



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 16, 2015

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Clay Holstine
City Manager

SUBJECT: Status Report- San Francisco Transit/Transportation Planning Efforts Impacting Brisbane

As the City Council is aware, the City of San Francisco is involved in a number of transit and transportation planning efforts along our common border that have either direct or indirect implications on the future development of the Baylands. We have on numerous occasions directly expressed our concerns to San Francisco that these efforts are either premature (and should be put deferred until the City's planning process for the Baylands is further along) or inappropriate (contemplating or assuming land uses on the Baylands that have not been approved). San Francisco has acknowledged our concerns but have made it clear that they intend to move forward in any event.

Below is a summary of the various work programs that are underway and their status. Additionally this memo also provides an update of the design work for Geneva Avenue that is under our control and being directed by the Public Works Department.

Relocation of the Caltrain Railyard (4th and King) San Francisco is undertaking a study looking at relocating existing Caltrain storage and maintenance facilities from the the existing yard at 4th and King in order to free this site for other development. Caltrain established the parameter of studying alternate railyard sites *within the City of San Francisco*. However, San Francisco staff has indicated that the Brisbane Baylands is also being studied as a potential relocation site due to its close proximity. We have stated our objections to the Baylands being studied as a railyard site. San Francisco staff met with us once in July 2013 and there has been no further contact regarding this study, nor has anything been published to date.

Bayshore Station Location Study This San Francisco-led study is studying the "preferred location" for a Bayshore Caltrain station with a multi-modal component. This study was initiated without input from or consultation with Brisbane and Caltrain, leading staff to question both the integrity and motivation of this effort. Despite our misgivings,

the City has agreed to have staff participate in San Francisco's technical advisory committee (TAC) for this study. There has only been one TAC meeting and limited draft work products produced. The limited materials produced to date have only reinforced staff's original concerns that the overarching objective is to justify relocating the Bayshore Station northward as far as possible.

Geneva Ave/Harney Way Interim Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Feasibility Study For several years San Francisco has been studying the feasibility and potential routing of a BRT alignment connecting the new Hunters Point/Candlestick development to Bayshore Caltrain and Balboa Park BART. When this effort began, CCAG appointed two Brisbane representatives to serve on the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the study (including Councilmember Lentz), and staff participated in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Due to the lack of transparency and coordination with San Francisco's other transportation planning efforts as described above, the City concluded that our formal participation in the TAC and CAC was no longer productive. As such, Councilmember Lentz and staff have stopped attending TAC and CAC meetings. Staff continues to monitor this work effort through the review of agendas, meeting materials, and meeting minutes.

This study had evolved over time. San Francisco originally focused primarily on studying BRT alignments traversing local neighborhood streets in San Francisco (particularly Little Hollywood). These alignments generally avoided or skirted streets in Brisbane, so the implications of this work effort on Brisbane were minimal and did not warrant a substantial commitment of City staff resources to the TAC/CAC process.

However, once the preferred BRT alignment was presented in neighborhood meetings in San Francisco, it drew substantial neighborhood opposition. In response, San Francisco expressed its desire to study Beatty Avenue as a potential BRT alignment. City staff has on numerous occasions indicated a willingness to consider such an alignment, and has requested a meeting with a limited number of San Francisco representatives and their technical consultants to discuss the proposed BRT alignment design and potential operational impacts on the current and future use of Beatty Avenue. While San Francisco staff has been unable to arrange the meeting as requested, they continue to schedule TAC, CAC, and community meetings apparently for further discussion of the Beatty alignment.

Given the lack of technical clarity regarding the proposal and what the implications might be on the City of Brisbane, staff does not believe further committee or community meetings at this point in the process are productive. Rather, staff believes continued dialogue on this issue without a strong informational foundation on foundation will likely be counterproductive and create confusion among the meeting participants and the public. Staff remains committed to evaluating the technical implications of such a proposal and continuing a dialogue with San Francisco once there is meaningful information to discuss.

I would further point out the CAC/TAC structure is San Francisco's traditional way of doing business in these types of planning efforts. In addition, while this structure might

make sense for engaging multiple stakeholders within the City of San Francisco, Brisbane is not an “advisory stakeholder” to the City of San Francisco when it comes to land use decisions for the Baylands or the use and design of Brisbane city streets. Engagement and discussions between Brisbane and San Francisco should recognize our equal levels of authority and autonomy, not relegate Brisbane’s input to that of an advisory stakeholder.

Geneva Avenue Design Status

Using San Mateo County Measure A funds, Brisbane city staff is completing a supplemental technical study for Geneva. This study is analyzing 3-dimensional, construction phasing, and final construction issues related to the four variants studied in the Baylands EIR, as well as our current understanding of the to be initiated EIR for the Recology Expansion project.

This work is expected to be completed in June 2015. The speculative studies under review by San Francisco have not been considered as part of this work effort.