

**COMMENTS RECEIVED ON MULTI-PROJECT TRAFFIC STUDY AT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING 9/4/08**

<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
William Kunz 970 Swan St.	City's pre-1995 standard was LOS C	This is not correct. Before 1995, the 1993 General Plan contained Policy LUC-50, which stated that "The City will seek to achieve a traffic service level of "C" or better on City streets and level of "D" or better during peak traffic hours..." This is the same language used in the current plan with the addition of a statement "...although it will be necessary to accept level of service "E" or "F" at the Chess Drive/SR 92 Ramps, the Foster City Blvd./Metro Center Blvd./Triton Drive and the East Hillsdale Blvd./Edgewater Blvd. intersections..." LUC-50 was amended to include this language when the East Third Avenue/SR 92 interchange was removed from the General Plan.
	Study should include aggregate delay for typical trips, not just average intersection delay	This is not the approach used for a development impact analysis. An analysis of aggregate delays would be more appropriate for a corridor analysis or General Plan study.
	Cumulative traffic impacts for all projects = over 33,000 additional daily trips	The added daily trips for the three projects under study would be about 14,420. When trips from existing developments not currently fully occupied, developments that have been approved, the three projects under study and other potential development anticipated in the General Plan are added together, the cumulative total is about 33,000 daily trips.
	Only motor vehicle traffic was analyzed. Pedestrians, bicyclists, blind and limited mobility aren't considered. Pedestrians are lightly mentioned regarding difficulty crossing. No bike paths or dedicated pedestrian walkways or bridges are included. No physically or visually challenged specific improvements are included.	Bicycle, pedestrian and transit impacts will be studied in EIRs for each project. A traffic analysis does not focus on the issues raised by the speaker.
	Study should estimate costs of infrastructure	Staff will be working with the traffic consultant to develop cost estimates for the proposed improvements but this will be separate from the traffic analysis report.

COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>Triton widening includes Public Bond Funds. The City's Fact Sheet states the city won't fund infrastructure improvements. Project economic analysis typically states improvements not contractually required by developers will be borne by the citizens through taxes, bonds or assessments.</p>	<p>The City had begun the process to use Measure A funds for the Triton Drive widening before the Pilgrim-Triton project was submitted. (See p. 13 of the 2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan by the San Mateo Transportation Authority, where the Triton Drive widening is listed as a "candidate project."  <a href="http://www.smcta.com/Expenditure_Plan/Complete.pdf">http://www.smcta.com/Expenditure_Plan/Complete.pdf</a>). Measure A authorized a ½ cent sales tax for transportation improvements, which is administered by the San Mateo Transportation Authority. The City will officially apply in the next cycle of project applications in January 2009. If Measure A funds cannot be used, then the developers will be required to pay for the widening.</p>
	<p>Developer proposed tenant transit programs without funding major improvements</p>	<p>The developers are aware that they will be required to fund their fair share of transit and traffic improvements. Development plans will include bus turnouts that can be used by buses and shuttles.</p>
	<p>Planning Policy LUC-50 allows degraded LOS at key intersections allowing gridlock to be "insignificant"</p>	<p>This is not correct. LUC-50 states that "it will be necessary to accept level of service "E" or "F" at three intersections. The criteria for determining "significant" impacts are contained on p. 5 of the traffic study and include that for signalized intersections, an increase in the average delay by 4 seconds per vehicle or more at an intersection exceeding its LOS threshold without the project would be considered significant. LOS E would not be considered "gridlock." Levels of Service are explained on p. 29, where it is stated that LOS E "is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay" for most drivers (although Foster City has adopted a standard of LOS D or better).</p>

COMMENTS	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	Our infrastructure can't carry 33,000 additional trips per day.	It is correct that the existing roadway infrastructure cannot carry 33,000 additional trips without causing some intersections to exceed established LOS thresholds. The purpose of the study was to identify what improvements would be needed to accommodate the additional trips. The traffic analysis actually shows on p. 18 that with the recommended improvements and mitigation measures, all of the five affected intersections would operate at LOS D or better in the peak hours. Six of the ten peak hour LOS (1 AM and 1 PM LOS at each intersection) would be the same or better LOS with the improvements and added traffic than under existing conditions.
	Improvement "contracts" a must before FEIR approval & permits	The City is beginning the process of working with the developers to prepare a proposed timetable for construction of the improvements. Through Development Agreements or conditions of approval the developers will be required to construct or pay for the required mitigation and improvements.
Charles Caldwell 620 Fathom Drive	Closure of Lakeside Drive will force traffic that now uses Reef and Lakeside Drive to go to Foster City to use Mariners Island Blvd, Trader Lane, Bridgepointe Circle and Chess Drive. Will be longer and more inconvenient. Will increase noise levels for adjacent housing. Developer should be required to install triple-paned windows.	Traffic counts performed by Kimley-Horn indicated that there were approximately 350 daily trips traveling through on Lakeside Drive that would be diverted to other routes if Lakeside Drive were closed. This correlates with a peak hour estimate of 35-40 trips that would be affected (Table 8, <i>Analysis of Gilead Sciences General Development Plan Traffic Impacts</i> , Kimley-Horn, May 2008). Shifting 40 peak hour trips from Lakeside Drive to an alternate route would not have a significant impact on intersection levels of service or noise. Although the closure would require a different route for some trips, the closure of Lakeside Drive would improve pedestrian safety on Lakeside Drive.
Linda Haskin 1116 Halsey Blvd.	The City's master plan was amended to say that level F is acceptable when unavoidable – how is the City defining unavoidable?	This is not correct. The 1993 General Plan included the East 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue/SR 92 Interchange. When the interchange was removed from the General Plan, LUC-50 was amended to state that with the addition of new

COMMENTS	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		development anticipated in the General Plan, "it will be necessary to accept level of service "E" or "F" at the Chess Drive/SR 92 Ramps, the Foster City Blvd./Metro Center Blvd./Triton Drive and the East Hillsdale Blvd./Edgewater Blvd. intersections..." The City Council realized that removing the interchange would result in worse levels of service at other intersections during peak hours and approved this trade-off.
	Why isn't the city doing a better job of reaching out to necessary agencies during the planning process?	Caltrans, C/CAG and neighboring cities were provided with copies of the draft report. See also later letter dated October 2, 2008 from Caltrans that states "The Department applauds the effort of the City in taking a comprehensive approach to the evaluation of traffic impacts from three large projects on seven freeway segments and 29 intersections in the Cities of Foster City and San Mateo."
	Development projects being studied have not yet finished growing in size. Gilead asked to add another building to their project.	This is not correct. Gilead's proposed office building (NOB-1) is the first phase of their master plan project, not an additional proposal. Any proposed increases from the development assumed in the Multi-Project Traffic Study will require additional environmental review.
	Study doesn't include a time limit for morning and afternoon hours of operation. An impacted afternoon commute could indicate a condition that continues for hours.	The study looked at the "peak hour" which is the worst hour in the morning or evening. If improvements will work during the peak hour to achieve acceptable levels of service, they will work in the other hours also.
	City must insist that developers, state and federal agencies prepare complete measures for fully managing parking, transit and circulation consequences before any developments reach approval stages.	Staff will be working with the developers to prepare a proposed timetable for construction of the improvements with the goal of having traffic improvements constructed in time to avoid adverse traffic impacts. Although Caltrans will be involved in the two proposed improvements to SR 92 ramps, state and federal agencies don't get involved in project-level review of "parking, transit and circulation consequences."
	How can adding any traffic to an already impacted	The significance criteria are spelled out on p. 5 of the

COMMENTS	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	intersection be considered insignificant?	report. For an intersection already exceeding its LOS threshold, an increase in the average intersection delay by 4 seconds per vehicle or more would be considered a significant impact. Increases in average delay less than 4 seconds per vehicle are not likely to be noticed by drivers because they are within the typical day-to-day fluctuations of traffic conditions at intersections.
	Additional traffic will impair people 1) leaving the city in the event of an emergency, 2) getting to and from work, 3) conducting business meetings during the day, 4) getting kids to and from school	The traffic analysis actually shows on p. 18 that with the recommended improvements and mitigation measures, all of the five affected intersections would operate at LOS D or better in the peak hours. Six of the ten peak hour LOS (1 AM and 1 PM at each intersection) would be the same or better LOS with the improvements and added traffic than under existing conditions. Further, the City considered the trade-offs listed by the commenter when establishing LOS thresholds.
Rich Hedges 904 Wharfside Rd	Don't agree with assessment of current LOS at: 1) Fashion Island/Bridgepointe 2) Norfolk/E Hillsdale 3) Edgewater/E Hillsdale	No data was presented by the commenter to support this. Fehr & Peers performed traffic counts at these intersections and calculated the existing levels of service using standard methods.
	Congestion on freeway will cause people to get off on Fashion Island Blvd.	For traffic traveling to or from a Foster City destination, such as the Gilead campus, the potential for vehicles to exit the freeway on Fashion Island Boulevard, rather than an exit closer to their destination, was considered and is reflected in the study. For traffic traveling on SR 92 through Foster City (e.g., from US 101 to the San Mateo Bridge), using City streets to bypass freeway congestion and then get back on the freeway is not likely to be a time-saving route and is therefore not anticipated.
	Closure of Lakeside Drive will increase traffic at Mariners Island/E Third	As indicated above, up to 40 peak hour trips would be diverted to various other routes, which is not enough to alter levels of service.
	Need a signal at Reef/Mariners Island	The intersection of Reef/Mariners Island Blvd. will be studied in more detail in the final Multi-Project Traffic Study and the Gilead EIR.

COMMENTS	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
	Should require the walkway from Gilead to the Hilton to be retained	This is not a traffic issue, and is therefore not a topic covered in this report. Pedestrian circulation will be studied in the Gilead EIR and staff reports.
Ginny Stewart 1111 Sprague Lane	Report has nothing about disaster planning & limited ways to get out of Foster City	This issue will be addressed in the project EIRs.
Jim Neubert 854 Lurline	Video didn't represent traffic in/out of fast food restaurants on Triton Drive	The traffic model does not model each driveway, but it does account for the "friction" that comes from the driveways.
Grant Cherrington 859 Lurline	Don't see reference to Caltrans - they will have to consent to some improvements	Yes, Caltrans would have to consent to the two proposed modifications to SR 92 ramps.
Patrick Merrill 921 Clipper Lane	Why was LOS threshold set at LOS D?	When the E. Third Avenue interchange was removed from the General Plan, traffic forecasts showed that if the City was going to allow additional development, then the LOS at three intersections would be LOS E or F. Setting a LOS standard involves balancing the City's needs for economic growth, new housing, redevelopment, revenues to support services, etc. with needs for efficient circulation. The LOS standard also takes into account the efficient use of the City's resources. For example, a peak hour LOS of C would result in wider streets (more costly construction, more pavement, less open space) that would be underutilized in the non-peak hours.
	Delay has added costs in gas and pollution; traffic lights add to delays – should take multiple lights into consideration for cumulative delays	The added costs of delay are taken into consideration when a LOS standard is set. See previous response regarding aggregate delay.
Larry Meyer 1441 Halibut	Timing/funding of improvements not clear	Staff will be working with the developers to prepare a proposed timetable for construction and funding of the improvements with the goal of having improvements constructed in time to avoid adverse traffic impacts.
Max Cologna 416 Fathom	Neighbors use Reef Drive Reef/Mariners Island is a dangerous intersection. There's speeding on Mariners Island Blvd. Need a traffic light. Foliage blocks views of the cars. What about emergency access?	See previous responses regarding Reef/Mariners Island. This will be studied in more detail in the Final Multi-Project Traffic Study and the Gilead EIR.
Jim Howard	Are any speed limit changes planned? Opposed to	No speed limit changes are proposed. Comment noted

<b>COMMENTER</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
131 Trimaran Ct	signal at Marlin/Foster City Blvd.	on signal for Marlin/Foster City Blvd.
Noemi Avram Planning Commissioner	Did we also factor in projects in San Mateo?	San Mateo projects are factored into the C/CAG model which was used to analyze freeway impacts. The only other relevant San Mateo project is the approved 76-unit condominium development at the southwest corner of Mariners Island and E. Third Avenue. The traffic analysis for this project indicated that it would generate less than 50 peak hour trips in the am or pm. The project did not have any significant impact on levels of service. The final Multi-Project Traffic Study and the Gilead EIR will include trips from this development.
	Not clear on how Lakeside closure affected Mariners Island residents	See previous responses regarding the 40 peak hour trips to be diverted due to Lakeside Drive closure. It may lengthen some trips to some destinations, but it won't affect levels of service.
Ollie Pattum Planning Commissioner	Seems like a signal would be needed at Polynesia/Foster City Blvd. more than at Marlin	Polynesia/Foster City Blvd. doesn't meet the traffic warrants to require a signal, whereas the Marlin/Foster City Blvd. intersection is on the cusp of needing one.