
SPECIAL STUDY SESSION STAFF REPORT

DATE: JUNE 18, 2009

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3.B.

TO: FOSTER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

PREPARED BY: WHITNEY MCNAIR, CONSULTING PLANNER

CASE NOS.: EA-07-001, EA-07-002, EA-07-003, EA-06-003

PROJECT LOCATIONS:

- CHESS DRIVE OFFICE BUILDINGS: 1155-1191 CHESS DRIVE (EA-07-001)
- MIRABELLA SAN FRANCISCO BAY/PARKVIEW PLAZA: 11 ACRES ADJACENT TO THE GOVERNMENT CENTER (EA-07-002)
- GILEAD SCIENCES CAMPUS MASTER PLAN: 300-368 LAKESIDE DRIVE (EA-07-003)
- PILGRIM TRITON MASTER PLAN: (AREAS BOUNDED BY FOSTER CITY BOULEVARD, TRITON DRIVE, PILGRIM DRIVE, EAST HILLSDALE BOULEVARD AND STATE ROUTE 92) (EA-06-003)

REQUESTED ACTION/PURPOSE

Staff is providing the Planning Commission with a Progress Report on the status Multi-Project Traffic Analysis and the Engineering Feasibility Study.

The *Final Multi-Project Traffic Analysis* (MPTA) was completed in December 2008. The findings from this final traffic analysis have been incorporated in each of the proposed projects' draft environmental impact reports. The Planning Commission will be reviewing the project specific traffic analyses when reviewing the EIR for each specific development project. This report is being provided to the Commission as an informational item and will not be reviewed in detail at this meeting. The MPTA provides a comprehensive analysis of the anticipated traffic from the proposed projects under different scenarios and provides a complete list of proposed roadway improvements needed over time to keep traffic within acceptable level of service thresholds.

The *Foster City Multi-Project Engineering Feasibility Study* (Feasibility Study) was completed in May 2009. This study takes those roadway improvements identified in the MPTA and analyzes the improvement feasibility, construction timing and estimated costs. The purpose of this meeting is to provide the Commission with a summary of the Feasibility Study. City staff is currently working with the developers and City management on the details for project obligation towards construction funding and phasing of the improvements. The outcomes of these discussions will be included in the Development Agreements or final approvals for the projects, which will be brought to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation to the City Council. However, this Study Session is being held to provide an overview of the information.

BACKGROUND

The City retained the transportation consulting firm of Fehr & Peers to study the traffic-related impacts of three proposed projects, both individually and cumulatively. Rather than having three separate traffic studies, staff elected to combine the analyses into a single, multi-project traffic analysis (MPTA). This approach provides for a single cohesive set of recommendations and allows the City's decision-makers to fully understand the impacts of each proposed project prior to considering approval of any of the projects and before any of the projects are constructed. The traffic analysis will be incorporated into the EIRs currently being prepared for each project.

The three proposed projects considered in the MPTA analysis include:

- Mirabella San Francisco Bay/Parkview Plaza. A Continuing Care Retirement Community (350 independent living apartments, 20 assisted living apartments, a 20-bed memory care facility, and a 30-bed skilled nursing facility), 70 affordable senior apartments, up to 50,000 sq. ft. of retail, and a 1.3 acre public plaza on 11 acres of public property adjacent to the Government Center.
- Chess Drive Office Buildings. Replaces 190,000 sq. ft. of office / warehouse space with up to 800,000 sq. ft. of office space at 1155-1191 Chess Drive.
- Gilead Sciences Campus Master Plan. Replaces some buildings, resulting in an increase from 631,000 sq. ft. of office and research and development space to 1.2 million sq. ft. of lab and office space at 300-368 Lakeside Drive.

Another approved Master Plan project, Pilgrim-Triton, was included in the traffic projections.

- Pilgrim-Triton. Replacing 256,000 sq. ft. of industrial park space and 38,000 sq. ft. of office space with a mixed-use development containing 266,000 sq. ft. of office space, 30,000 sq. ft. of retail space, and 730 residential units.

On September 4, 2008, the Planning Commission held a Study Session to review and provide comments on the Draft MPTA. Comments received at that meeting are summarized and attached to this report. Responding to the comments received on the draft, the City Council authorized a budget amendment on November 3, 2008 to:

- Add two new study intersections (Mariners Island Blvd./Reef Drive and Mariners Island Blvd./Bridgepointe Pkwy.) and an additional development (76 unit condo near mariners Island Blvd./East Third Ave.) into the analysis;
- Perform a signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Mariners Island Boulevard/Reef Drive to determine if a signal was needed for Gilead Traffic.
- Perform a sensitivity analysis for the improvements that require Caltrans approval by analyzing a "Cumulative with all projects" scenario with all improvements except the two that require Caltrans approval;
- Perform a cumulative "no project" analysis for each of the three projects to see if each project by itself would have a significant impact on the cumulative traffic conditions;

The Final MPTA was made available to the public in December 2008 (attached). The MPTA is being incorporated into the environmental impact reports (EIRs) for each of the three proposed projects. This analysis provides a clear and comprehensive set of recommendations and requirements to ensure that each of the proposed developments will either install improvements, or will contribute financially their fair share towards a comprehensive set of roadway improvements that will improve traffic and mitigate any additional traffic from the proposed project.

On November 3, 2008 City Council authorized the consultant, Fehr & Peers together with Jacobs Engineering, to assess constructability and cost of the recommended traffic improvements outlined in

the MPTA. The Feasibility Study provides an estimated cost for each improvement and a proposed methodology for sharing the costs of the improvements among the developers. This additional study is meant to provide the decision makers with information to show the financial contribution required by the developers, a possible phasing for the improvements and that the proposed improvements are feasible and reasonable.

PUBLIC NOTICING

A Notice for the June 18, 2009 Planning Commission Study Session was published in:

- Foster City Islander (June 10)
- Daily Journal (June 9)
- The Examiner – Peninsula (June 11)

The Notice was also mailed to or posted to:

- The City's Planning; Pilgrim-Triton; Mirabella; Chess/Hatch; Gilead Listserves (June 4)
- Posted at regular posting locations approved by the City (June 12)
- The City's web site (June 4)
- Foster City TV Channel 27 (June 4 – 19)
- City Electronic Marquee (June 4 – 19)

Copies of the Final MPTA and Feasibility Study are available on the City's website.

ANALYSIS

MULTI-PROJECT TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The MPTA analyzes traffic impacts for seven different scenarios ranging from Existing Conditions to Cumulative Conditions, which includes projected future traffic from the full build out of the Foster City General Plan. The MPTA concludes that the intersection of Foster City Boulevard & Chess Drive currently exceeds the established level of service (LOS) thresholds.

The MPTA also concludes that Baseline Conditions, which is defined as Existing Conditions added together with expected traffic from full occupancy of currently vacant space, completion of several currently approved but not yet constructed projects (such as Mariners Island Condominiums), and construction of pending projects (such as Pilgrim/Triton), exceeds LOS thresholds at three locations (Foster City Boulevard & Chess Drive, SR 92 Eastbound Ramps & Metro Center Boulevard, Foster City Boulevard & Marlin Avenue).

The MPTA analyzes each of the proposed three projects and finds that none of the three proposed projects would individually have significant project-level traffic impacts, although some intersections would exceed established thresholds. However, when the three projects are considered together in Cumulative Conditions (along with expected traffic from full "build-out" of Foster City per the development anticipated in the General Plan and expected long-term regional growth), two projects, Chess/Hatch and Gilead would have significant cumulative impacts. Table ES-3A, page 8 and Table ES-3B, page 9 provides a summary of facilities that exceed established thresholds.

The MPTA recommends improvements for all of the scenarios (including existing and baseline conditions) to reduce each of the significant impacts to less than significant levels, where possible. These improvements would ensure that transportation facilities in the City operate at or better than the City's minimum level of service threshold (LOS D) during peak commute times. Table ES-4A and ES-

4B, page 10 – 11 provide a summary of improvements to reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels. Two of the significant impacts are to freeway segments, which require modifications to a Caltrans facility.

ENGINEERING FEASIBILITY STUDY

Jacobs Engineering reviewed each of the proposed improvements identified in the MPTA for their potential constructability. The list of improvements was slightly modified from the MPTA. A map showing the location of the proposed 11 improvements is included on page 2, Figure 1. These improvements listed below are not in priority order:

1. Westbound SR 92 on-ramp reconstruction
2. Interlock signals on Chess Drive at Foster City Blvd & westbound SR 92 ramps
3. Lengthen northbound left-turn lane on Foster City Blvd. at Chess Drive to 650 feet
4. Lengthen westbound left-turn lane on Chess Drive at Foster City Blvd to 300 feet
5. Construct 2nd eastbound through lane on Triton Drive East of Foster City Blvd; Provide “signal overlap” phase on westbound Triton Drive at Foster City Blvd.
6. Construct 2nd eastbound through lane on Metro Center Blvd between SR 92 eastbound ramps and Foster City Blvd and interlock signals on Metro Center Blvd at Foster City Blvd. and eastbound SR 92 ramps
7. Construct northbound right-turn lane from Foster City Blvd. to Chess Drive
8. Construct 2nd westbound through lane on Chess Drive east of Foster City Blvd.
9. Consider traffic signal at Foster City Blvd./Marlin Ave
10. Close driveway on north side of Chess Drive/ westbound SR 92 ramps intersection
11. Westbound SR 92 off-ramp reconstruction

Conceptual plans for each of the improvements are presented in Appendix B of the Study. Design and construction of most of the improvements is expected to be relatively straightforward with the exception of Improvements #7 and #11. However, the Study provides design ideas for implementation of these improvements that would be analyzed as the design of the improvements evolves.

Jacobs Engineering prepared preliminary duration schedules and approximate improvement costs (Table 1, page 7). Altogether, the roadway improvement projects are estimated to take between 11 and 35 months from planning through construction. The improvements could all be designed, bid, and constructed as a single package, or they could be grouped and phased over time. The on and off ramp improvements (Improvements #1 and #11) are anticipated to take the longest amount of time due to the Caltrans permitting process. Improvement #1 is the highest priority improvement for the City because without implementation of Improvement #1, the other recommended improvements would be less effective.

To determine the feasibility of Improvement #1, staff has started discussions with Caltrans. The City has submitted the draft permit application and Caltrans has determined that a streamlined process is feasible due to the estimated cost of the improvement. These preliminary discussions support the feasibility of implementing this improvement.

The total preliminary cost estimates for all improvements is estimated to be \$7,980,000. The preliminary cost estimates for each improvement include: Permits, Engineering & Design, Plans & Specifications, Construction costs, Inspections, Land acquisition, Other costs, see Table 2 on page 9.

The study analyzed how the costs of constructing the improvements could be allocated to the four different development projects. There are a number of ways this could be accomplished. City staff has

determined that for most of the roadway improvements, the improvement cost should be shared amongst the four development projects, with costs allocated proportionally to their relative peak hour traffic generation (AM plus PM peak hour trips), see Table 3 on page 11. This method is often used to determine traffic impact fees as it is based on the idea that all of the development projects will benefit from the roadway system improvements and that the rate of benefit is directly related to the amount of traffic, or size, of the development. This method does provide flexibility if development proposals change. The shared improvements are: #1, #2, #3, #6, #9, #11, for a total cost of \$3,832,000.

For roadway improvements that specifically address a single project's need, the cost of those improvements would be borne by the individual project they are designed to serve and the construction of these improvements would only occur when and if those specific projects are developed. Improvements #4, #7, #8 are the responsibility of the Chess/Hatch project sponsor for a total of \$2,690,000. The improvements along Metro Center Blvd. and Triton Drive (Improvement #5) are needed to provide access between SR 92 and Foster City Blvd for all projects and access east of Foster City Blvd. for the Pilgrim/Triton development site. Therefore, the cost of these improvements have been split into two components: those on Metro Center Blvd. west of Foster City Blvd, which will be shared by all projects, and those on Triton Drive east of Foster City Blvd., which will be funded solely by the Pilgrim/Triton project sponsor.

The staff's goal is to construct all (or as many) of the shared roadway improvements as soon as possible, independent of the buildout phasing for the development projects, which is subject to change based on market forces. This would reduce inconvenience to the public by reducing the duration of roadway disruptions and would ensure that the traffic improvements are in place prior to the generation of substantial new traffic from the proposed developments, avoiding deterioration in levels of service. Grouping the design of the improvements into a single contract may also reduce costs. However, the timing of the improvements has to be balanced against the cost of the improvement and the availability of funding.

There are several methodologies for determining the fair share contribution for each project and the phasing of those improvements. The financial contribution and the timing of the improvements are different, yet they are linked. Therefore, different methodologies consider just one of the factors, and some consider both. Table 4 on page 13, summarizes one potential improvement cost allocation methodology. Table 5 on page 15 provides an alternative cost allocation and improvement phasing plan based on when specific phases of development might occur. Table A-5 in the Appendix is an alternative improvement phasing plan considered by the project sponsors and the Attachment "Multi-Project Development Cost Share & Project Schedule" was prepared by City staff. All of these are possible methodologies to determine the fair share cost allocation and phasing of improvements.

Discussions between staff and the project sponsors are ongoing to determine how funding can be worked out to meet the goal of constructing the shared improvements as soon as possible. The project sponsors understand that they will be required to fund their fair share of the identified improvements. The project sponsors have been cooperative and continue to work with City staff on the methodology for funding and phasing. Staff is not seeking a formal recommendation on the preferred approach from the Commission, but welcomes comments on this item.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will continue to negotiate with representatives from each of the proposed developments to determine phasing and financing for each improvement. Financial obligations and timing requirements will be outlined in the Development Agreement or final approval for each proposed project.

The reports are tentatively scheduled for review by the City Council on July 20, 2009.

ATTACHMENTS

MPTA Executive Summary

Engineering Feasibility Study (with selected Appendices)*

Comments Received on Multi-Project Traffic Study at the Planning Commission Meeting
9/4/08

Multi-Project Development Cost Share & Project Schedule

* Full copies of the Engineering Feasibility Study are available on the City's website, www.fostercity.org, and in the Community Development Department at City Hall, 610 Foster City Boulevard.