

The Third Street corridor is a major north to south roadway knitting together the City's eastern shoreline and linking the southeastern quadrant of the City with the Downtown, the Peninsula, and the Bay Bridge. It also links the various neighborhoods through which it passes, and serves as each neighborhood's major neighborhood commercial street.

*General Plan* maps designate the corridor as a *Major Arterial*.

Through most of the corridor, the light rail system typically would run in an exclusive right-of-way in the center of the street. For short sections in the vicinity of the Fourth Street Bridge and in the Bayview Commercial Core between Kirkwood and Thomas avenues, the light rail system would run in a "mixed-flow" configuration in which light rail vehicles would share lanes with other vehicles.

North of 16th Street, the corridor now typically carries two lanes of traffic in each direction. South of 16th Street, it now generally carries three lanes of traffic each way. Left turns generally are allowed at most intersections. With the completion of the light rail line, the corridor generally would carry two lanes of traffic in each direction. It would accommodate left-turns in fewer places than currently.

Reconfigured for fixed-rail transit, the Third Street Corridor would go from essentially a street with three lanes of traffic each way throughout its length south of Sixteen Street to one with two lanes of traffic each way throughout its entire length. The corridor would retain its current traffic functions, and would continue to function as a major arterial.

Where the trains run in an exclusive right-of-way, the right-of-way would be at street grade but separated from the traffic lanes by curbs. Vehicular traffic would generally be able to cross the tracks at intersections, but would not be able to cross the tracks mid-block. Within mixed-flow areas, the right-of-way would be at street grade, and would not exclude other traffic.

### General Plan Policies Related to Vehicular Traffic

The *General Plan* is clear in its intent that San Francisco's street system—including the Third Street corridor—function not just for the automobile, but also for pedestrians, bicyclists, and trucks as well as transit. *General Plan* policies that address traffic functions

in the Third Street Corridor are as follows:

#### **Transportation Element**

The Transportation Element supports strong access for residents of the City and the region. As well, its policies support restoring a balance to the City's transportation system, long dominated by the automobile.

##### ***Objective 1***

*Meet the needs of all residents and visitors for safe, convenient and inexpensive travel within San Francisco and between the city and other parts of the region while maintaining the high quality living environment of the Bay Area.*

##### ***Policy 1.6***

*Ensure choices among modes of travel and accommodate each mode when and where it is most appropriate.*

**Comment:** Since the project reconfigures the Third Street corridor to accommodate not only its current traffic functions but also introduces fixed-rail transit, it meets these policies of the *General Plan*.

#### **Vehicle Circulation**

##### ***Objective 18***

*Establish a street hierarchy system in which the function and design of each street are consistent with the character and use of adjacent land.*

##### ***Policy 18.1***

*Wherever feasible, divert through automobile and commercial traffic from residential neighborhoods onto major and secondary arterials, and limit major arterials to nonresidential streets wherever possible.*

##### ***Policy 18.2***

*Design streets for a level of traffic that serves, but would not cause a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses.*

**Comment:** The project would reconfigure the Third Street Corridor in a way that would give the corridor a function and design that more clearly expresses its function as both a trafficway and a transit way, and would thereby be generally more supportive and in

character with adjacent land uses in the neighborhoods through which it passes

**Analysis of Traffic Functions.** The project is in conformance with the *General Plan* as it relates to the traffic functions of the corridor.

### 3. Pedestrian Functions of the Reconfigured Corridor

The Third Street Corridor now provides pedestrian sidewalks along nearly its entire length. Only the stretch of the corridor between Mission Rock Street and the Fourth Street Bridge is without walkways now. South of Mission Rock Street, corridor sidewalks are essentially continuous and uninterrupted except on the U.S. Highway 101 overpass.

Third Street is designated a *Neighborhood Commercial Pedestrian Street* in the *General Plan*. In addition to its planned pedestrian functions, Third Street between 24th Street and Cargo Way is planned to accommodate a segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail.

As currently proposed and planned, the San Francisco Bay Trail would cross China Basin on the Lefty O'Doul Bridge on Third Street, follow Terry Franchoise Boulevard through Mission Bay, and run along Illinois Street to 25th Street. It would follow Third Street from 25th Street to Cargo Way, crossing over Islais Creek, and then follow Cargo Way to Hunters Point. Recent proposals for the Bay Trail would replace the current planned accommodation of the trail on Third Street south of Cargo Way. Amendments to the Bay Trail, which include not accommodating it on Third Street south of Cargo Way as currently planned, are now being prepared and are expected to be presented for adoption soon.

Third Street Corridor streets, like all streets in the City, are expected to function as pedestrian places and linkages as much as they are intended to function as traffic and transit streets. They are intended to be efficient pedestrian circulation systems that are pleasant and safe, and that attract pedestrians to and along them.

To some, the pedestrian function and ambiance of some sections of the Third Street Corridor may seem unimportant given the corridor's great length, the seeming discontinuity of the sidewalk in some places, the relative lack of intense uses along much of the corridor, and the fact that along a significant portion of its length the corridor passes through industrial areas rather than residential neighborhoods or neighborhood commercial areas or other places where people live and shop. But pedestrian functions

are not unimportant.

At its most basic level, the Third Street Corridor must gracefully accommodate pedestrians, because essentially all of the light rail system's riders begin or end their transit journeys as pedestrians. Transit service cannot be effective if it does not welcome pedestrians. As well, Third Street serves as a major part of the pedestrian network in the communities through which it passes, and for the city as a whole. It must accommodate pedestrians gracefully and safely

The major features that help create sound pedestrian environments are the continuity of sidewalks, lack of dead ends or abrupt terminations, adequate sidewalk widths, graceful and safe accommodation of pedestrians, and strong connections to surrounding areas and uses. In the Third Street Corridor, this would also include strong connections to light rail transit facilities. Also important is psychological and physical separation of pedestrians from traffic, which is most effectively achieved by curb-side on-street parking that provides a physical separation between pedestrians and traffic; or by street tree plantings that provide at least a psychological separation from traffic if not a continuous physical one.

The proposed changes to the pedestrian environment along the Third Street Corridor are summarized below. See also the section on signalization that follows, which discusses the effect of signalization on the pedestrian environment.

**Mission Bay North (King Street to Owens Street).** As discussed earlier, this segment of the corridor currently provides pedestrian sidewalks along Fourth Street and across the Fourth Street Bridge. There are no formal sidewalks south of the bridge to Mission Rock Street. This section of the corridor would continue to provide pedestrian sidewalks, and ultimately would extend them south of the bridge, as well.

The changes to Fourth Street and Berry Street would affect the pedestrian environment. Widening the Fourth Street roadway as planned would increase the distance pedestrians would need to travel to cross Fourth Street by approximately 30 feet. While there would be pedestrian refuges in the middle of the street at the platform, this wider street section would create a less pleasant and possibly less safe pedestrian environment at this crossing. Narrowing Berry Street would decrease the distance pedestrians would need to travel to cross that street by approximately 20 feet, as well, which would create a more welcoming and possibly safer pedestrian environment at this crossing.

The sidewalks on each side of Fourth Street would be 12 to 15 feet wide, once the street

was reconfigured. Sidewalks on each side of the Fourth Street Bridge would remain 6.26 feet wide.

**Mission Bay South (Owens Street to Mariposa Street).** Currently, there are sidewalks along Third Street and Fourth Street south of Mission Rock Road, but none north of it. Generally, existing sidewalks are 10 feet wide, except between Alameda and 16th streets, where they are 15.5 feet in width on the east side. There currently are no sidewalks north of Mission Rock Street. When the street is finally improved by the Mission Bay developer some time after the light rail project has been completed, sidewalks along this stretch of the corridor would be 12 feet wide, except north of Mission Rock Street, where they would be 15 feet wide on the east side of the street and 12 feet wide on the west side.

The light rail project would be built within the current street right-of-way. The current curb configuration would not be changed as part of the project, except at Mission Rock Street, South Street, and 16th Street, where platform construction and left turn pockets would require that the project move the existing curb back three feet from its current location. In the interim, then, sidewalk widths would remain at their current width except at Mission Rock Street, South Street, and Mariposa Street, where they would be 7 feet wide. The effective width of the sidewalk would be further reduced by the strain poles, which would be placed so that their centerlines are 2.0 feet behind the final face of curb when the street is widened by the Mission Bay developer. Assuming a strain pole one foot in diameter at the sidewalk, this would result in a uniform sidewalk width behind the strain pole of 4.5 feet until the sidewalk finally is completed, at which time there would be a uniform 9.5-foot sidewalk width behind the strain poles.

North of Mission Rock Street on Third Street, there currently are no sidewalks. On the east side of Third Street here, the project would construct a new curb at the final curb location, and a 15-foot-wide sidewalk would be built. On the west side of Third Street here, and on the stretch of Owens Street between Third and Fourth streets and on Fourth Street between Owens Street and the Fourth Street Bridge, the project would place the strain poles in their final locations and at their final elevations, but no sidewalk would be built.

Curb-side on-street parking is one element that provides both a physical and psychological barrier between pedestrians and moving traffic. Even when the street improvements planned for Mission Bay are completed, there would be no curb-side on-street parking to buffer pedestrians from travel lanes. This would tend to distract



somewhat from the pedestrian environment. Street trees, however, ultimately would be installed as part of the Mission Bay development, which would help improve the pedestrian character of the street by helping to buffer pedestrians from traffic lanes. The strain poles, too, would provide some level of separation.

**Mariposa Street to Kirkwood Avenue.** Currently, there are 10-foot-wide sidewalks along this segment of the corridor except on the Islais Creek Bridge, where the sidewalks now are 6.77 feet wide.

In some places in this segment of the corridor, the sidewalk would be narrowed to 9 feet, primarily in those intersections where both stations and left-turn lanes would be provided. To add to this loss of sidewalk width, many of these narrowed sections of sidewalk would adjoin traffic lanes without an intervening buffer of curb-side on-street parking nor of street trees. The current sidewalk width on the Islais Creek Bridge would be maintained.

**Bayview Commercial Core (Kirkwood Avenue to Thomas Avenue).** Currently, there are 10-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of Third Street in the Bayview Commercial Core.

Sidewalk widths would be increased to 12 feet along this entire segment of the corridor. In addition, pedestrians would be buffered from traffic by curb-side on-street parking along both sides of the street, as well as by street trees that would be planted along the length of the street. Corner bulbs would be installed at most intersections here, as well, further adding to the more gracious pedestrian environment. In addition to enhancing the pedestrian sidewalk space, these bulbs would shorten the distance pedestrians would need to travel to cross Third Street.

**Thomas Avenue to U.S. Highway 101.** Currently, there are 10-foot-wide sidewalks along this segment of the corridor. A retaining wall now prevents pedestrians from crossing Third Street south of LeConte Boulevard, and as a result of this and the U.S. Highway 101 freeway overpass, pedestrians cannot cross Third Street from south of LeConte Avenue to Bayshore Boulevard at Hester Avenue, a distance of about 700 feet.

In some places in this segment of the corridor, the sidewalk would be narrowed to 9 feet, primarily at those intersections where left-turn lanes would be provided. To add to this loss, many of these narrowed sidewalk sections would adjoin traffic lanes without any intervening buffer of curb-side on-street parking nor of street trees.

For 900 feet from just north of Key Avenue to just south of Meade Avenue, the light rail line would run in a retained cut that would be as much as 8 feet below the level of the

street. This retained cut would continue to just before the freeway overpass and its ramps. Pedestrians would be able to cross Third Street at Key Avenue, but would not be able to cross it from south of Key Avenue to beyond the freeway overpass near Meade Avenue, a distance of nearly one-half mile. As a result, the project would increase the distance over which pedestrians are unable to cross Third Street by approximately 200 feet more than currently exists.

**U.S. Highway 101 Overpass.** The U.S. Highway 101 overpass is approximately 1,300 feet long. Currently, there is a 6-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of the overpass, but none on the north side.

As currently, pedestrians would be able to cross the freeway overpass on the south side, but would not be able to cross it on the north side. The reconfigured overpass would provide a 4-foot-wide shoulder on its north side and a 4-foot-wide shoulder/bike lane on the south side. There would be no curb-side on-street parking, street trees, nor strain poles to separate pedestrians or bicyclists from traffic lanes. There would be a pedestrian-activated and bicycle-activated signal where the exit ramp from U.S. Highway 101 enters Third Street.

**U.S. Highway 101 to Sunnydale Avenue Along Bayshore Boulevard.** Currently, there are 12.5-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of Bayshore Boulevard.

Existing sidewalk widths would be maintained. Segments of this section also would accommodate curb-side on-street parking to buffer pedestrians from traffic lanes. Street trees would not be planted as part of the project.

For 600 feet from just north of Hester Avenue (south) to just south of Tunnel Avenue, the light rail line would run within a retained fill that would be as much as 6 feet above the level of the street. This would limit the ability of cross traffic and pedestrians to cross the street. Pedestrians would not be able to cross Bayshore Boulevard between Hester Avenue (north) and Blanken Avenue (south), a distance of approximately 1550 feet, or about one-third of a mile.

**Bayshore Intermodal Terminal.** The pedestrian functions at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal are discussed and analyzed separately later in this referral.

**Street Trees.** The project would replace street trees that are removed as a result of construction, and would plant street trees within the Bayview Commercial Core between Kirkwood Avenue and Thomas Avenue. The project also would plant street trees in the

median within Visitacion Valley. The project would not provide new street trees in other segments of the corridor.

### **General Plan Policies Related to Pedestrian Functions**

*General Plan* policies that address pedestrian environment along the Third Street Corridor are as follows. See also the section on corridor signalization that follows, which discusses the effect of signalization on pedestrian and other functions.

**Street Trees.** The planting and maintenance of street trees is addressed in the Air Quality Element and the Transportation Element.

#### **Air Quality Element**

The Air Quality Element supports the planting of street trees as a component of new projects.

##### ***Policy 3.9***

*Encourage and require planting of trees in conjunction with new development to enhance pedestrian environment and select species of trees that optimize achievement of air quality goals.*

#### **Transportation Element**

The Transportation Element also supports the planting of street trees along streets and at transit stops.

##### ***Policy 20.5***

*Place and maintain all sidewalk elements, including passenger shelters, benches, trees, newsracks, kiosks, toilets, and utilities at appropriate transit stops according to established guidelines.*

##### ***Policy 24.2***

*Maintain and expand the planting of street trees and the infrastructure to support them.*

#### **Urban Design Element**

The Urban Design Element supports a strong respect for the city's pattern, and proposes to strengthen and clarify this pattern through the planting of street trees.

##### ***Objective 1***

*Emphasis of the characteristic pattern which gives the city and its neighborhoods*

*an image, a sense of purpose, and a means of orientation.*

***Policy 1.4***

*Protect and promote large-scale landscaping and open space that define districts and topography.*

***Policy 1.5***

*Emphasize the special nature of each district through distinctive landscaping and other features.*

***Policy 1.9***

*Increase the clarity of routes for travelers.*

***Policy 1.10***

*Indicate the purposes of streets by means of a citywide plan for street landscaping.*

**Objective 4**

*Improvement of the neighborhood environment to increase personal safety, comfort, pride and opportunity.*

***Policy 4.4***

*Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.*

***Policy 4.12***

*Install, promote and maintain landscaping in public and private areas.*

***Policy 4.13***

*Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.*

***Policy 4.14***

*Remove and obscure distracting and cluttering elements.*

Comment. Except in the Bayview Commercial Core from Kirkwood Avenue to Thomas Avenue, the project will not provide street trees along the corridor, nor even at transit stops within the corridor. Trees in Mission Bay will be planted by the developer at the time of that development. Street trees provide visual amenity and a visual identity along streets; comfort to pedestrians from the shade they provide and the human scale they help create; and physical and psychological separation for pedestrians from traffic. This

ability of trees to separate pedestrians from the street becomes most important when there is no other physical separation such as from curb-side on-street parking, or where sidewalks are narrow, and especially where both conditions overlap. As the project will remove curb-side on-street parking and narrow sidewalks in a number of places, street trees become much more critical to forming satisfactory pedestrian spaces and accommodating pedestrians within the corridor.

**Pedestrian System and Pedestrian Environment.** The adequacy of the pedestrian system (sidewalks) and the pedestrian environment are addressed primarily in the Transportation Element and the Urban Design Element.

**Transportation Element.**

The Transportation Element supports strong pedestrian systems and environments. It supports the multiple functions of the city's streets—including pedestrian functions—and the creation of streets that are pleasant, comfortable places for people. It also supports efficient intermodal transfers. Walking is a mode of transportation in San Francisco, and sidewalks are the means by which pedestrians move about. Essentially all transit riders begin or end their transit journeys as pedestrians, and they must have safe and comfortable sidewalks to do so if transit is to be effective and efficient.

***Objective 1***

*Meet the needs of all residents and visitors for safe, convenient and inexpensive travel within San Francisco and between the city and other parts of the region while maintaining the high quality living environment of the Bay Area.*

***Policy 1.2***

*Ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city.*

***Policy 2.4***

*Organize the transportation system to reinforce community identity, improve linkages among interrelated activities and provide focus for community activities.*

***Policy 4.6***

*Facilitate transfers between different transit modes and services by establishing simplified and coordinated fares and schedules, and by employing design and technology features to make transferring more convenient.*

***Policy 12.1***

*Develop and implement strategies which provide incentives for individuals to use public transit, ridesharing, bicycling and walking to the best advantage, thereby reducing the number of single occupant auto trips.*

***Policy 21.9***

*Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.*

***Policy 21.10***

*Ensure passenger and operator safety in the design and operation of transit vehicles and station facilities.*

***Objective 23***

*Improve the city's pedestrian circulation system to provide for efficient, pleasant, and safe movement.*

***Policy 23.1***

*Provide sufficient pedestrian movement space with a minimum of pedestrian congestion in accordance with a pedestrian street classification system.*

***Policy 23.2***

*Widen sidewalks where intensive commercial, recreational, or institutional activity is present, sidewalks are congested and where residential densities are high.*

***Policy 23.3***

*Maintain a strong presumption against reducing sidewalk widths, eliminating crosswalks and forcing indirect crossings to accommodate automobile traffic.*

***Policy 23.4***

*Tow-away lanes [and by extension, other measures that would reduce or would not provide physical and psychological separations of pedestrians from moving traffic] should not be approved, and removal should be considered, if they impair existing and potential pedestrian usage and level of service on abutting sidewalks, as well as the needs of transit operation on the street.*

***Policy 23.5***

*Minimize obstructions to through pedestrian movement on sidewalks by maintaining an unobstructed width that allows for passage of people, strollers and*

*wheelchairs.*

***Policy 23.6***

*Ensure convenient and safe pedestrian crossings by minimizing the distance pedestrians must walk to cross a street.*

***Policy 23.9***

*Implement the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the city's curb ramp program to improve pedestrian access for all people.*

***Objective 24***

*Improve the ambience of the pedestrian environment.*

**Urban Design Element**

The Urban Design Element supports a strong and supportive pedestrian environment.

***Objective 1***

*Emphasis of the characteristic pattern which gives the city and its neighborhoods an image, a sense of purpose, and a means of orientation.*

***Policy 1.4***

*Protect and promote large-scale landscaping and open space that define districts and topography.*

***Policy 1.5***

*Emphasize the special nature of each district through distinctive landscaping and other features.*

***Policy 1.9***

*Increase the clarity of routes for travelers.*

***Policy 1.10***

*Indicate the purposes of streets by means of a citywide plan for street landscaping.*

***Policy 1.11***

*Indicate the purposes of streets by means of a citywide plan for street lighting.*

**Objective 4**

*Improvement of the neighborhood environment to increase personal safety, comfort, pride and opportunity.*

***Policy 4.3***

*Provide adequate lighting in public areas.*

***Policy 4.4***

*Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.*

***Policy 4.12***

*Install, promote and maintain landscaping in public and private areas.*

***Policy 4.13***

*Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.*

***Policy 4.14***

*Remove and obscure distracting and cluttering elements..*

Comment. The project would support at least minimal pedestrian functions along the corridor, except as noted in the following analysis.

**Analysis of Pedestrian Functions**

There are a number of elements of the project that would produce a less-than-ideal pedestrian environment, and that are not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* as they are currently planned.

**Narrow Sidewalks.** The quality of the pedestrian environment would be unacceptable at a number of intersections within the corridor where sidewalks would be reduced to 9-foot-widths to accommodate turn lanes, and where simultaneously no curb-side on-street parking would be accommodated and no street trees would be planted to help buffer pedestrians from moving traffic.

The following are locations where the quality of the pedestrian environment is not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* due to narrow sidewalk widths.

- northwest and southeast corners of Mariposa street,
- northwest and northeast corners of 16th street,
- northwest and southeast corners 20th street,



- northwest and southeast corners of 23rd street,
- northwest and southeast corners of Cesar Chavez street,
- southeast and northwest corners of Evans street,
- northwest corner of Hudson Avenue,
- north corner of William Avenue,
- southeast and northwest corners of Carroll Avenue,
- on the west side of Third Street opposite Gillman Avenue,
- on the west side of Third Street opposite Hollister Avenue,
- on the east side of Third Street south of Jamestown Avenue, and
- on the east side of Third Street south of Hester Avenue.

These areas could be brought into substantial conformance with the *General Plan* by inter-planting new street trees between any existing street trees that are retained, so as to produce a regularly spaced planting of trees at approximately 20 feet on center. An alternate solution would be to install a curb-side barrier such as a railing to physically separate pedestrians from traffic.

**Discontinuous Sidewalks.** The pedestrian environment also will unacceptable in those areas of the corridor where there are light rail platforms at or near “gore point” intersections that form indirect crossings or odd triangles of land adjacent to Third Street, or both. In these places, pedestrians walking along Third Street would be expected to veer away from Third Street rather than to proceed directly along it.

The following are locations where the quality of the pedestrian environment as currently proposed is not in conformance with the City’s *General Plan* due to discontinuous sidewalks.

- Phelps Street and Davidson Avenue west of Third Street, where pedestrians would need to detour from Third Street for a substantial length of the street, crossing both Phelps Street and Davidson Avenue before they could continue along Third Street.
- Newhall Street and Innes Avenue east of Third Street, where pedestrians

would need to detour from Third Street for about the width of Innes Avenue, and would to cross both Newhall Street and Innes Avenue before they could continue along Third Street.

- Newhall Street and Kirkwood Avenue west of Third Street, where pedestrians would need to detour from Third Street for a substantial length of the street, crossing both Newhall Street and Kirkwood Avenue before they could continue along Third Street.
- Mendell Street and Palou Avenue east of Third Street, where pedestrians would need to detour from Third Street for about the length of a block, and would have to cross both Mendell Street and Oakdale Avenue before they could continue along Third Street. In addition, the triangle formed by the intersection of Third Street, Mendell Street, and Palou Avenues accommodates both a private use and a stop for MUNI buses. Especially, there is no accommodation for pedestrians who would want to cross from the southern end of the triangle to the Third Street and Palou Avenue intersection. As well the platform at this intersection, there would be expected to a strong desire for pedestrians to make this crossing to get to the platform or to the bus stops on Palou Avenue east of Third Street.
- Van Dyke Avenue and Lane Street east of Third Street, where pedestrians would need to detour from Third Street for about one-half block, crossing Van Dyke Avenue and Lane Street before they could continue along Third Street or cross Third Street at Van Dyke Avenue.
- Lane Street and Yosemite Avenue west of Third Street, where pedestrians would need to detour from Third Street for about a block, crossing Yosemite Avenue and Lane Street before they could continue along Third Street.
- Fitzgerald Avenue east of Third Street, where pedestrians would need to detour from Third Street for more than a block, crossing an un-named street (Paul Street?) and Fitzgerald Avenue before they could continue along Third Street.

These areas could be brought into substantial conformance by continuing to work closely with the Department of Parking and Traffic to develop the safest possible,

most direct system to accommodate pedestrians on Third Street and especially to the platforms. Safe, graceful pedestrian accommodation in these areas should be balanced against the need to ensure the appropriate priority for and accommodation of the proposed light rail system.

**Lack of Crossings.** There are no pedestrian crossings over Third Street at a number of intersections.

The following are locations where the quality of the pedestrian environment is not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* due to lack of pedestrian crossing of Third Street.

- Across Third Street from the north side of Thornton Avenue and the south side of Thomas Avenue,
- Across Third Street from Salinas Street or the south side of Ingerson Avenue,
- Across Third Street from the north side of Key Avenue. There is a platform on the south side of this intersection,
- Across Meade Avenue on the east side of Third Street,
- Across Hester Avenue on the east side of Third Street,
- Tunnel Avenue on the east side of Third Street,
- Blanken Avenue right-of-way on the east side of Third Street.

These areas could be brought into substantial conformance by continuing to work closely with the Department of Parking and Traffic to develop safe pedestrian crossings balanced against the need to ensure the appropriate priority for and accommodation of the proposed light rail system.

Other elements of the pedestrian functions in the Third Street corridor are in conformance with the City's *General Plan*. See also the discussion of signalization later in this referral, which discusses the effects of signalization on pedestrian functions in the corridor.

#### 4. Bicycle Functions of the Reconfigured Corridor

There currently are no formal bicycle facilities along the Third Street Corridor.



The City's *General Plan* designates the Third Street Corridor a *Citywide Bicycle Route*.  
The *General Plan* notes that its Bicycle Route Map was developed in

cooperation with the Department of Parking and Traffic's *San Francisco Bicycle Master Plan*, and states that the *Bicycle Master Plan* would include additional information on specific segment treatments and on route designation numbers. The *General Plan* itself requires the City to treat bicycle transportation as a mode of transportation on par with other modes. It does not relegate the bicycle to a form of recreation.

The *San Francisco Bicycle Master Plan*, which was adopted by the City in 1996, designates the Third Street Corridor to accommodate Bicycle Route 5. Bicycle Route 5 is planned to run unimpeded and uninterrupted throughout the length of Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard, although it would veer from Third Street around the U.S. Highway 101 overpass. Bicycle Route 5 is planned as a 6-foot-wide bicycle lane along each side of the street.

The *San Francisco Bicycle Master Plan* acknowledges that right-of-way widths in the Third Street Corridor are not sufficient to accommodate both light rail facilities and bicycle lanes. It designates Route 7 as an alternate route at the time a light rail line is built in the corridor. Bicycle Route 7 is planned to run adjacent to but not on Third Street through most of the corridor. Even this alternative route, however, is planned to run within Third Street over the Islais Creek Bridge. And it terminates at Carroll Avenues and Third Street, where bicyclists would need to merge with Route 5 and travel south on Third Street between Carroll and Paul avenues, a distance of about four blocks, at which point Route 5 turns from Third Street onto Paul Avenue to detour around the U.S. Highway 101 interchange.

The project would not accommodate bicycle lanes within the Third Street segment of the Corridor, nor would it accommodate bicycle lanes on the Fourth Street or Islais Creek bridges. It would accommodate bicycles along much of Bayshore Boulevard, which has a wider right-of-way than Third Street. With the project in place, bicyclists who prefer to depend on lanes would need to rely on alternative Bicycle Route 7, which runs adjacent to but not on Third Street, and which is a significantly less direct bicycle route through the corridor. There are no good alternatives to the crossing of Mission Creek or Islais Creek, or to bicycles using the four-block segment of Third Street between Carroll and Paul avenues.

See also the section on corridor signalization that follows, which discusses the effect of signalization on bicycle accommodation.

Mission Bay North (King Street to Owens Street). The *San Francisco Bicycle Master Plan* establishes two routes over Mission Creek. Bicycle Route 5 is planned to cross Mission Creek on the Lefty O'Doul (Third Street) Bridge. Bicycle Route 19 is planned to cross Mission Creek on the Fourth Street Bridge. The plan acknowledges the primacy of transportation modes other than bicycles on the Fourth Street Bridge, and acknowledges that accommodating bicycles on this bridge should not interfere with these other modes.

The project would not affect the configuration of the roadway on the Third Street Bridge, and this bridge should be able to continue to accommodate Bicycle Route 5 as planned. It would not accommodate bicycle lanes on the Fourth Street Bridge, but would accommodate bicycles on the streets on both sides of the bridge.

**Mission Bay South (Mariposa Street to Owens Street).** There are currently no formal bicycle facilities within this segment of the corridor.

The *San Francisco Bicycle Master Plan* designates Third Street to carry Bicycle Route 5 along its entire length in Mission Bay. It acknowledges, however, that right-of-way widths would not allow Third Street to accommodate both light rail and bicycle lanes, and designates Route 7 as an alternative to Route 5 when light rail is constructed. Route 7 would travel along 7th Street west of and outside of Mission Bay.

The project does not propose bicycle lanes on Owens Streets, nor on Third Street in this segment of the corridor.

**Mariposa Street to Carroll Avenue.** There are currently no bicycle facilities within this segment of the corridor.

The *San Francisco Bicycle Master Plan* designates Third Street in this segment of the corridor to carry Bicycle Route 5. It does acknowledge, however, that right-of-way widths would not allow Third Street to accommodate both light rail and bicycle lanes, and designates Bicycle Route 7 as an alternative route.

Bicycle Route 7 is planned to travel primarily on Indiana Street one block west of Third Street, joining Third Street between Cesar Chavez and Phelps streets to cross Islais Creek on the Islais Creek Bridge. South of Islais Creek, Route 7 is planned to travel on Third Street to Phelps Street, then move to adjacent streets from Phelps Avenue to Carroll Avenue, where it would terminate and merge with Route 5.

With the project in place, Third Street in this section would not accommodate designated bicycle lanes, and none are proposed. In addition, the Islais Creek Bridge is not wide enough to accommodate both the light rail and bicycle lanes, and none are proposed by the project. However, since the Islais Creek Bridge is the only place where bicyclists can cross Islais Creek, bicyclists would need to use the bridge on Third Street to cross the creek. They would need to share travel lanes with vehicles or sidewalks with pedestrians to do so.

**Carroll Avenue to U.S. Highway 101.** There are currently no bicycle facilities within this

segment of the corridor.

The *San Francisco Bicycle Master Plan* designates Third Street to accommodate Bicycle Route 5 between Carroll and Paul avenues. Bicycle Route 7 is planned to end at Carroll Avenue, where it would merge with Route 5, and is not planned to run within this section of the Third Street Corridor. Bicycle Route 5 is planned to leave Third Street south of Paul Avenue, and to follow Paul Avenue to San Bruno Avenue and then to Bayshore Boulevard, so as to avoid the U.S. Highway 101 overpass.

The project would not provide bicycle facilities in this section of Third Street. However, since the four-block stretch of Third Street from Carroll to Paul avenues is the only logical route for bicyclists traveling within the Third Street corridor, bicyclists would need to use this section of Third Street with or without formal bicycle lanes. They would need to share travel lanes with vehicles to do so.

**U.S. Highway 101 Overpass.** The overpass on U.S. Highway 101 carries northbound traffic only. There is a bicycle lane on the overpass northbound, but none southbound. The *Bicycle Master Plan* designates streets other than Third Street to carry bicycle facilities, so as to bypass the Third Street overpass southbound. Once the project reconfigures the overpass, it will continue to accommodate only northbound bicycle traffic and not to accommodate bicyclists traveling southbound. Bicyclists traveling southbound will need to use surface streets to bypass the overpass.

**U.S. Highway 101 to Sunnydale Avenue Along Bayshore Boulevard.** Currently, there are no bicycle facilities within this segment of the corridor.

Bicycle Route 5 is planned to merge with Bayshore Boulevard at San Bruno Avenue, and then run on Bayshore Boulevard south to Sunnydale Avenue.

The project would provide a southbound bicycle lane on the west side of Bayshore Boulevard from Arleta Avenue to just south of Visitacion Avenue, where it would terminate. It also would provide a northbound bicycle lane on the east side of Bayshore Boulevard from U.S. Highway 101 to just south of Sunnydale Avenue, where it also would terminate. Bicycle Route 5 is intended to join Bayshore Boulevard at San Bruno Avenue and run south along Bayshore Boulevard; the project would connect these two bicycle segments. However, the project would accommodate northbound bicyclists from Sunnydale Avenue north along Bayshore Boulevard, but would not accommodate those traveling southbound. Southbound lanes on Bayshore Boulevard terminate just south of Visitacion



Avenue.

Bayshore Intermodal Terminal. The bicycle functions of the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal are described and analyzed separately later in this referral.

#### General Plan Policies Related to Bicycle Functions

*General Plan* policies that address bicycle functions along the Third Street Corridor are as follows. See also the section on corridor signalization that follows, which discusses the effect of signalization on bicycle functions.

##### Commerce and Industry Element

The Commerce and Industry Element calls for the provision and improvement of all forms of private transportation to industrial areas, including bicycles.

##### *Policy 4.7*

*Improve public and private transportation to and from industrial areas.*

##### *Transportation Element*

The Transportation Element also supports the provision and improvement of all forms of public and private transportation, including bicycles.

##### *Objective 1*

*Meet the needs of all residents and visitors for safe, convenient and inexpensive travel within San Francisco and between the city and other parts of the region while maintaining the high quality living environment of the bay area.*

##### *Policy 1.3*

*Give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as the means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs, particularly those of commuters.*

##### *Policy 4.6*

*Facilitate transfers between different transit modes and services by establishing simplified and coordinated fares and schedules, and by employing design and technology features to make transferring more convenient.*

##### *Policy 12.1*

*Develop and implement strategies which provide incentives for individuals to use public transit, ridesharing, bicycling and walking to the best advantage, thereby*

*reducing the number of single occupant auto trips.*

***Policy 16.6***

*Encourage alternatives to the private automobile by locating public transit access and ride-share vehicle and bicycle parking at more close-in and convenient locations on-site, and by locating parking facilities for single-occupant vehicles more remotely.*

***Policy 21.9***

*Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.*

***Objective 27***

*Ensure that bicycles can be used safely and conveniently as a primary means of transportation, as well as for recreational purposes.*

***Policy 27.1***

*Expand and improve access for bicycles on city streets and develop a well-marked, comprehensive system of bike routes in San Francisco.*

***Policy 27.6***

*Accommodate bicycles on regional transit facilities and important regional transportation links wherever feasible.*

**Recreation and Open Space Element**

***Policy 2.8***

*Develop a citywide urban trails system that links city parks and public open spaces, hilltops, the waterfront and neighborhoods and ties into the regional hiking trail system.*

**South Bayshore Area Plan.** The South Bayshore Area Plan calls for the provision of a comprehensive bicycle system within the South Bayshore area.

***Policy 4.5***

*Create a comprehensive system for pedestrian and bicycle circulation.*

**Analysis of Bicycle Functions**

There are alternative ways to accommodate bicycles within the Third Street segment of the Third Street Corridor, even though these alternatives are less direct than would be bicycle lanes along the street. On balance, is in conformance with the City's *General*

*Plan* policies related to bicycles.

See also the discussion of signalization later in this referral, which discusses the effects of signalization on bicycle functions in the corridor.

## 5. Truck Functions in the Reconfigured Corridor

The Third Street Corridor passes through the industrial areas and the Port lands that lie along the City's eastern shoreline. Trucks typically get to and from these industrial areas either from the U.S. Highway 101 ramps at Jamestown Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard and along Third Street, or from the ramps to both U.S. Highway 101 and Interstate-280 and along Cesar Chavez Street.

In addition to passing through much of the City's industrial lands, the Third Street Corridor also passes through the residential neighborhoods of Little Hollywood, Visitacion Valley, Bayview/Hunters Point, the Bayview Commercial Core, and Lower Potrero Hill. When North and South Mission Bay are developed, the corridor will pass through those residential neighborhoods, as well.

*General Plan* maps identify Bayshore Boulevard and Third Street north of Jerrold Avenue as *Freight Traffic Routes with Significant Truck Traffic*. They also identify Fourth Street north of Mission Creek, Cesar Chavez east and west of Third Street, Cargo Way east of Third Street, Evans Avenue east and west of Third Street, and Carroll Avenue east of Third Street as *Freight Traffic Routes with Significant Truck Traffic*. They identify Cesar Chavez Street and a corridor west of Carroll Street as *Areas Needing Improved Freight Route Connections*. Finally, they identify Third Street from U.S. Highway 101 to Jerrold Avenue as a *Freight Traffic Route with Certain Restrictions for Trucks 11,000 Pounds or More*.

Primarily, the proposed project would affect truck access in the way it limits turning movements onto or off of the Corridor, in the way it might prohibit truck traffic on streets where they currently have access, through the loss of existing on-street loading areas, or by forcing trucks to streets not now used for trucks or not intended for truck use.

Large truck turning radii make it necessary to keep station platforms and other structures in the Third Street right-of-way back from intersections, so as to facilitate truck turning movements and to ensure that trucks will not run into them. Large truck turning radii make it difficult to provide safety refuges for pedestrians who may find themselves in the

middle of the corridor waiting for a crossing signal. In response, the project proposes to prohibit trucks from turning right onto Third Street at those intersections where such turns would be unsafe or problematic because of intersection configuration, platform locations, or the ability to ensure pedestrian safety when in crosswalks in the center of the street, waiting for a walk signal.

Within Mission Bay, there currently are few streets other than Third Street and Fourth Street. Currently, only 16th Street provides a left-turn lane for traffic northbound on Third Street. The development of Mission Bay would result in construction of new streets intersecting Third Street. Northbound, there would be left-turn lanes on Third Street at Owens, Mission Rock, North Mall, 16th Street, and Mariposa streets. Southbound, there would be left-turn lanes on Third Street at Owens, Mission Rock, South Wall, 16th, and Mariposa streets. Right turns onto Third Street would be prohibited for trucks at Mission Rock, South, and Mariposa streets. This would limit truck access to some portions of Mission Bay. Large corner radii will be constructed at 16th Street to accommodate truck turning movements both directions on 16th Street, but this is not a result of the project.

Independent from this project, the City is planning to widen Cesar Chavez Street on both sides of Third Street, and to construct large corner radii so as to accommodate truck turning movements onto and off of Cesar Chavez Street.

The project would not accommodate left turns northbound or southbound in the Bayview Commercial Core except at Newcomb and Quesada avenues. Left turns at Oakdale Street would be accommodated for northbound traffic by opening Mendell Street.

#### **General Plan Policies that Relate to Truck Access**

*General Plan* policies that address truck functions in the corridor are as follows:

##### **Commerce and Industry Element**

The Commerce and Industry Element calls for the provision and improvement of all forms of private transportation to industrial areas, including trucks.

##### ***Policy 4.7***

*Improve public and private transportation to and from industrial areas.*

##### **Transportation Element**

The Transportation Element calls for the accommodation of truck traffic and truck access commensurate with sound protection of neighborhood environment and

ambience.

***Objective 39***

*Make freeway and major surface street improvements to accommodate and encourage truck/service vehicle traffic in industrial areas away from residential neighborhoods.*

***Policy 39.1***

*Establish and maintain advisory truck routes, with clear signs, between industrial areas and freeway interchanges to enhance truck access and to clearly and visibly attract truck traffic away from residential neighborhoods.*

***Policy 39.2***

*Accommodate heavy vehicles with extra-legal loads on major truck routes by ensuring vertical clearances, appropriate intersection design for maneuvering and providing signal timing to allow smooth truck progression.*

***Policy 39.3***

*Implement measures to reduce adverse affects from trucks/service vehicles and rail traffic by enforcing restrictions on certain routes, specific areas or times of day.*

**Urban Design Element**

The Urban Design Element, too, calls for the accommodation of truck traffic and truck access commensurate with sound protection of neighborhood environment and ambience.

***Policy 4.1***

*Protect residential areas from the noise, pollution and physical danger of excessive traffic.*

***Policy 4.2***

*Provide buffering for residential properties when heavy traffic cannot be avoided.*

**Central Waterfront Area Plan**

The Central Waterfront Area Plan calls for improving adequate truck access to the area.

***Objective 7***

*Improve the transportation accessibility of the subareas .*

***Policy 7.1***

*Improve citywide and regional transit access to the subareas.*

***Policy 7.2***

*Provide adequate rail and truck access to all maritime piers.*

***Policy 7.3***

*Establish an official truck route system along the designated major and secondary thoroughfares to facilitate truck movements within and to Port facilities and to minimize the adverse impacts of truck movement on adjacent residential, commercial, and recreational land uses.*

***Policy 7.5***

*Improve transportation access on Third Street by implementing design changes in traffic lanes, turning bays, and signal timing.*

***Objective 8***

*Improve transportation conditions within the subareas.*

**Analysis of Truck Functions**

The project does not significantly impede the movement of truck traffic within or across the corridor, nor does it preempt the City's abilities to establish a truck route system within the corridor. Truck functions in the corridor, on balance, is in conformance with the City's *General Plan*.

**6. On-Street Parking Functions in the Reconfigured Corridor**

Much of the Third Street Corridor now accommodates on-street parking at the curb. Overall, the corridor accommodates approximately 1,498 on-street parking spaces. The project would provide approximately 812 spaces, or 686 fewer spaces overall. (Neither figure includes the 377 on-street parking spaces that will be removed as a result of the Mission Bay development but that cannot be attributed to the Third Street Light Rail project.) On-street parking accommodation is described below by corridor segment. The off-street parking provisions of the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility and of the Bayshore Intermodal Station are discussed separately later in this referral.

The following table summarizes existing on-street parking facilities in the corridor and the changes to on-street parking that would occur as the result of the project.

**Table 1**  
**Existing and Future On-Street Parking in the Corridor**

Corridor Segment	Existing	Proposed	Increase or [Decrease]
Mission Bay: King Street to 16th Street	377*	0**	[377]**
16th Street to Kirkwood Avenue	552	339	[213]
Kirkwood Avenue to Thomas Avenue	116	131	15
Thomas Avenue to U.S. Highway 101	258	142	[116]
U.S. Highway 101 to Sunnydale Avenue	195	200	5
Total Including Mission Bay	1498	812	[686]
Total Not Including Mission Bay	1121	812	[309]

\* Approximate number of occupied spaces

\*\* Due to Mission Bay project.

**Mission Bay (King Street to 16th Street).** Approximately 377 on-street parking spaces are occupied on average in this segment of the corridor. The collaborative planning efforts between the developers of Mission Bay and the City determined that on-street parking

should be removed from the corridor . This collaborative decision will displace those 377 on-street parking spaces, but this loss cannot be attributed to the project.

**Mission Bay (16th Street to Kirkwood Avenue).** Currently, this section of the corridor accommodates 552 on-street parking spaces. The project would provide 339 on-street parking spaces, or 213 fewer spaces.

**Kirkwood Avenue to Thomas Avenue.** Currently, this section of the corridor accommodates 116 on-street parking spaces. The project would provide 131 on-street parking spaces, or 15 additional spaces. On-site parking at the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility between 25th and Cesar Chavez streets east of Third Street is discussed and analyzed separately later in this referral.

**Thomas Avenue to U.S. Highway 101 Overcrossing.** Currently, this segment of the corridor accommodates 258 on-street parking spaces. The project would provide 142 spaces, or 116 fewer spaces.

**U.S. Highway 101 Overcrossing to Sunnydale Avenue.** Currently, this segment of the project accommodates 195 on-street parking spaces. The project would provide 200 spaces, or 5 more spaces. On-site parking at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal at Sunnydale Avenue is discussed and analyzed separately later in this referral.

#### **General Plan Policies Related to On-Street Parking**

*General Plan* policies that address on-street parking in the Third Street Corridor are as follows:

##### **Transportation Element**

The Transportation Element supports the adequate supply of parking in line with sound transit policy that discourages single-use occupancy and that encourages transit use, walking, bicycling, and other modes of moving about.

##### ***Objective 16***

*Develop and implement programs that would efficiently manage the supply of parking at employment centers throughout the city so as to discourage single-occupant ridership and encourage ridesharing, transit and other alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.*

##### ***Policy 16.1***

*Reduce parking demand through the provision of comprehensive information that*



*encourages the use of alternative modes of transportation.*

***Policy 16.2***

*Reduce parking demand where parking is subsidized by employers with "cash-out" programs in which the equivalency of the cost of subsidized parking is offered to those employees who do not use the parking facilities.*

***Policy 16.3***

*Reduce parking demand through the provision of incentives for the use of carpools and vanpools at new and existing parking facilities throughout the City.*

***Policy 16.4***

*Manage parking demand through appropriate pricing policies including the use of premium rates near employment centers well-served by transit, walking and bicycling, and progressive rate structures to encourage turnover and the efficient use of parking.*

***Policy 16.5***

*Reduce parking demand through limiting the absolute amount of spaces and prioritizing the spaces for short-term and ride-share uses.*

***Policy 16.6***

*Encourage alternatives to the private automobile by locating public transit access and ride-share vehicle and bicycle parking at more close-in and convenient locations on-site, and by locating parking facilities for single-occupant vehicles more remotely.*

***Objective 35***

*Meet short-term parking needs in neighborhood shopping districts consistent with preservation of a desirable environment for pedestrians and residents.*

***Policy 35.1***

*Provide convenient on-street parking specifically designed to meet the needs of shoppers dependent upon automobiles.*

**South Bayshore Area Plan**

In concert with the Transportation Element, the South Bayshore Area Plan supports the adequate supply of parking in line with sound transit policy.

*Policy 4.4*

*Improve parking conditions along Third Street to meet current and future parking needs of commercial uses.*

**Analysis of On-Street Parking Functions**

The *General Plan's* policy framework, which calls for reducing the need for parking through the provision of adequate transit service and management of the supply of parking. In light of these policies, the on-street parking provisions of the project are in conformance with the *General Plan*.

**7. Other Project Elements**

**1. Signalization**

Currently, only major intersections in the Third Street Corridor are signalized. In the remaining intersections, Third Street continues uninterrupted, and cross traffic is controlled with stop signs.

As part of the light rail project, almost all intersections along the Third Street Corridor would be signalized, and would provide timed, phased, semi-actuated signalization to maximize light rail and vehicular traffic flows. In some intersections, a signal preemption system would give green-light priority to light rail vehicles. Where left turns are permitted, left-turn signals would be provided.

Signals at lower-volume intersections would be *semi-actuated*, meaning that the cross-streets lights at these intersections generally would be red. Cross-street signals would turn green when a vehicle or bicycle on the cross street activated a sensor in the street, or when a pedestrian pushed a crossing-signal button.

At most signalized semi-actuated intersections, pedestrians wanting to cross Third Street itself or a side street would need to push a button to get a *walk* signal. This is true even if cross-street vehicles or bicycles have activated the traffic signal and gotten a green light. Requesting a walk signal would keep the traffic signal green longer, giving a typically mobile pedestrian (assumed to be moving at a rate of 2.5 feet per second) time to cross the street during one signal phase. However, even typically mobile pedestrians who have entered an intersection on a green traffic light without having first pushed a

button and waited for a “walk” signal, or who have entered an intersection some time into the walk signal, would not have time to cross the entire intersection before the traffic signal would change and cross traffic would be given a green signal.

The project passes through the heart of a number of neighborhoods, specifically the future Mission Bay neighborhood and the Lower Potrero and Bayview/Hunters Point neighborhoods.

### **General Plan Policies Related to Signalization**

*General Plan* policies related to signalization are as follows:

#### **Transportation Element**

The Transportation Element requires that the City signalize its street systems in ways that manage vehicular flows appropriately without preempting or impeding the movement of pedestrians and traffic or the flow of bicyclists.

#### ***Policy 14.1***

*Reduce road congestion on arterials through the implementation of traffic control strategies, such as signal-light synchronization and turn controls, that improve vehicular flow without impeding movement for pedestrians and bicyclists.*

#### ***Policy 14.2***

*Ensure that traffic signals are timed and phased to emphasize transit, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic as part of a balanced multi-modal transportation system.*

#### ***Policy 14.3***

*Improve transit operation by implementing strategies that facilitate and prioritize transit vehicle movement and loading.*

#### ***Policy 23.7***

*Ensure safe pedestrian crossings at signaled intersections by providing sufficient time for pedestrians to cross streets at a moderate pace.*

#### ***Policy 25.4***

*Maintain a presumption against the use of demand-activated traffic signals on any well-used pedestrian street, and particularly those streets in the Citywide Pedestrian and Neighborhood Networks.*

#### ***Policy 25.5***

*Where intersections are controlled with a left-turn only traffic signal phase for automobile traffic, encourage more efficient use of the phase for pedestrians where safety permits.*

***Policy 27.4***

*Maintain a presumption against the use of demand-activated traffic signals on designated bicycle routes.*

***Policy 27.10***

*Accommodate bicycles in the design and selection of traffic control facilities.*

**Analysis of Signalization**

The proposed signalization program for the project has the potential to impede pedestrian and bicycle traffic moving within and across the corridor, the potential to present unsafe conditions to these pedestrians, or both. As a result, the signalization program, on balance, is not in conformance with the City's *General Plan* policies regarding signalization.

The signalization program could be brought into substantial conformance with the City's *General Plan* by ensuring the movement of pedestrians and bicyclists are not impeded (preferably by not using demand-activated traffic signals in the corridor), that timing and phasing of signals balance the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists as well as transit and traffic, and that signals are timed to allow sufficient time for pedestrians to cross streets at a moderate pace. The signalization program could be brought into conformance by working closely with the Department of Parking and Traffic to develop the greatest level of crossing access possible commensurate with pedestrian safety and the need to ensure the appropriate priority for transit service.

**2. Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility**

As part of the light rail project, MUNI would construct a new Metro East Light Rail Maintenance Facility to store and maintain the light rail vehicles which serve Third Street, as well as to store and maintain other light rail vehicles which are currently serviced at the Metro Green Facility. The facility would be built on approximately 13 acres of land (Stage I) on the west portion of a former and currently vacant railroad yard east of Illinois Street and north of Pier 80 between Cesar Chavez and 25<sup>th</sup> Streets (Assessor's blocks

4297, 4298, 4299, 4310, and 4313).

The primary light rail vehicle access to the site would be from Third Street via an eastward extension of 25<sup>th</sup> Street into the northwest corner of the site. Secondary light rail vehicle access would be from Cesar Chavez into the southwestern corner of the site. Roadway access also would be from Cesar Chavez, Michigan, or Maryland streets at the southwest corner of the site.

The facilities will occupy 13 acres of land in Stage I, with the capability to expand to up to 16 acres in Stage II. It will contain a yard and maintenance facilities that, together, can accommodate 80 light rail vehicles in Stage I. The maintenance facilities will accommodate 100 Breda light rail vehicles, and will be comprised of a main building of approximately 181,000 square feet and a secondary building of approximately 25,000 square feet for paint and body work. The storage yard will have the capacity to accommodate up to 80 Breda light rail vehicles in Stage I, and up to 100 vehicles in Stage II. Other elements of the project include a guardhouse and check-in facility for incoming light rail vehicles, two of the project's six traction power substations, environmental and waste treatment facilities, and approximately 185 on-site parking spaces for MUNI vans and trucks, and for employees and visitors.

#### **General Plan Policies Related to the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility**

*General Plan* policies related to the Metro East facility are as follows:

##### **Commerce and Industry Element**

The Commerce and Industry Element concerns itself with industrial uses and their retention in the city.

##### ***Objective 4***

*Improve the viability of existing industry in the city and the attractiveness of the city as a location for new industry.*

##### ***Policy 4.2***

*Promote and attract those economic activities with potential benefits to the city.*

##### **Transportation Element**

Transit. The Transit Element's Transit First policy is aimed at restoring balance to a transportation system long dominated by the automobile, and improving overall mobility for all residents and visitors when reliance chiefly on the automobile would result in severe transportation deficiencies. It encourages multi-modalism, the use of transit and other alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle as modes of transportation, and gives priority to the maintenance and expansion of the local transit system and the improvement of regional transit coordination.

***Objective 11***

*Establish public transit as the primary mode of transportation in San Francisco and as a means through which to guide future development and improve regional mobility and air quality.*

The Transportation Element supports a strong transit system, which must be assumed to include strong support for transit-related uses, as well.

On-Site Parking. The Transportation Element of the City's *General Plan* calls for the adequate provision of on-site parking on industrial sites in the City. It does not support the provision of on-site parking beyond minimum levels needed, and supports reducing the amount of on-site parking needed through the use of management programs that discourage the use of single-occupant vehicles and encourage the use of transit and ridesharing.

***Objective 1.13***

*Give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as a means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs, particularly those of commuters.*

***Policy 2.5***

*Provide incentives for the use of transit, carpools, vanpools, walking and bicycling and reduce the need for new or expanded automobile and automobile parking facilities.*

***Objective 16***

*Develop and implement programs that will efficiently manage the supply of parking at employment centers throughout the city so as to discourage single-occupant*

*ridership and encourage ridesharing, transit and other alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.*

***Policy 16. 2***

*Reduce parking demand where parking is subsidized by employers with “cash-out” programs in which the equivalency of the cost of subsidized parking is offered to those employees who do not use the parking facilities.*

***Policy 16.3***

*Reduce parking demand through the provision of incentives for the use of carpools and vanpools at new and existing parking facilities throughout the city.*

***Policy 16. 5***

*Reduce parking demand through limiting the absolute amount of spaces and prioritizing the spaces for short-term and ride-share uses.*

***Policy 30.5***

*In any large development, allocate a portion of the provided off-street parking spaces for compact automobiles, vanpools, bicycles and motorcycles commensurate with standards that are, at a minimum, representative of the city’s vehicle population.*

Comment. The City’s *General Plan* firmly supports a strong transit system, and facilities such as the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility that are necessary to the functioning of such a transit system. It also supports the retention of appropriate industrial uses in the city, and transit-related industrial use is appropriate to retain in the city, both to support the city’s critically important transit service and the city’s industrial jobs base.

The policies of the City’s *General Plan* clearly discourage providing any excess on-street parking for the private automobile, and encourage managing parking to discourage single-occupant automobile use, especially in areas well-served by transit. The maintenance facility would be immediately adjacent to the Third Street Light Rail line. However, the employees for whom the parking spaces are intended provide transit service. Their work patterns require that at least some shifts must come to the site before the transit system is in operation in the morning, or leave the site once the transit system operations have ended for the night.

## Analysis of the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility

The policies of the City's *General Plan* clearly support the retention of appropriate industrial uses in the city. They also clearly support the development and support of transit services and of the City's transit system. On balance, the elements of the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility are in conformance with the City's *General Plan*.

### 3. Bayshore Intermodal Terminal

The project includes the development of a new terminal for the Third Street Light Rail line at the southern terminus of the line, adjacent to the existing Caltrain Bayshore Station. The southern terminal would be designed as an intermodal facility to facilitate transfers between the Third Street Light Rail line, Caltrain, SamTrans, MUNI bus services, and possibly a shuttle connecting with a new 49ers stadium and Candlestick Mills mall

The new intermodal station would allow passengers to transfer between MUNI light rail and Caltrain commuter rail service at the Bayshore Caltrain Station. This station also would provide bus parking, a passenger drop-off area, access and facilities for bicycles, and 45 on-site automobile parking spaces intended for MUNI patrons (a structured parking facility was considered in early stages of project planning, but is not proposed as part of the initial operating segment addressed in this referral).

Where it turns from Bayshore Boulevard into the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal at the city's southern limits, the light rail track alignment would consist of two parallel tracks within a 24-foot-wide exclusive right-of-way in a generally 66-foot-wide street right-of-way. With the completion of the light rail line, it would carry one lane of traffic in each direction. It would not accommodate on-street parking at either curb line.

**Pedestrian Functions.** The intermodal facility would include a center platform for deboarding and a side platform for boarding the Third Street Light Rail line, bus bays for drop-off and pick-up of passengers and queuing for buses, a curbside drop-off area for transit riders, and surface parking. Ticket vending machines, sheltered boarding areas and other passenger amenities would be included.

The development of the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal would provide a sidewalk on the north side of Sunnydale Avenue east of Bayshore Boulevard.



One center platform and one side platform would be constructed at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal.

**Bicycle Functions.** Bicycle access to the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal from Bayshore Boulevard is not addressed specifically in the *Bicycle Master Plan*, although it, like the *General Plan*, supports the accommodation of bicycles at transit centers. The project would not provide bicycle facilities on this segment of Sunnydale Avenue. It would provide bicycle lanes on Bayshore Boulevard northbound from Sunnydale Avenue, which would thereby link with the intermodal station to the bicycle system northbound. The project would not provide southbound bicycle lanes on Bayshore Boulevard in the vicinity of Sunnydale Avenue (the lane would terminate just south of Visitacion Avenue), so there would be no link from the intermodal station site for southbound bicyclists on Bayshore Boulevard north of Sunnydale Avenue.

**Property Acquisition.** The Bayshore Intermodal Terminal would require the acquisition of two parcels of privately owned land. The parcel that lies 100 feet east of the intersection of Sunnydale Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard is unoccupied (Assessor's Block 5107, Lot 001). The other parcel is occupied by a structure and a surface parking lot (Assessor's Block 5102, Lot 009). Sunnydale Avenue extends through the site, and has a 66-foot-wide right-of-way. There currently are no sidewalks on either side.

**Parking.** Currently, Sunnyvale Avenue does not extend east of Bayshore Boulevard, so there is no on-street parking on this site. Neither is there public parking on the private parcels. The project would extend Sunnyvale Avenue east from Bayshore Boulevard into the site, and provide 45 on-site automobile parking spaces, currently intended for MUNI transit riders.

#### **General Plan Policies Related to the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal**

The major issues related to the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal include the appropriateness of such a facility and its configuration. The *General Plan* policies that address the terminal are as follows:

**Intermodal Transit Stations.** The Transportation Element addresses the issues of intermodal connections and the development of transit centers such as the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal. This Element's policies for transit centers are as follows.

#### **Transportation Element**

***Policy 1. 5***

*Coordinate regional and local transportation systems and provide for interline transit transfers.*

***Policy 1. 6***

*Ensure choices among modes of travel and accommodate each mode when and where it is most appropriate.*

***Policy 4. 4***

*Integrate future rail transit extensions to, from, and within the city as technology permits so that they are compatible with and immediately accessible to existing BART, Caltrain or MUNI rail lines.*

***Policy 4. 5***

*Provide convenient transit service that connects the regional transit network to major employment centers outside the downtown area.*

***Policy 21. 3***

*Make future rail transit extensions in the city compatible with existing BART, CalTrain or MUNI rail lines.*

***Policy 21. 4***

*Provide for improved connectivity and potential facility expansion where any two fixed-guideway transit corridors connect.*

***Policy 21. 7***

*Make convenient transfers between transit lines, systems and modes possible by establishing common or closely located terminals for local and regional transit systems and by coordinating fares and schedules.*

***Objective 30***

*Ensure that the provision of new or enlarged parking facilities does not adversely affect the livability and desirability of the city and its various neighborhoods.*

***Policy 30. 4***

*Restrict long term automobile parking at rapid transit stations in the city in favor of development of effective feeder transit service.*

Comment: The City's *General Plan* clearly supports the development of transit centers, and especially intermodal transit centers, in the city.

**Pedestrian Functions.** The City's General Plan addresses the issue of pedestrian access on public streets and at transit centers, and requires that pedestrians be fully and comfortably accommodated.

**Transportation Element**

***Policy 21. 9***

*Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.*

*Pedestrian access to and from major destinations and the serving transit facility should be direct and uncomplicated. Bicyclists should be accommodated on regional and trunkline transit vehicles wherever feasible, and at stations through the provision of storage lockers and/or secured bicycle parking.*

Comment: The plans for the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal adequately accommodate pedestrians using the terminal facility.

**Bicycle Functions.** The City's General Plan addresses the issue of bicycle accommodation on public streets and at transit centers, and requires that bicyclists be fully and comfortably accommodated.

**Transportation Element**

***Policy 21. 9***

*Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.*

*Pedestrian access to and from major destinations and the serving transit facility should be direct and uncomplicated. Bicyclists should be accommodated on regional and trunkline transit vehicles wherever feasible, and at stations through the provision of storage lockers and/or secured bicycle parking.*

***Policy 27. 6***

*Accommodate bicycles on regional transit facilities and important regional transportation links wherever feasible.*

***Policy 28. 4***

*Provide bicycle parking at all transit terminals.*

*Policy 29. 1*

*Consider the needs of bicycling and the improvement of bicycle accommodations in all city decisions and improve accommodation as much as possible.*

Comment: The plans for the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal would not adequately accommodate bicycles at the terminal facility.

Parking. The City's General Plan addresses the issue of parking at transit centers.

**Transportation Element**

*Policy 2. 5*

*Provide incentives for the use of transit, carpools, vanpools, walking and bicycling and reduce the need for new or expanded automobile and automobile parking facilities.*

*Objective 7*

*Develop a parking strategy that encourages short-term parking at the periphery of downtown and long-term intercept parking at the periphery of the urbanized bay area to meet the needs of long-distance commuters traveling by automobile to San Francisco or nearby destinations.*

*Policy 7. 1*

*Reserve a majority of the off-street parking spaces at the periphery of downtown for short term parking.*

*Policy 7. 2*

*Outlying transit terminals and adjacent commuter parking facilities of the regional transit systems leading to San Francisco should be well-marked and easily accessible from regional highways.*

*Policy 7. 3*

*Maintain a supply of parking commensurate with demand at outlying intercept parking facilities that have good connections to transit and ride-sharing opportunities.*

*Policy 12. 1*

*Develop and implement strategies which provide incentives for individuals to use public transit, ridesharing, bicycling and walking to the best advantage, thereby reducing the number of single occupant auto trips.*

***Objective 16***

*Develop and implement programs that will efficiently manage the supply of parking at employment centers throughout the city so as to discourage single-occupant ridership and encourage ridesharing, transit and other alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.*

***Policy 16. 5***

*Reduce parking demand through limiting the absolute amount of spaces and prioritizing the spaces for short-term and ride-share uses.*

***Policy 16. 6***

*Encourage alternatives to the private automobile by locating public transit access and ride-share vehicle and bicycle parking at more close-in and convenient locations on-site, and by locating parking facilities for single-occupant vehicles more remotely.*

***Objective 30***

*Ensure that the provision of new or enlarged parking facilities does not adversely affect the livability and desirability of the city and its various neighborhoods.*

***Policy 30. 4***

*Restrict long term automobile parking at rapid transit stations in the city in favor of development of effective feeder transit service.*

***Policy 31. 1***

*Set rates to encourage short-term over long-term automobile parking.*

***Policy 32. 2***

*When it must be provided, locate any new long-term parking structures in the areas peripheral to downtown. Any new peripheral parking structures should be concentrated to make transit service convenient and efficient, connected to transit shuttle service to downtown, and provide preferred space and rates for van and car pool vehicles, bicycles and motorcycles.*

*Policy 34. 4*

*Where parking demand is greatest in city neighborhoods, consider wide-scale transit improvements as an alternative to additional parking garages as part of a balanced solution.*

Comment: The plans to provide on-site parking, if it accommodates long-term parking, and especially if it accommodates single-occupancy vehicle parking at the intermodal station, are not supported by the City's *General Plan*.

**Analysis of the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal**

The City's *General Plan* clearly supports the provision and development of a multimodal transit center; and, with the following exception, the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal development is in conformance with the policies of the *General Plan*.

The plans for on-site parking at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal as currently proposed are not in conformance with the policies of the City's *General Plan*. *General Plan* policies support developing the intermodal terminal without parking. The provision of parking at the terminal could be brought into conformance with the *General Plan* if it were managed for other than long-term commuters in single-occupancy automobiles.

**4. Traction Power Substations**

The project would include the construction of six traction power substations to distribute electric power to the overhead catenary wires. These substations would be approximately 15 feet high and 2,000 square feet in size, and would be spaced approximately one mile apart along the corridor. They would be placed at the following locations:

- South of 16th Street between Illinois Street and Terry Franchoise Boulevard; (Assessor's Block 3940, Lot 002).
- On the Metro East Light Rail Maintenance and Storage Facility property between Illinois, Cesar Chavez, and 25th Streets west of Pier 80. Two of the six traction power stations would be built on this site. One of the power stations is for the maintenance facility. The other is to power the light rail system; (Assessor's blocks 4297, 4298, 4299, 4310, and 4313).
- Southeast Sewage Treatment Plant on Phelps Street near Hudson Street; (Assessor's Block 5260, Lot 001).

- Keith Street and LeConte Avenue intersection; (Assessor's Block 5474, Lot 024).
- Sunnydale Avenue east of Bayshore Boulevard; (Assessor's Block 5107, Lot 024).

#### General Plan Policies Related to the Traction Power Stations

The City's *General Plan* clearly support the development of a strong transit system, and the traction power stations listed above are necessary for the development of the Third Street Light Rail systems. The traction power station provisions of the project are in conformance with the *General Plan*.

#### 5. Property Acquisition

The light rail project would require the City to acquire six parcels of land:

1. The Metro East Light Rail Maintenance Facility site on the former Western Pacific Railroad Yard. (Assessor's blocks 4297, 4298, 4299, 4310, 4313.) This parcel is currently owned by Catellus Development Company, but would be transferred to the Port of San Francisco before being leased by the Port to MUNI. The property would be acquired by the Port through lease, fee-simple acquisition, or other means.
2. A parcel of land owned by Caltrans at the corner of Keith Street and LeConte Avenue.(Assessor's Block 5474, Lot 024).This parcel is needed to accommodate a traction power station.
- 3 &4. Two parcels of land in a strip approximately 150 feet in length along the east side of Bayshore Boulevard at Hester Avenue (Assessor's Block 5054, Lots 002 and 009). These are City-owned lots under DPW's jurisdiction. They are required for the widening of Bayshore Boulevard as it approaches the U.S. Highway 101 overpass, which itself is intended to be widened.
5. One privately-owned parcel near the corner of Sunnydale Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard (Assessor's Block 5107, Lot 001). This parcel currently is unoccupied. It is needed to accommodate a power substation.
6. One parcel currently owned by the Universal Paragon (formerly Tuntex) Co., located near the Bayshore CalTrain Station, east of Bayshore Boulevard, near Sunnydale Avenue (Assessor's block 5102, Lot 009). This site is currently

occupied by one building, and is also used for private parking for an adjacent use. It is needed for elements of the intermodal transit station.

### **General Plan Policies Related to Property Acquisition**

The City's *General Plan* clearly supports the development of a strong transit system, and the acquisition of the parcels listed above are necessary for the development of the Third Street Light Rail system. The acquisition provisions of the project are in conformance with the *General Plan*.

### **6. Utility Relocation**

There are sewers in the center of the street right-of-way along parts of the corridor that are beneath the future rail alignment, and there are other utilities beneath other portions of the right-of-way, as well as underground utilities that cross the corridor. There are above-ground utilities in the corridor in Mission Bay, in Bayview outside the Commercial Core, and in portions of the Visitacion Valley neighborhood.

Where there are sewers and other utilities beneath what would be the future rail alignment or within areas affected by the construction of the light rail project, the project may replace them and relocate them from the track area. In the Bayview from Galvez to Wallace avenues, the project may replace the existing single sewer with two sewer lines on either side of the light rail track, to facilitate future repairs or installations. Relocation of these utilities may also necessitate the relocation of other private utilities that might conflict with the new sewer alignment. In instances where there would be insufficient clearance between the existing sewers and the track slab, the project would reconstruct the existing sewer to a lower profile or would move it from the track area. In some locations where utilities such as major auxiliary water supply system pipes cross beneath the track alignment, the project would sleeve them. In some locations, the project would move existing water pipes from beneath the track alignment to facilitate repairs or replacements. In addition, the project would construct a concrete duct bank for power feed cables under the vehicle travel lane. The project would construct a similar duct bank for communication system optical fibers, which would run the length of the project.

Private, above-ground utilities (electricity, telephone, etc.) in Bayview outside the Commercial Core and in the Visitacion Valley neighborhood may be placed underground



at the same time the project is constructed. This work would be done through an undergrounding district, which would need to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

#### **General Plan Policies Related to Utilities**

On sum, *General Plan* policies support the efficient use of resources and the coordinated provision of public services. On balance, the coordination of the relocation of utilities with the construction of the light rail project is in conformance with the policies and intent of the *General Plan*.

## EIGHT PRIORITY GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The following is a review of the project for consistency with the eight priority policies of Section 101.1 of the City's *Planning Code*.

### *Priority Policy 1*

*That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced.*

Neighborhood-serving retail businesses would not be directly affected by the implementation of this project on a long-term basis. There might be some short-term impacts on some retail businesses as a result of construction activities, but the project's construction plan would be formulated to minimize this disruption. One goal of the light rail project is to support the preservation and expansion of neighborhood-serving retail in the Third Street corridor, and it could be expected to do so in the other neighborhood-serving areas through which it passes. The light rail project is expected to improve and facilitate transit access to businesses, while urban design improvements associated with the project (to be considered in a subsequent referral) would be expected to improve the streetscape environment.

An adequate balance of on-street parking is important to the function of neighborhood-serving retail uses. The project would result in the loss of about 309 on-street curb-side parking spaces along Third Street as a whole as compared to the present (excluding the 377 on-street parking spaces in Mission Bay, where separate agreements between the City and the Mission Bay developer have determined that there should not be on-street parking on the street segments that accommodate the light rail line). Analysis shows that there is now excess on-street parking capacity in many segments of the corridor. The project's EIR parking analysis showed that the impacts of any reduction of curb parking supply would be greatest in the Bayview Commercial Core, but the project would increase the supply of on-street parking here by approximately 15 spaces.

The project is consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

*Priority Policy 2*

*That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhood.*

No housing would be removed or physically affected by this project. The urban design improvements associated with the project (to be considered in a subsequent referral) would be intended to respect existing neighborhood character in all communities along the light rail corridor.

The project is consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

*Priority Policy 3*

*That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.*

This project would have no effect on the supply of affordable housing. However, the improved transit service would create incentive for construction of market rate housing and affordable housing.

The project is consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

*Priority Policy 4*

*That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.*

The light rail project would not itself generate any additional automobile traffic volume in the Third Street Corridor. In fact, it would serve to slightly reduce total vehicular traffic volume than to not building the light rail system, as it would improve transit service by adding the light rail system. The project does, however, reduce the vehicular capacity of Third Street, as well as reduce the total number of on-street parking spaces.

**Traffic Capacity.** Through most of the corridor, the light rail project reduces available vehicular travel lanes from three lanes in each direction to two lanes in each direction. Though this reduces total carrying capacity, traffic analyses indicate that there would generally be sufficient capacity to accommodate expected traffic volumes. However a few intersections would have their levels of service reduced to “F.” Since the light rail line would operate in an exclusive right-of-way for most of the alignment, transit service in the corridor would not be disrupted by any congestion that occurs. In the nine-block Bayview Commercial Core, the light rail line would share one of the two traffic lanes with automobile traffic in each direction. In this section of the corridor, there is a potential for traffic congestion to impact transit service, but traffic analyses show that this should be manageable.

The transit and traffic elements of the project are consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

**On-Street Parking Supply:** The project would result in the loss of about 309 on-street curb-side parking spaces along Third Street as a whole as compared to the present (excluding the 377 on-street parking spaces in the corridor in Mission Bay, where separate agreements between the City and the Mission Bay developer have determined that there should not be on-street parking on the street segments that accommodate the light rail line). There are no provisions as part of the light rail project to replace this parking, but in many areas along the corridor there is excess capacity at present. The project’s EIR parking analysis showed that the impacts of reduced curb parking supply would be greatest in the Bayview Commercial Core. In this area, the project would use a mixed flow right-of-way design which would not only retain all the existing curb parking, but also increase the supply by 15 spaces.

The on-street parking elements of the project are consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

**On-Site Parking Provisions at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal.** The project would provide on-site parking at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal. No program is proposed to manage this parking so that it serves a purpose other than long-term parking. The

provision of on-site parking at transit centers in the city is inconsistent with the policies of the City's *General Plan*.

The provision of on-site parking at the Bayshore Intermodal Terminal is inconsistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*. While the *General Plan* policies supports developing the intermodal terminal without parking, the provision of parking could be brought into conformance with the *General Plan* if it were managed for other than long-term commuters in single-occupant automobiles.

*Priority Policy 5*

*That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for residential employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.*

This project would not directly affect displacement of industrial or service uses by commercial development. The project would offer improved travel access to job opportunities along the Third Street corridor.

The project is consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

*Priority Policy 6*

*That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.*

All facilities constructed as part of this project would adhere to current seismic standards.

The project is consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

*Priority Policy 7*

*That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.*

There are 10 historic properties within the vicinity of the initial operating segment of the light rail line. However, the only city landmarks or historic structures that would be directly affected by the project are the Fourth Street Bridge and the Islais Creek Bridge. The light rail line would cross both of these bridges, requiring the addition of tracks and overhead wires at each bridge.

The Fourth Street Bridge is eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. This bridge was designed for electric streetcar use. The Islais Creek Bridge appears to be eligible for the register. This bridge, built in 1950, never had overhead wires or tracks, though the earlier Long Street bridge, which it replaced, did accommodate streetcar service. The addition of light rail infrastructure to the current bridge would not affect its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.

The project is consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

***Priority Policy 8***

***That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.***

The light rail alignment (i.e. tracks, overhead and station platforms), because it would be located in the street right-of-way, would not impact any open spaces. However, two of the traction power substations required as part of the project are proposed to be located in future open space provided as part of the Mission Bay project. These two substations are intended to be designed to fit with the intended character of the neighborhood and the open space in which they are to be placed, and the design of which is to be considered in a subsequent referral.

The project is consistent with this priority policy of the *Planning Code*.

N:\REFERRAL\96281R.WPD

*I:\Citywide\General Plan\General Plan Referrals\1996\1996.281R Third Street Light Rail Project Initial Operating Segment 96281R.doc*

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184  
Fax No. (415) 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Carla Short, Interim Director, Public Works  
Jeffrey Tumlin, Executive Director, Municipal Transportation Agency  
Andrico Penick, Director, Real Estate Division  
William Blackwell, Acting City and County Surveyor, Office of the City and County Surveyor

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: May 18, 2022

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

---

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Walton on May 10, 2022:

**File No. 220543**

**Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, conditioned upon the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") Board of Directors' approval of the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area to SFMTA, to facilitate the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility; approving the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area from Public Works to SFMTA, subject to the approval of the SFMTA Board of Directors; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; adopting findings that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and authorizing official acts in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein.**

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: [erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org).



Board of Supervisors  
Land Use and Transportation Committee  
Referral  
Page 2

cc: David Steinberg, Public Works  
Bryan Dahl, Public Works  
John Thomas, Public Works  
Lena Liu, Public Works  
Kate Breen, Municipal Transportation Agency  
Janet Martinsen, Municipal Transportation Agency  
Joel Ramos, Municipal Transportation Agency  
Adrian VerHagen, Office of the City and County Surveyor  
Jason Wong, Public Works

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184  
Fax No. (415) 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

### BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as a Committee of the Whole, will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard in person or remotely.

Members of the public attending this hearing in-person may be required to wear masks and adhere to certain procedures, please visit [https://sfbos.org/in\\_person\\_meeting\\_guidelines](https://sfbos.org/in_person_meeting_guidelines) for the current guidelines.

**Date:** Monday, July 11, 2022

**Time:** 1:30 p.m.

**Location:** **IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION**  
Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

#### REMOTE ACCESS

Watch: [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)

Watch: SF Cable Channel 26, 78 or 99 (*depending on your provider*) once the meeting starts, the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen.

Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

**Subject:** **File No. 220543.** Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, conditioned upon the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") Board of Directors' approval of the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area to SFMTA, to facilitate the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility; approving the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area from Public Works to SFMTA, subject to the approval of the SFMTA Board of Directors; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; adopting findings that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and authorizing official acts in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email ([board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)). Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 8, 2022.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Land Use and Transportation Clerk:

Erica Major ([Erica.Major@sfgov.org](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org)) ~ (415) 554-4441)

**Please Note:** *The Department is open for business, but employees are partially working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.*



Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

em:vy:ams

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184  
Fax No. (415) 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. (415) 544-5227

## PROOF OF POSTING

Legislative File No. (220543) Summary Street Vacation - Michigan Street in Connection with MUNI Metro East Improvements - Interdepartmental Property Transfer

Description of Items:

Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, conditioned upon the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") Board of Directors' approval of the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area to SFMTA, to facilitate the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility; approving the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area from Public Works to SFMTA, subject to the approval of the SFMTA Board of Directors; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; adopting findings that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are consistent with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and authorizing official acts in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein.

I, JEWOLDE WELDETENSAE, an employee of the City and County of San Francisco, posted the above-described document(s) along the street(s) to be affected at least ten (10) days in advance of the hearing (pursuant to California Streets and Highways Code Section 8317):

Date: 06-24-2022

Time: 1:20 Pm

Location: CESAR CHAVEZ ST & MICHIGAN ST.

Signature:

Instructions: Upon completion, original must be filed in the above referenced file.

# CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

## DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839  
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

ERICA MAJOR  
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)  
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

### COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

#### Ad Description

EDM 07.12.2022 Land Use Agenda - 220543 Summary Street Vacation (Walton)

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

06/26/2022 , 07/03/2022

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

Publication	\$742.50
Total	\$742.50

EXM# 3599723

#### NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY, JULY 11, 2022 - 1:30 PM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard in-person or remotely. Members of the public attending this hearing in-person may be required to wear masks and adhere to certain procedures, please visit

[https://sfbos.org/in\\_person\\_meeting\\_guidelines](https://sfbos.org/in_person_meeting_guidelines) for the current guidelines. File No. 220543, Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, conditioned upon the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") Board of Directors approval of the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area to SFMTA, to facilitate the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility; approving the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area from Public Works to SFMTA, subject to the approval of the SFMTA Board of Directors; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; adopting findings that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are consistent with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and authorizing official acts in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email

(board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 8, 2022. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org - (415) 554-4441) Please Note: The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.

EXM-3599723#



\* A 0 0 0 0 0 6 0 5 2 0 5 8 \*

# Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp  
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning : "Supervisor  inquiries"
- 5. City Attorney Request.
- 6. Call File No.  from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission
- Youth Commission
- Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission
- Building Inspection Commission

**Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.**

Sponsor(s):

Walton

Subject:

Summary Street Vacation - Michigan Street in Connection with MUNI Metro East Improvements - Interdepartmental Property Transfer

The text is listed:

Ordinance ordering the summary street vacation of a portion of Michigan Street, generally bounded by Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4298 to the north and west, Assessor's Parcel Block No. 4310 to the east, and Cesar Chavez Street to the south, as part of the improvement of the MUNI Metro East maintenance facility, subject to the approval of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") Board of Directors; approving the interdepartmental transfer of the vacation area from Public Works to SFMTA, subject to the approval of the SFMTA Board of Directors; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; adopting findings that the actions contemplated in this Ordinance are consistent with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and authorizing official acts in furtherance of this Ordinance, as defined herein.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: /s/ Shamann Walton