

**Attachment A:
Summary of Comments and Responses to Comments on the
Environmental Assessment**

INTRODUCTION

This document contains a summary of the written comments received on the Environmental Assessment of the Mission Bay Transit Loop Project during the 30-day public review period from May 7, 2013 through June 10, 2013. A complete set of written comments and responses to each of the comments are also provided. Several comments involve similar issues/topics. Accordingly, Master Responses are presented below. Master Responses are intended to provide a single, consistent response to multiple comments or questions that were submitted on the same topic. As appropriate, some specific responses presented for individual comments that are not addressed in the Master Responses.

MASTER RESPONSES

Master Response No. 1: Alternative location at the Muni Metro East Facility (MME)

This Master Response responds to the comments submitted seeking clarification or questions regarding the withdrawal of the MME as an alternative location of the Mission Bay Transit Loop.

The Muni Metro East (MME) facility is located about a mile south of the proposed Loop, on Illinois and 25th Streets, near Cesar Chavez Street and a block from the T-Third Light Rail Line. This location was evaluated by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and was discussed in Section 2.3 of the EA. It was rejected because this alternative location would add travel time, would require redesign of the facility, would add cost to the project, would require the procurement of additional light rail vehicles (LRV), and would conflict with the storage and maintenance activities of MME.

Travel time: Turning a train around in and out of the MME facility is estimated to take approximately 10 minutes due to track configuration and switch technology and placement. When including the travel time between 19th Street and the yard of four to five minutes and an additional four to five minutes out of the yard, the total travel time increase is approximately 20 minutes.

Cost: Extending the service to the MME facility would require requiring a redesign of the facility. The layout of the facility does not allow for the addition of a loop on the west side of the yard without a significant capital expenditure. Furthermore, at least three additional two-car trains would be needed to maintain the planned 7.5 minute service. North of the Loop, a decrease from 9-minute to 4-minute headways is indicated in the Central Subway Service Plan. At a cost of an estimated cost of \$5 million for each car, a two-car train is estimated to cost \$10. Three two-car trains would require an investment of \$30 million in new rail vehicles. Considering that the estimated cost of the Loop is nearly \$6.26 million. The cost of the additional LRVs is nearly quadruple the cost of the project. The extra cost for operations from the additional travel time for all Short Line light rail vehicles is estimated to be \$3.7 million annually.

Maintenance facility operations: While trains are currently diverted at the MME facility, the facility cannot absorb the volume of trains the will be required to be diverted on a regularly scheduled basis. As stated in Section 3.13, page 46 of the EA: “[t]he Loop would allow a larger volume to trains to be diverted toward downtown than the volume that can be managed at the Muni Metro East facility.” The MME facility was developed and built as a maintenance and storage facility. The yard does not include a transit loop suited to the anticipated volume and frequency of trains and is not designed to handle regular

in-service train movements every 5-10 minutes. A loop at the MME would impact to train maintenance and operations at the MME, particularly during construction of the project.

Master Response No. 2: Alternative locations for the Loop

This Master Response responds to the comments submitted seeking clarification or questions regarding the consideration of other alternative locations for the Mission Bay Transit Loop.

Screening: Alternate locations were screened during the planning process for the T-Third Street rail line. Alternate loop locations were analyzed in the area bounded by Mariposa Street, Cesar Chavez Street, Indiana Street and the waters of San Francisco Bay. These sites were reviewed for possible residential impacts, grade issues that could impact rail transit operations, parking impacts, vehicular traffic impacts, including access to freeway ramps, and cost impacts. A comparison of the alternative locations were summarized in Table 2-1 in the EA and discussed in Section 3.7. Below Table 2-1 has been revised to in response to comments to provide clarification on the considerations during screening of the alternative locations.

Alternative location south of 23rd Street: Options south of 23rd St. would require additional LRVs and would incur added annual ongoing operations costs of roughly \$3.7 million. Also, as noted in Section 1.1, ridership on the T-Third Street segment in Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods is also anticipated to increase with rising need to access new high-density retail, and commercial establishments in these neighborhoods. The proposed project would not preclude a station on Illinois, which would provide access to new retail and commercial establishments and future developments in the Central Waterfront neighborhoods and Pier 70. Options further south of the proposed project would not provide this access.

Alternative location on 23rd Street, Illinois Avenue and 24th Street: A loop located on 23rd Street, Illinois Avenue and 24th Street is similar a loop at the MME alternative location, although the length of loop at 23rd Street would not be as long as the MME. The added travel time for a loop on 24th and 23rd street would be similar to the additional travel time to the MME alternative location, which is estimated at five minutes in each direction. A preliminary analysis indicates that the four minute frequency needed for Central Subway service to Downtown and Chinatown could not be met without additional LRV equipment at this location. Conservatively, an estimated one or two additional two-car train sets may be needed at a cost of \$5 million per car for a total of \$10 to \$20 million. Considering that the estimated cost of the Loop is nearly \$6.26 million. The cost of the additional LRVs may double or triple the cost of the project. Similar to the MME, the added annual operations costs would be an estimated \$3.7 million.

Furthermore, as noted in Section 1.1, ridership on the T-Third Street segment in Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods is also anticipated to increase with rising need to access new high-density retail, and commercial establishments in these neighborhoods. Compared to the proposed project, an alternative location on 24th St., Illinois Ave. and 23rd St. would be located in an industrial area; however, it would not provide the flexibility to add a station to access to new retail and commercial establishments and future developments in the Central Waterfront neighborhoods and Pier 70. Therefore, the 24th St., Illinois Ave. and 23rd St. was eliminated from further consideration.

Table 2-1: Comparison of Alternative Locations for the Loop

	Street 1	S, R, P, V*	Street 2	S, R, P, V*	Street 3	S, R, P, V*	Added cost**	Comment
1	Mariposa	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= No	Tennessee	S= No R= Yes P= Yes VT= No	18th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict with access to I-280 (exit) ramp. Requires change to one-way direction w/loop direction due to I-280 ramp. Existing residential loft building and perpendicular parking on Tennessee.
2	Mariposa	S=No R=No P=Yes VT= No	Illinois	S=No R=Yes P=Yes VT=No	18th	S=No R=Yes P=Yes VT=No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict with boarding platform at Mariposa Street. Moving or extensively remodeling the station would have significant cost and construction impacts. Eliminates parking on Illinois St.
3	18th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Tennessee	S= Yes R= Yes P= Yes VT= No	19th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slope on 19th St. is over 9% max grade for LRVs. Layover would conflict with traffic to Potrero Hill and freeway onramp. Requires a change to one-way direction w/loop direction due to I-280 ramp. Six residential buildings on eastside of Tennessee St.
4	18th	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Illinois	S= No R= Yes P= Yes VT=Yes	19th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slope present, but not as great as 19th Street between Tennessee and 3rd Street. Residential units built in area after T-Third project approved in 1990s, adjacent to the loop. 11 garage openings for commercial or passenger vehicles were counted, including 1 loading dock.
5	19th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Tennessee	S= No R= Yes P= Yes VT= No	20th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict with boarding platform on 20th Street. Moving or extensively remodeling the station would have significant cost and construction impacts. Slope on 19th St. is over 9% max grade for LRVs. Requires a change to one-way direction w/loop direction due to I-280 ramp. Perpendicular parking on Tennessee would need to become parallel parking and parking capacity would be reduced.
6	19th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Illinois	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	20th	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19th St. has slope, although not as steep as west side of Third St. near Tennessee. 20th St. access to Third St. would require moving or extensively remodeling the 20th St. station. This would have significant cost and construction impacts. Adverse traffic and parking impacts at corner of 20th St. and Illinois. Eliminates parking on both sides of Illinois Street due to offset for the United Pacific rail tracks. Requires a change to one-way direction w/loop direction. Development plans at Pier 70 and existing port tenants would be impacted by this alternative more than 18th/19th Street alternative because 20th Street is a busier traffic street that accesses a much larger area of Port 70 property.
7	20th	S= Yes R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Tennessee	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=No	22nd	S= No R= Yes P= Yes VT= Yes	Yes. The longer loop would incur higher cost for construction and operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This loop is longer than any of the other options. Parking loss would occur on 22nd St. Requires change to one-way direction on 20th St. due to I-280 ramp.

	Street 1	S, R, P, V*	Street 2	S, R, P, V*	Street 3	S, R, P, V*	Added cost**	Comment
8	20th	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Illinois	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=Yes	22nd	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Yes. A longer loop would incur higher costs for construction and operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This loop is longer than other options. Eliminates parking on Illinois Street. Traffic and parking problems are most difficult at corner of 20th St. and Illinois. Port development plans at Pier 70 and existing port tenants would be impacted by this alternative more than on 19th St. because 20th Street is a busier traffic street that accesses a much larger area of Port 70 property.
9	22nd	S= No R= Yes P= Yes VT=Yes	Tennessee	S=Yes R=Yes P=Yes VT=Yes	23rd	S= No R= No P= Yes VT=No	Yes. Requires additional LRVs and added operations costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dead end on Tennessee prevents loop completion without right-of way acquisition and displacement of businesses. Results in substantial loss of parking on 22nd St.
10	22nd	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Illinois	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=Yes	23rd	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=No	Yes. Requires additional LRVs and added operations costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict with station platform at 23rd St. station. Moving or extensively remodeling the station would have significant cost and construction impacts. Driveway interference with west side businesses. 19 garage openings for commercial vehicles or passenger vehicles were counted on the 22nd Street, Illinois Avenue and 23rd Street loop. Five of openings were loading docks which are a barrier to moving a truck off the street. Results in substantial loss of parking on 22nd St.
11	23rd	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= No	Tennessee	S= No R= Yes P= Yes VT=Yes	24th	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Yes. Requires additional LRVs and added operations costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates parking on Tennessee St. Multiple conflicts with trucks and business driveways. One or two additional two-car train sets may be needed at a total cost of \$10 to \$20 million.
12	23rd	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=No	Illinois and Michigan	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=No	24th	S= No R= No P= Yes VT= Yes	Yes. Requires additional LRVs and added operations costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple conflicts with trucks and business driveways on Illinois. Michigan does not connect 23rd St. to 24th St. Right-of way acquisition and displacement of businesses would be required to complete the loop. One or two additional two-car train sets may be needed at a total cost of \$10 to \$20 million. The added travel time for a loop would be similar to the additional travel time to the MME alternative location, which is estimated at five minutes in each direction. Crosses a United Pacific Rail Crossing.
13	24th	S=No R= No P=Yes VT=Yes	Tennessee	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=Yes	25th	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=No	Yes. Requires additional LRVs and added operations costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or two additional two-car train sets may be needed at a total cost of \$10 to \$20 million. The added travel time for a loop would be similar to the additional travel time to the MME alternative location, which is estimated at five minutes in each direction. This location is a heavy warehouse, trucking area. There are potential conflicts with truck movement.
14	24th	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=Yes	Illinois	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=No	25th	S=No R=No P=No VT=No	Yes. Requires additional LRVs and added operations costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or two additional two-car train sets may be needed at a total cost of \$10 to \$20 million. The added travel time for a loop at this location would be similar to the additional travel time to the MME alternative location, which is estimated at five minutes in each direction. This location is a heavy warehouse, trucking area. There are potential conflicts with truck movement. Crosses a United Pacific Rail Crossing.

	Street 1	S, R, P, V*	Street 2	S, R, P, V*	Street 3	S, R, P, V*	Added cost**	Comment
15	25th	S=No R=No P=No VT=No	Illinois or Muni Metro Yard	S=No R=No P=Yes VT=No	Cesar Chavez	S=No R=No P=No VT= Yes	Yes. Requires additional LRVs and added operations costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muni Metro Yard is not set up to dedicate a loop track. A new track structure would need to be built. Construction of a loop track would have significant impacts to operation of the yard. • Turning a train in and out of the MME is estimated to take approximately 10 minutes due to track configuration and switch technology and placement. When including the additional travel time between 19th Street and the yard of four to five minutes in each direction, travel time would increase by 20 minutes. • Three additional two-car train sets may be needed at a total cost of \$30 million. • The fire lane track would need to be used or an alternate track arrangement would need to be developed.

Notes:

*Slope=S, Residential=R, Parking=P, Vehicular (Traffic Impact)=V

**Added cost compared to the proposed loop on 18th Street, Illinois Avenue and 19th Street. Options of a loop below 23rd St. will require additional LRVs to maintain anticipated service frequency and incur added annual ongoing operations costs of roughly \$3.7 million.

Master Response No. 3: Traffic and circulation

Master Response No. 3 responds to the comments submitted seeking clarification or questions regarding the estimated traffic volumes and impacts to roadway capacity and level of service.

Traffic on Illinois Street and Third Street are discussed in Section 3.12.1 of the EA. Traffic volumes on Third Street and Illinois Street are estimated based on the count data collected in the past by the SFMTA combined with estimated traffic growth from recent developments in the vicinity of the project since SFMTA's data collection. Estimated traffic volumes include heavy-truck traffic.

As noted in Section 3.12 of the EA, the proposed project would not eliminate travel lanes and would not affect roadway capacity on Illinois Street. The width of Illinois Street with the Loop would not preclude heavy trucks from using Illinois Street as discussed in Section 3.12.1 and shown on Figure 2-1 in the EA. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to generate any additional vehicle trips on the street network nor reduce the roadway capacity significantly. It would generate approximately additional eight light rail vehicle trips per hour during the AM and PM peak periods. At 18th and 19th Street crossing Third Street, the project would result in an approximately 9 seconds of delays at these intersections. The intersection of Third and 19th Street would continue to operate at LOS B. Therefore, the streets would continue to provide sufficient capacity for daily trips and the peak hour traffic in the project area.

As noted in Section 2.1.1, to avoid reduction in roadway capacity while trains are making their way onto Illinois Street from 18th Street or onto Third Street from 19th Street, the SFMTA would implement one of the three design options after consideration of public comments. SFMTA has selected Design Option 2, which would maintain traffic on 18th and 19th Street, but parking on one side of the street would be removed.

The proposed project would allow trains to turn around for special events (e.g., baseball games, concerts, street fairs) and during peak periods to meet the projected service needs between Mission Bay and the Market Street Muni Metro corridor. Implementation of the proposed project is expected to improve operating conditions at 18th and 19th Streets by offering improved transit service (see Section 3.12.5), which encourages a shift in transportation mode from automobiles to transit.

Master Response No. 4: Current and Future Land Use

Master Response No. 4 responds to the comments submitted regarding analysis of impacts to current and future residential and commercial development in the Central Waterfront area, including the Dogpatch neighborhood, Pier 70, and Crane Cove Park.

The EA includes a review of the changes to the environment that have occurred since 1999, the current characteristics of the neighborhood, and reasonably foreseeable land uses when evaluating the impact of the proposed loop. Potential effects of the project on current and future land use are discussed in Section 3.7 of the EA. Section 2.1.1 of the EA mentions development of the Pier 70 by Port of San Francisco that includes the development of Crane Cove Park east of Illinois Street between Mariposa and 19th Streets along the Bay shoreline, which are to be completed at a later date. Pier 70 and Crane Cove Park are currently in early planning and conceptual design stages. Environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act for development of Pier 70 or Crane Cove Park have not been conducted.

As mentioned in Section 3.7, the vision for land use and transportation changes in Central Waterfront was first articulated in the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Program that covers the neighborhoods of Mission District, East South of Market, Central Waterfront, Showplace Square, and Potrero Hill. The vision for each of these neighborhoods was incorporated into area plans included in the *General Plan* and

the *Central Waterfront Area Plan*. By expanding the frequency of transit service from the Central Waterfront area to Chinatown, Mission Bay, and South of Market neighborhoods, the project would help to achieve the goal in the area plans for the Eastern Neighborhoods to 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. Providing residents of the Central Waterfront with more frequent transit service towards downtown San Francisco is also consistent with the policy objectives of the Central Waterfront Area Plan to establish a land use pattern that supports and encourages transit use.

Master Response No. 5: Bicycle Circulation and Safety

There are several streets in the city where light rail trains, vehicles, and bicycles, safely travel in mixed traffic, such as Market Street and Duboce Avenue. Safe operation of light rail under similar conditions in other parts of the city indicates that mixed traffic do not pose significant safety problems to train operation.

As shown on Figure 2-1, the proposed project would not eliminate the existing bike lanes on Illinois Street. The proposed project would not change current operation or width of bike lanes on Illinois Street. As stated in Section 3.12.7 of the EA, traffic at the intersections of 18th and Illinois Streets and 19th and Illinois Streets would be regulated by signals which would provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access. Overall the proposed project is expected to benefit pedestrians and bicyclists within the project area by improving the transit system, providing improved pedestrian facilities, and improve multi-modal transportation connections.

Master Response No. 6: Passenger Platform/ Station at Illinois Street

As noted in Section 2.1.8 of the EA, a passenger platform/ station at Illinois Street is not part of the proposed project. The proposed project would not preclude a future station at Illinois Street, which could be constructed as a separate project pending sufficient right-of-way clearance, operational support, and additional funding.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

COMMENT NO. 1

From: Diana Bowen <diana_bowen@gensler.com>

Subject: Mission Bay Loop T-Line turnaround

Date: May 30, 2013 2:37:25 PM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

in addition to my previous comments, I would also like to express favor for having the turnaround at 25th Street and Illinois (instead of 18th Street) to connect with the 22-Fillmore line @ its 20th Street terminus. | **1.1**

thanks again

From: Diana Bowen **Sent:** May 30, 2013 2:06 PM **To:** 'darton.ito@sfmta.com' **Subject:** Mission Bay Loop T-Line turnaround

to whom it may concern:

I am writing in favor of the Mission Bay Loop T-Line turnaround. ANY improvement to this Muni line, in ANY capacity will be a welcome improvement. | **1.2**

Currently trains during rush hour are crowded even before reaching this point. Perhaps double-trains could be run on this line at peak times or on baseball game days. | **1.3**

Additional trains to service this neighborhood would be a good thing!

thank you,

Diana Bowen
1917 20th Street
SF

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 1

1.1. Comment expressing support for an alternative location at 25th and Illinois is noted. The Muni Metro East (MME) facility is located about a mile south of the proposed Loop, on Illinois and 25th Streets. Refer to Master Response No. 1 and 2 regarding screening of alternative locations for the Loop.

1.2. Comment expressing support for the Mission Bay Transit Loop Project is noted.

1.3. SFMTA plans to operate two-car trains on this line between the Mission Bay Loop turnaround (south end) and Chinatown (north end). As demand on the T-Third Street Line increases with the influx of development, SFMTA will closely monitor ridership and determine if two-car trains are needed along the entire length of the line in the future.

COMMENT NO. 2



COMMENT CARD
MISSION BAY LOOP MEETING – JUNE 4, 2013

NAME Steve Rosen
AFFILIATION / BUSINESS Bayview / City Planning
ADDRESS 1795 Oakdale Ave
EMAIL
PHONE 408 823-5693

...the public was building a loop
in Ellinors in front of - but not
inside of - the Muni East barn.



COMMENT CARD
MISSION BAY LOOP MEETING – JUNE 4, 2013

I am for the project and for it where it is planned. The Dogpatch is a tiny neighborhood that doesn't need the City to bend over backwards to double its T-Line frequency at the expense of the whole system. LRV's aren't loud. They don't smell. Engineers are smarter than us about transportation. ~~The only sensible alternative provided by~~

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 2

Comment expressing support for the Loop is noted.

COMMENT NO. 3



COMMENT CARD
MISSION BAY LOOP MEETING – JUNE 4, 2013

NAME *RICHARD WIENER*
AFFILIATION / BUSINESS
ADDRESS *700 ILLINOIS ST # 207*
EMAIL *SF CA 94107*
PHONE

*Move Loop to 25 ST / ILLINOIS / C. CHAVEZ!
NOT 18 / ILL / ST*

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 3

Comment expressing support for an alternate location for the Loop is noted. See Master Response No. 1 and No. 2 regarding alternative locations for the Loop.

COMMENT NO. 4

From: Marc Goldfine <ionball1@comcast.net>

Subject: T-Line turnaround at 18th

Date: June 4, 2013 9:27:03 PM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

As a local business owner I believe it is of great importance to put the T turnaround further south than 18th street. Too much has changed since the plan was developed. By the end of this year there will be at least 12 establishments serving alcohol on premises between 20th and 22nd St. This number will only grow in the future While we do our best to discourage drunk driving, the sad truth is that many people would rather get in their cars and drive rather than walk the extra few blocks to get to and from these establishments. Putting the turnaround at 18th St. leaves SFMTA failing to service a growing neighborhood and puts the public at risk as well. We rely on Muni not only to help our businesses, but to make it easier for people to make smart decisions when coming to and from our establishments. Please reconsider this outdated and inadequate plan. Thank you.

4.1

4.2

Marc Goldfine

Dogpatch Saloon

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 4

4.1. Comment expressing support for an alternative location at south of the project is noted. Alternate locations were evaluated in the planning process for the T-Third Street rail line. These locations along with reasons for their unsuitability are listed in Table 2-1 in the EA. Refer to Section 2.3 for a discussion of alternatives withdrawn from consideration.

4.2. Potential effects of the project on current and future land use are discussed in Section 3.7 of the EA. See Master Response No. 4.

The loop, as proposed, would not add a station to the T-Third Street Rail Line; however, following the completion of the Central Subway, the loop would provide the ability for the SFMTA to place more trains on the T-Third Street rail line, which would increase frequency of service to the area between 20th and 23rd Streets (trains arriving every 7.5 minutes). Presently, there are transit stops at Third Street and Mariposa, 20th, 23rd, and Marin Streets that service the area between 20th and 23rd Streets. It is about a two to five minute walk between each of these stations. See Master Response No. 6.

COMMENT NO. 5

June 4, 2013

I have looked over the Mission Bay loop draft EA. I do not understand why the alternative for having the loop turn east onto 24th, north onto Illinois, and then west onto 23rd does not seem to have been considered in the study.

This loop appears to have several advantages:

It would allow the 24th station to be served by all trains and provide full access to the dogpatch neighborhood.

24th street and 23rd appear to be wider and less traveled than 18th and 19th streets.

There is a wider sidewalk on this section of Illinois that will provide more room pedestrians and cyclists.

The area to the east is industrial and would less impacted by the loop.

Can you explain why this alternative does not seem to have been considered in the study?

The existing plan is deeply flawed and out of date. I really think new alternatives need to be considered.

Keith Abey, S.E. Senior Associate

Jacobs Associates.

(415) 249-8203

49 Stevenson Street, 3rd Floor

San Francisco, CA 94105-2950

www.jacobssf.com

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 5

Comment expressing support for an alternative location is noted. Refer to Master Response No. 1 and No. 2 regarding alternative locations withdrawn from consideration. The 24th St., Illinois Ave. and 23rd St. was eliminated from further consideration because it would add travel time resulting in additional capital expenditures for additional LRVs and increase the cost to operate daily service. A loop located on 23rd Street, Illinois Avenue and 24th Street is similar a loop at the MME alternative location, although the length of loop at 23rd Street would not be as long as the MME. The loop would be located further south than the 18th/19th Street alternative. The added travel for a loop on 24th and 23rd street would be similar to the additional travel time to the MME alternative location, which is roughly five minutes in each direction. A preliminary analysis is that the four minute frequency planned for Central Subway service to Downtown and Chinatown could not be met without additional LRV equipment. An estimated one or two additional two-car train sets may needed at a cost of \$5 million per car for a total of \$10 to \$20 million. The estimated cost of the Loop is nearly \$6.26 million. The cost of the additional LRVs may more than double the cost of the Loop. The added annual operations costs would be an estimated \$3.7 million.

Furthermore, as noted in Section 1.1, ridership on the T-Third Street segment in Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods is also anticipated to increase with rising need to access new high-density retail, and commercial establishments in these neighborhoods. Compared to the proposed project, an alternative location on 24th St., Illinois Ave. and 23rd St. would be located in an industrial area and would not provide the access to new retail and commercial establishments and future developments in the Central Waterfront neighborhoods and Pier 70. Therefore, the 24th St., Illinois Ave. and 23rd St. was eliminated from further consideration.

COMMENT NO. 6

J. D. BEAN

700 ILLINOIS STREET #201
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94107
June 4, 2013

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Attn: Mr. Darton Ito
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, California 94103

RE: Draft Environmental Assessment for Mission Bay Transit Loop Project

Dear Mr. Ito:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the subject Environmental Assessment (EA) dated May 6, 2013.

I am the President of the 700 Illinois Street Homeowners' Association and am writing on behalf of the twenty owners and thirty-four residents at 700 Illinois Street. We are opposed to the Mission Bay Transit Loop Project (Loop) as it is presented in the draft and we feel strongly that a more logical, service-oriented, and cost-effective solution to the Loop already exists at the SFMTA's Muni Metro East (MME) facility just 0.6 miles south of the proposed project.

6.1

The Mission Bay area is the fastest growing area of San Francisco. The facts on which the report was based are outdated and no longer reflect the current environmental conditions. We urge the SFMTA to update the Environmental Assessment based upon current conditions in the area, and to consider our proposed alternative as a location for the Loop. The fact is that there is absolutely zero support for the current proposal within the community.

There appear to be numerous inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the draft EA. Some of these are enumerated below.

1. "Alternatives Considered but Rejected" (Section 2.3, page 12): Paragraph 2 of this section was inserted following suggestions to utilize the MME facility that were voiced during SFMTA's outreach meetings. This paragraph is disingenuous, at best.
 - a. The facility is substantially less than "a mile" south of the proposed Loop.

6.2

- b. The assertion that MME “does not currently have the infrastructure for a revenue service turnaround” is directly contradicted later in the EA (Section 3.13, page 46, paragraph 12) which states, in part, “Currently, trains on the T-Third line are diverted from the line at Muni Metro East facility...when additional service is needed to accommodate ridership toward downtown associated with special events or when a train needs to be removed from service.” 6.3
- c. The assertion that use of MME would increase travel time by approximately 20 minutes appears to be inaccurate: it takes approximately five minutes for current trains to travel between 18th and 25th Streets. 6.4
- d. The estimated capital costs of \$30 million and operation and maintenance costs of \$3.7 million are completely unsubstantiated in the EA. 6.5

Based upon these inaccurate data and unsubstantiated cost estimates, the SFMTA declined to evaluate the option of using MME. We urge SFMTA to change its position and to evaluate the MME option seriously since it appears to solve most of the objections to the proposed Loop that have been voiced by local residents (please refer to the Committee for Reevaluation of T-Line Loop’s letter to Supervisor Malia Cohen dated April 30, 2013, a copy of which is attached. If the MME facility were to be seriously considered, the advantages would be many: double tracks in both northerly and southerly directions already exist; the trains would be turned around on two tracks apart from, but parallel to, Illinois Street; facilities for drivers already exist at MME; the facility is in an industrial area rather than a residential area; and the turnaround would occur over the course of two city blocks rather than just one. 6.6

- 2. The draft EA includes Table 2-1 (pages 13-14) that indicates why alternative locations for the Loop were rejected in a 1999 evaluation. Alternative locations were rejected for precisely the reasons that local residents are objecting to the current Loop proposal, to wit: driveway conflicts, locations with mixed residential and commercial uses, elimination of parking, conflict with Port tenants and development plans at Pier 70, plans for property development along the site, conflict with traffic overpass to Potrero Hill, and vehicular impact with I-280 access ramp. 6.7

- 3. The draft EA (Section 3.12, “Transportation”) does not adequately address the following traffic issues on Illinois Street:

- a. There is no mention of the fact that the Port plans to extend 19th Street as the primary commercial entrance to the BAE ship repair facility and to Crane Cove Park on Pier 70. 6.8

- b. There is no discussion of the fact that the construction of the T-Line made the traffic lanes on 3rd Street too narrow for many large, heavy-duty trucks and that Illinois Street is now used as a primary transport corridor into the city from the south for these vehicles. **6.9**
 - c. There is no discussion of the effect on the safety of existing bicycle lanes on Illinois Street as traffic is constricted between 18th and 19th Streets, particularly if truck traffic needs to veer around the proposed passenger platform mentioned in Section 2.1.8. **6.10**
 - d. There is no mention of the fact that Illinois Street is a primary transit corridor to the south following baseball games and special events at AT&T Park, or that westbound 18th Street is heavily used at those times for access to the northbound I-280, or that 20th Street, just south of the proposed Loop is heavily used at those times for access to the southbound I-280 and to southbound US 101 via Pennsylvania Street. Traffic problems at these times would clearly be negatively impacted with the addition of the proposed Loop down the middle of Illinois Street and, particularly, if the Loop is used to stage two-double-car N-Judah trains on the Loop at those exact special-event times (Section 2.1.9). **6.11**
 - e. It appears to many of us that the conclusions in virtually every sub-section of Section 3.12 are in contradiction with the on-the-ground facts.
4. While the proposed Loop is being funded, in part, by the Lifeline Transportation Commission in support of improved mobility and accessibility needs in low-income communities, it will make the connection to the 48 Muni bus stop at 20th Street, the closest link to the Protrero Terrace and Annex public housing units, much less frequent than if the MME facility were chosen. **6.12**
5. “Purpose and Need” (Section 1.1, paragraph 7): This paragraph states “The Loop at this location would also provide the SFMTA with an ability to remove disabled trains from this portion of the T-Third Street line, thereby minimizing effects on system service levels.” This “purpose and need” appears to be contrary to common sense: the proposed Loop at 19th Street only has northbound tracks so that disabled trains would be turned back north to travel several miles to a maintenance facility, rather than just continuing 0.6 miles south to the MME facility. **6.13**

SF Municipal Transportation Agency
Mr. Darton Ito
June 5, 2013

We thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the draft EA. We hope our comments will be useful in urging the San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority to reject the proposed Loop in favor of changing procedures at Muni Metro East to accommodate the desired turnaround.

Sincerely,

Joel D. Bean
President, 700 Illinois Street HOA

Cc: Leona Bridges
Cheryl Brinkman
Andrea Bruss
Janet Carpinelli
Malia Cohen
Malcolm Heinicke
Jerry Lee
Tom Nolan
Joél Ramos
Christina Rubke
700 Illinois Street Owners

Attachment to J.D. Bean Letter

SF Municipal Transportation Agency
Mr. Darton Ito
June 5, 2013

Committee For Reevaluation of T-Line Loop
c/o Bill Schwartz, President
700 Illinois St., Unit 203
San Francisco, CA 94107
415-291-8655

Supv. Malia Cohen
City of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 272
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

April 30, 2013

In Reference to:

Mission Bay Transit Loop Project, San Francisco, CA
Federal Transportation Agency is the lead agency and SF Municipal Transportation Authority is the project sponsor
DOT Allocation for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Activity (TIGER) funds

Dear Ms. Cohen:

This letter and attachment is intended to bring your attention to a federally funded Mission Bay Transit Loop Project originally planned in 1999, which, if implemented, would create a myriad of problems for residents, traffic flow, bicyclists, and local businesses, while not providing all the benefits it could if it were relocated.

Due to dramatic neighborhood development unforeseen 14 years ago when the loop was planned, the proposed loop will have many adverse effects. Most importantly, an alternative loop location with tracks already installed only six blocks further south would provide a much more ideal location for the loop, at lower costs, with tangible advantages, and with little if any of the problems noted in the attached.

Therefore, this Committee, as well as neighboring property owners, in addition to neighborhood groups and businesses, are seeking your help in bringing about a reevaluation of the current project and whether relocation would be recommended.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Bill Schwartz
President

Attachment: Petition for Revaluation of the Federally Funded Mission Bay Transit Loop Project, San Francisco, CA

SF Municipal Transportation Agency
Mr. Darton Ito
June 5, 2013

**Petition for Revaluation of the FTA Funded Mission Bay Transit Loop Project
By Residents and Businesses in the Dogpatch Area
San Francisco, CA**

BACKGROUND

Once an outpost, our neighborhood, called Dogpatch, has become over the past 12 years, since the transit loop project was planned, one of the "hot" new expanding areas, booming with large residential construction that is adding hundreds of new apartments and condos and thousands of residents, as well as new businesses.

MAJOR NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGES

Among the many changes that have taken place since the loop project was planned are the following:

- The 20-unit, 5-story work-live building at 700 Illinois
- The 35-unit 5-story apartment building at 550 18th St.
- A new 42,000 seat ballpark, AT&T Park, about one mile north
- The 105-unit 7-story apartment building at 2121 Third St.
- The coming Crane Cove Park east of Illinois St. from Mariposa St. to 19th St.
- A major redevelopment of Pier 70 area and its historic buildings
- New construction of multi-unit buildings, some underway and some recently built
- A developing business district around 22nd St. and Third St.

CURRENT LOOP PROPOSAL

The proposed "Loop" would bring about one-third of the Third Street Light Rail Streetcars running south along Third Street curving onto 18th Street heading east for one block, turn south along Illinois St. for one block, and then turn right on 19th Street, then curve back onto Third Street, thereby reversing direction and heading north towards downtown.

The current proposal is intended to allow the streetcars to have a faster turnaround to carry local residents towards the city center and to other transportation, such as BART and CalTrans. While this is a worthy objective, the location of this turnaround is what we question because a potential turnaround could be created at a major public transportation depot facility (MUNI Metro East-MME) at 25th Street, only six block further south.

ADVANTAGES OF AN ALTERNATIVE LOOP LOCATION AT THE 25TH STREET MUNI METRO EAST FACILITY

6.14

By placing the loop at the existing 25th Street MME Facility, which already has turnaround capability, instead of the proposed 18th -Illinois-19th loop, the Third St. streetcars would:

- a. Actually serve the expanding and growing Dogpatch/Central Waterfront area and not only Mission Bay and north
- b. Reach the 22nd Street Caltrans station, which serves many heading to/from Silicon Valley
- c. Better serve the emerging businesses along 3rd St. from 20th to 24th and along 20th Street and 22nd Street.
- d. Better serve the huge industrial/commercial American Industrial Center
- e. Allow streetcar drivers to refresh and use restrooms at the MME depot
- f. Allow for stacking of streetcars and for disabled streetcars to be taken offline directly into the depot for repair more efficiently
- g. Avoid noise and vibration disturbance to hundreds of residents on 18th, Illinois, and 19th Streets, which will reduce property values and property taxes

- h. Avoid traffic slowdowns caused by the 75-foot streetcars blocking/queuing on these same neighborhood streets
- i. Keep these streets safer for cars and bicycles and pedestrians
- j. Prevent accidents as cars exit building garages on these narrow streets
- k. Save transit worker costs by having managers and drivers from the current depot facility right at the turnaround loop
- l. Avoid loss of parking spaces on 18th and 19th Streets in an already difficult parking area
- m. Avoid after-ballgame cars having to go circuitously to get to the Hwy 280 North entrance on 18th St., which would likely become one-way.
- n. Save funds not spent on the proposed new loop that could be used for the Central Subway project, which will be connected to the Third Street Light Rail project.

6.14
cont'd

Further Discussion of the Impact of the Current Proposal

1. **19th St. Traffic Bottleneck.** The Port of San Francisco currently plans to build the primary commercial entrance to the BAE shipyard and to the huge business development at Pier 70, from 19th Street, the same street proposed to be used by the turnaround streetcar.

6.15

2. **Illinois St. Congestion.** Illinois Street is now the major thoroughfare for commercial trucks between Caesar Chavez St. and 16th Streets and a designated Commuter Bike Lane. Streetcars and the addition of traffic signals on Illinois Street would cause major disruptions to this traffic flow, causing additional local air pollution and noise. The same disruption would occur on Third St., a major automobile thoroughfare. The addition of a station on Illinois St. between 18th and 19th Sts. would cause additional disruption of traffic flow. A better station location would be nearer the Dogpatch commercial 22nd Street area.

6.16

3. **Conflicts With Garage Entrances.** Since the original T-line plans were developed 12 years ago, large multi-unit residences with garages will border five sides of the proposed turnaround. This can be expected to be problematical if not *dangerous*.

6.17

4. **Residential disruption.** Both 18th and 19th Streets are narrow and short and the noise of such a short turn will be disruptive to those at home and those who work at home. Additionally, it will be potentially dangerous to residents as well as to users of the new Crane Cove Park. In contrast, the existing turnaround lines at 25th Street (MME) are near commercial/industrial properties and so would have none of these problems. Furthermore, the new preschool on Illinois near 19th street will be disrupted during naptime for children.

6.18

5. **Residential Intrusion.** Residents facing 18th Street may encounter loud noise due to the canyon echo created between the 65-foot buildings. This particular condition has not been tested in the current environmental studies and previous estimates may not be accurate for noise levels today at the location. The use of "average" levels is not a valid measurement since it is the noise peaks that are the problem. For example, when the Blue Angels fly over the city, it is painfully loud when overhead, yet over the course of a month, that minute of extreme sound *averages* down to be of little significance. Also, streetcar turns, and especially older trolleys, are shown to cause loud and piercing screeches and *exceed FTA guidelines*. There must be no trolleys on the turnaround.

6.19

6. **Ballgame Schedule.** It is estimated that as many as 77 streetcars will use the loop daily. While it is expected these cars will use the loop mainly in the morning and afternoon commute times (dinnertime for some), this schedule may be changed. When the Giants play at AT&T Park, the streetcars may be running on the loop at 10-11 pm (sleep time for many), while also adding to the traffic mess when ballgames end.

6.20

SF Municipal Transportation Agency
Mr. Darton Ito
June 5, 2013

- 7. **Vibration.** The Environmental Assessment notes: "...there may be times when train activity exceeds the FTA recommendation." FTA recommends that frequent events not exceed 72 velocity decibels, which corresponds to the threshold of human vibration detection. Vibration tests showed a range of 67-76 velocity decibels for outbound trains, *exceeding the FTA guidelines*. 6.21

- 8. **Emergency Response.** If a 75-foot streetcar become disabled on 18th or 19th Sts., fire trucks would not be able to enter the street freely and fully to deal with the situation, endangering lives and property. 6.22

- 9. **Traffic Volumes.** The Environmental Assessment indicates that traffic volumes for Third St. and Illinois St. are based on 1997 data, with estimates used to estimate current conditions. No recent actual data is presented, which raises questions about the validity of the data in this report. 6.23

- 10. **Bicycle Lanes.** During the past year, as the City has rolled out the dedicated bike lanes for cyclists, Illinois Street has become the only thoroughfare north and south on the eastern side of the City for cyclists. Because Third Street no longer supports large trucks, those vehicles are now competing with cyclists on the Illinois Street thoroughfare. Coupled with the construction of residential units that will provide housing for some 300-500 additional households within the next two years, this thoroughfare will not be safe for cyclists or for pedestrians if the T-Line turnaround is constructed along Illinois Street. 6.24

SUMMARY

In short, there are many problems with the proposal for this loop, while the use of an existing turnaround facility just six blocks further south at the MUNI Metro East facility offers many advantages.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 6

6.1. Comment expressing support for an alternative location is noted. See Master Response No. 1 regarding the MME as an alternative location.

6.2. The distance to the facility is less than one mile (approximately 0.7 miles). The EA states that the distance to the Muni Metro East (MME) yard was *about* one mile.

6.3. See Master Response No. 1 regarding the MME as an alternative location.

6.4. See Master Response No. 1 regarding increase of travel time at the MME facility.

6.5. See Master Response No. 1 regarding increase of cost at the MME facility.

6.6. Comment expressing support for an alternative location at the MME facility is noted. See Master Response No. 1 regarding the consideration of the MME facility as an alternative location.

The SFMTA provided a letter in response to the petition to locate the loop at MME in a letter from John Haley, Director of Transit at the SFMTA, dated April 22, 2013, addressed to Dogpatch Area Residents and Businesses.

6.7. See Master Response No. 2 regarding screening of alternative locations.

6.8. See Master Response No. 4 regarding current and future land uses.

The proposed project options would not result in signal degradation at any intersection to an unacceptable level of service (LOS), and per Section 3.12.3, train movements along 18th or 19th Street are projected to take one minute or less. SFMTA will coordinate with the Port plans to for ship repair facilities and Crane Cove Park, as these plans are currently in early planning and conceptual design stages.

6.9. See Master Response No. 3 regarding traffic and circulation.

6.10. See Master Response No. 5 regarding bicycle circulation and safety. See Master response No. 6 regarding a passenger platform and station at Illinois Street, which is not part of the proposed project.

6.11. See Master Response No. 3 regarding traffic and circulation.

6.12. See Master Response No. 1 regarding the MME as an alternative location.

6.13. The tracks to access the loop tie into northbound tracks at 19th Street and southbound tracks at 18th Street. Therefore trains traveling in either direction that must be removed from service have access to the loop and can be moved off of the main line, which would allow the T-Third LRV line to remain in service while the disabled train is “parked” until it can be safely moved to either of the Muni LRV yards . There is no requirement that a northbound train must travel several miles to return to a different Muni yard.

6.14. Comment expressing support for an alternative location at MME is noted. See Master Response No. 1 regarding the MME as an alternative location.

6.15. See response to comment 6.8 above.

6.16. Support for an alternative location near 22nd Street is noted. See Master Response No. 3 regarding traffic and circulation. See Master response No. 6 regarding a passenger platform and station at Illinois Street, which is not part of the proposed project.

6.17. Impacts to driveway access are discussed in Section 3.12.4 of the EA. As noted in Section 3.12.4, there are two main driveways off 18th Street on the south side of the street and a proposed driveway off the west side of Illinois Street. These driveways serve the adjacent multifamily residential developments. When a light rail train would be present, there may be potential conflicts between the train and vehicles exiting the garage and making a left turn across the trackway. It is anticipated that the vehicles turning left into the driveway would have sufficient sight distance to yield to each other. Safe operation of light rail under similar conditions in other parts of the city indicates that the vehicle turns do not pose significant safety problems to train operation. It is anticipated that the proposed project would not cause significant safety problems for vehicle driveway access. However, SMFTA will install flashing light signals by the exit from each driveway in order to warn the exiting vehicles to wait until the train clears and proceed with caution.

6.18. As discussed in Section 3.8 of the EA, the increase in both day-night average and peak hour average noise levels from operation of the Loop on La Scuola Internazionale di San Francisco, nearby residences or the open space and parks would be less than one decibel. Further, the noise contribution of six to eight light rail vehicles per hour during peak commute hours would not significantly elevate existing noise levels. The increase in noise is estimated to be less than one decibel and is not considered an impact per the FTA's guidance manual, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* (May 2006).

6.19. The noise assessment considered day-night average and peak hour average levels which differ from levels averaged over a period longer than one hour. Use of peak hour average levels is consistent with FTA's guidance manual, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* (May 2006). Sources of noise include but are not limited to wheel squeal on curves and the braking and propulsion systems.

As discussed in Appendix D of the EA, noise measurements were collected at a height of twelve feet to measure the impact of the Loop on the residential buildings along the proposed Loop. Potential elevated noise levels due to reflections off the buildings are taken into account in the measurements collected at Third Street and Channel Street, as these measurements were collected with buildings behind the meter. The reported noise levels built in an inflation factor accounting for this reflection. When measuring train pass bys at 3rd Street and Channel Street, the inbound rail line (40 feet from receiver) closely matches the distance of the proposed turn around rail line that turns left onto 18th Street. The outbound rail line (20 feet from receiver) closely matches the distance as the new rail line turns right onto Illinois and onto 19th Street.

The characterization of the effect of the buildings as that of a "canyon" can be misleading as it suggests that sound will build infinitely upon itself. In theory, two hard reflective surfaces increase a noise source by 6 decibels; however to achieve such an increase requires relatively close proximity to the noise source. The LRVs would be 20 feet from the building surfaces. The overall calculated increase for a single event is three decibels. Averaged over an hour, these single events do not introduce enough acoustical energy to exceed FTA noise impact criteria.

Factors that affect the noise and vibration levels are the condition of the wheels and rail lines as well as the speed of the street car. The SFMTA routinely inspects and maintains trackways and rail vehicles. To mitigate potential for vibration impacts associated with older rail cars, the speeds of vehicles on the loop will be kept under five miles per hour when turning at the corners to lower the noise and vibration velocity (please refer to Section 3.9 on page 33 of the EA). At this time the SFMTA has no plans to operate historic streetcars south of Fourth and King Streets, nor on the proposed Loop.

6.20. The loop will be used as needed to support efficient transit operations which may include supporting ballpark service during evening games. See Master Response 3 regarding traffic and circulation.

6.21. The vibration projection included in the EA is based on the methodology in the FTA's *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* (May 2006). As discussed on page 8 of the Noise and Vibration Assessment Report in Appendix D, the maximum levels measured for most regular streetcars would be 72

VdB or lower. One streetcar included in the vibration measurement exceeded 72 velocity decibels. This car was the historic “trolley” style and may have had more wearing at the wheels or have a longer wheel base. At this time the SFMTA has no plans to operate historic streetcars south of Fourth and King Streets, nor on the proposed Loop. To mitigate potential for vibration impacts associated with older rail cars, the speeds of streetcars on the loop will be kept under five miles per hour when turning at the corners to lower the vibration velocity (please refer to Section 3.9 on page 33 of the EA).

6.22. SFTMTA has selected to implement Design Option 2. Design Option 2 (see Section 3.12.3) includes adequate width for fire truck access on 18th and 19th Streets. Signal prohibitions to enforce mixed traffic restrictions to access 18th and 19th Streets while trains are present on these streets would not apply to emergency vehicles in an emergency

6.23. The 1997 traffic counts were updated as stated in Section 3.12.1 of the EA. Refer to footnote 4 in Section 3.12.1 of the EA for sources of recent traffic data used in the traffic assessment.

6.24. See Master Response No. 5 regarding bicycle circulation and safety.

COMMENT NO. 7

From: Peter Ehrlich <milantram1859@gmail.com>

Subject: Mission Bay Loop--Comments

Date: June 5, 2013 8:38:21 AM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

Hi Darton,

I was a Muni operator for 26 years, the last 10 working the F-Market historic streetcar line. I retired in 2005.

I have one specific comment regarding the proposed 18th/Illinois/19th loop, which should have been constructed back in 2006, when the T-Line was built.

My comment relates to possible future expansion of the E-Embarcadero to serve UCSF-Mission Bay and the pending Union Iron Works Historic District. There was no mention of this in the Environmental Assessment Report, and there should be. Building the Loop would allow single-end PCCs and Milan cars to use this as the southern terminal, providing for fleet assignment flexibility. At present, when the E-Line starts up, only double-end cars can be used, because they must turn back at stub-end 6th and King.

Peter Ehrlich
50 Rock Mill Road
Carmel, NY 10512
(415)420-8255
milantram1859@gmail.com

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 7

At this time the SFMTA has no plans to operate historic streetcars beyond Fourth & King Streets, nor on the proposed Loop. Therefore, historic streetcars use was not included in the EA.

COMMENT NO. 8

From: Ron Miguel <rm@well.com>

Subject: Mission Bay Loop Environmental Assessment

Date: June 6, 2013 9:40:16 AM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

Cc: "jc@jcarpinelli.com" <jc@jcarpinelli.com>

Mr. Ito - Attached is my commentment [sic] for the Mission Bay Loop Environmental Assessment. Please keep me advised of pending actions and meetings regarding this project.

Thanks,

Ron Miguel
600 De Haro St.
San Francisco, CA 94107
415-601-0708

RON & RUTH MIGUEL

600 De Haro St., San Francisco, CA 94107

T-415/285/0808 F-415/641/8621 E-rm@well.com C-415-601-0708

6 June 2013

San Francisco MTA
1 So. Van Ness Ave., 7th Flr.
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Mission Bay Loop – Environmental Assessment

The Mission Bay Loop was planned in 1998 and approved in 1999. This took into consideration the zoning – residential, commercial and industrial – as well as the density of the south-east section of our city which was in existence. What it did not do is anticipate or plan for the results of the Eastern Zoning which had been planned at that time but was just beginning – it changed nearly a third of our city. Your lack of foresight, long-range planning, and inter-departmental cooperation has now resulted in your attempt to implement a 15-year-old plan which no longer effectively serves its initial purpose.

Consider the changes to the southern waterfront already in progress and in the planning pipeline – the possible Warriors Arena at Piers-30-32; Bryant Park at Pier 34; Pier 48 and the Giants massive development of recreation retail, semi-industrial, residential, and

8.1

recreation; Pier 70, with its retail, PDR, and residential; and further south at the former Mirant site. In addition to all of this, there are upward of 2,000 residences already in progress in the Dogpatch and Potrero Hill neighborhoods, with more to come. This residential density will be followed by retail and increased PDR due to the rezoning.

**8.1
continued**

Your 1998 concept is no longer logical or viable! You are fifteen years behind the times, and twenty by the time your 'loop' is operational. As a former President of the San Francisco Planning Commission, I find this totally unacceptable. It is not the process by which our great city should be operated.

At the very least the loop should be placed at least 5 blocks south – at about 26th St./ Cesar Chavez. This begins to make sense in that it would then serve the neighborhood which is under expansion – even though it was hardly considered by you in 1998. It also would avoid unnecessary adverse affects on a 'now' built-out 19th-20th Sts. residential neighborhood which did not really exist in 1998.

8.2

What you are contemplating is not only backward (by 15-20 years) thinking, but detrimental to both a vibrant and growing neighborhood of our city, but to effective transportation as well.

Please – reconsider. Do not continue to look backwards. Anticipate the future. Understand that MTA does not exist to serve the San Francisco of 1998, but that of 2025 and onward.

Sincerely,

Ron Miguel

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 8

8.1. As noted in Section 1.1, ridership on the T-Third Street segment in Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods is also anticipated to increase with rising need to access new high-density retail, and commercial establishments in these neighborhoods. The proposed project would not preclude a future station on Illinois Street in the vicinity of Pier 70, which would provide the access to new retail and commercial establishments and future developments in the Central Waterfront neighborhoods and Pier 70. See Master Response No. 4 regarding current and future land use.

8.2. Support for alternative locations for the loop on 26th/Cesar Chavez is noted. 26th/Cesar Chavez is the location of the MME facility. See Master Response 1 regarding the MME facility.

As demand on the T-Third increases with the influx of development, SFMTA will closely monitor ridership and determine if service adjustments are needed along the entire length of the line.

COMMENT NO. 9

From: Bill Schwartz <billschwartz@idiom.com>

Subject: Mission Bay Loop Project--Comments

Date: June 6, 2013 5:07:38 PM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

Cc: MTABoard <MTABoard@sfmta.com>, "Boomer, Roberta" <Roberta.Boomer@sfmta.com>, "leona.bridges@sfmta.com" <leona.bridges@sfmta.com>, "cheryl.brinkman@sfmta.com" <cheryl.brinkman@sfmta.com>, "Bruss, Andrea" <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>, Janet Carpinelli <jc@jcarpinelli.com>, "Cohen, Malia" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "malcolm.heinicke@sfmta.com" <malcolm.heinicke@sfmta.com>, "jerry.lee@sfmta.com" <jerry.lee@sfmta.com>, "tom.nolan@sfmta.com" <tom.nolan@sfmta.com>, "joel.ramos@sfmta.com" <joel.ramos@sfmta.com>, "christina.rubke@sfmta.com" <christina.rubke@sfmta.com>, Steve Hester <shester@MCRTrust.com>, Craig Waddle <craig@vanguardsf.com>, Tristan Butler <tristanjames79@gmail.com>, "president@potreroboosters" <president@potreroboosters>, Kit Hodge <kit@sfbike.org>, Leah Shahum <leah@sfbike.org>, STEVE MOSS <4010@pacbell.net>

Attached and pasted for your consideration is our comment letter on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Mission Bay Transit Loop Project.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Bill Schwartz, President

Committee For Reevaluation of T-Line Loop
700 Illinois St., Unit 203
San Francisco, CA 94107
415-291-8655

c/o Bill Schwartz, President
700 Illinois St., Unit 203
San Francisco, CA 94107
415-291-8655

Darton Ito
Project Manager
SFMTA
1 South Van Ness—7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

June 6, 2013

In Reference to:

Mission Bay Transit Loop Project, San Francisco, CA

Federal Transportation Agency is the lead agency and SF Municipal Transportation Authority is the project sponsor

DOT Allocation for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Activity (TIGER) funds

Dear Mr. Ito:

This letter and attachment is intended to raise issues concerning the federally funded Mission Bay Transit Loop Project originally planned in 1999, which, if implemented, would create a myriad of problems for residents, traffic flow, bicyclists, and local businesses, while not providing all the benefits it could if it were relocated.

Due to dramatic neighborhood development unforeseen 14 years ago when the loop was planned, the proposed loop will have many adverse effects. Most importantly, an alternative loop location only six blocks further south would provide a much more ideal location for the loop, at lower costs, with tangible advantages, and with little if any of the problems noted in the attached.

Therefore, this Committee, as well as neighboring property owners, in addition to neighborhood groups and businesses, are seeking your help in bringing about a reevaluation of the current project and whether relocation would be recommended.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Bill Schwartz

President

Attachment: Petition for Revaluation of the Federally Funded Mission Bay Transit Loop Project, San Francisco, CA

Note: Petition is included in attachment to Comment Letter 6 above.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 9

See Master Response No. 1 and 2 regarding screening of alternative locations for the Loop.

See Master Response No. 4 regarding current and future land uses.

Issues raised in the petition are addressed in response to Comment 6 above.

COMMENT NO. 10

From: Corinne <corinnewoods@cs.com>

Subject: Mission Bay Loop Project - Environmental Assessment

Date: June 7, 2013 9:59:49 AM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

Cc: "Rahaim, John" <John.Rahaim@sfgov.org>

An Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the Third Street Light Rail Project was completed and approved in 1999 by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the City and County of San FranciscoThe Mission Bay Loop portion of the project was not completed with the rest of the project in 2003Because approximately 12 years have passed since the EIS/EIR for Third Street Light Rail project was completed, the SFMTA has prepared an Enviromental [sic] Assessment to identify and evaluate any conditions that may have changed after 1999 that could potentially result in adverse effects from construction of the Mission Bay Loop.

In October 2012, San Francisco Planning Department reviewed the proposed Loop project in light of the prior CEQA analysis and determined that no further assessment is required (Ahmadi, 2012).

I am concerned about SFMTA’s plan to construct the transit loop for LRVs at Eighteenth Street, Illinois Street and Nineteenth Street. The area has changed significantly since Phase I of the T-3rd metro line was built. The Environmental Assessment does not contemplate the major land use changes that have occurred south of Mariposa Street since the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan was approved, or the planned development of Pier 70 or the former Potrero Power Plant.

10.1

I am also amazed that the Planning Department determined that no further assessment of the project was needed, in view of the significant changes that have occurred and are planned in the area since 1999.

The Environmental Assessment is deficient in not addressing these concerns.

Driveway Interference

The ostensible reason for rejecting location of the loop on Illinois between 22nd and 23rd Streets is interference with "driveway of west side businesses" and elimination of parking. The proposed plan would also require removal of parking, and interfere with several driveways on 18th, Illinois and 19th Streets, requiring signal alerts at garage entrances if and when traffic is permitted. It would be helpful to have a study of traffic volumes to and from commercial and residential garages on 18th, 19th, 22nd and 23rd Streets, as well as Illinois between 18th and 24th Streets, to evaluate specific impacts.

10.2

Removal of Abandoned Freight Trackway

Rejection of the alternative location of Illinois Street between 23rd or 24th Street and the Bay is based on the presence of a Union Pacific Rail Crossing. The northernmost active freight rail crossing on Illinois Street is to Pier 80, south of 25th Street, and the Union Pacific tracks are abandoned north of Pier 80. Muni has already removed trackways in Illinois Street to the Metro East facility. The preferred alternative includes removal of abandoned Union Pacific freight trackway from north of the intersection of Eighteenth Street and Illinois to south of the intersection of 19th and Illinois. These alternative sites should be studied.

10.3

3. Operation between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m

The proposed plan contemplates operation between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., requiring changes in traffic

10.4

patterns and parking restrictions during those hours, whichever Design Option is chosen. However, the loop service is also supposed to allow trains to turn around for special events (i.e., ballgames) and possibly extension of the two-car N-Judah line for that service. Special event turnaround is currently provided at Metro East. Special event shuttle service operates after 7 PM to serve evening events at the ballpark. Vehicle access and parking restrictions would need to be extended to evening hours. Evening ballgames normally end after 10 PM, and shuttle service may be required for an hour after the events end, which would mean that the turnaround would be used late into the evening, significantly interfering with adjacent residential uses. Alternatives that do not impact residential uses in evening hours should be studied.

**10.4
Cont.**

4. Extension of 19th Street in to Pier 70

The Port's Pier 70 Master Plan includes the extension of 19th Street to serve the BAE shipyard and reduce anticipated traffic on 20th Street. Design Option 3 would turn 19th Street into a one-way westbound street, prohibiting eastbound shipyard traffic from turning off 3rd Street onto 19th Street. All the design options would reduce vehicle access to 18th and 19th Street. With the development of Pier 70, both 19th Street and 20th Street will see significant traffic increases.

10.5

5. 18th Street 280 Freeway access

Heavy post-event ballpark traffic is intentionally directed by SFMTA south from existing (and planned future) parking to Terry Francois Boulevard and Illinois Street, and this traffic uses 18th Street from Illinois to access the 280 freeway. Design Option 3 would make 18th Street one way eastbound, eliminating the 280 freeway connection and routing that heavy traffic on to 3rd Street and other limited access routes. All the Design Options would reduce traffic capacity on 18th Street.

10.6

While there has been a significant investment in the partially completed turnaround tracks on 18th and 19th Streets, and funding for the loop project may be jeopardized if the plan is changed, too much time has passed since the project was planned. The changes to this area must be acknowledged and considered in evaluating whether the proposed location is the best possible alternative, or whether other locations would better serve this growing neighborhood, the City, and Muni.

Corinne Woods
300 Channel Street, #10
San Francisco, CA 94158
(415) 902-7635

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 10

10.1. See Master Response No. 4 regarding current and future land use.

10.2. A loop option using 22nd Street, 23rd Street and Illinois Street is further south and is longer than the proposed 18th Street, 19th Street and Illinois Street loop. Additional LRV's would be required in order to maintain the anticipated frequency of the service,

The 22nd Street loop has a higher level of potential conflicts with truck loading and vehicle access than the proposed Loop. Approximately 19 garage openings for commercial vehicles or passenger vehicles were counted on the 22nd Street, Illinois Avenue and 23rd Street loop. Five of the openings were loading docks which are a barrier to moving a truck off a street. In comparison, the proposed Loop had eleven garage openings for commercial or passenger vehicles, and only one opening was a loading dock. Therefore, this alternative location was withdrawn from consideration.

10.3. Alternate locations were screened during the planning process for the T-Third Street rail line. Alternate loop locations were analyzed in the area bounded by Mariposa Street, Cesar Chavez Street, Indiana Street and the waters of San Francisco Bay. These sites were reviewed for possible residential impacts, grade issues that could impact rail transit operations, parking impacts, vehicular traffic impacts, including access to freeway ramps, and cost impacts. A comparison of the alternative locations were summarized in Table 2-1 in the EA and discussed in Section 3.7. Below Table 2-1 has been revised to in response to comments to provide clarification on the considerations during screening of the alternative locations. See Master Response No. 2 for clarification on screening of alternative sites.

10.4. The loop will be used as needed to support efficient transit operations which may include supporting ballpark service during evening games. SFMTA has selected Design Option 2 for implementation. Design option 2 will allow for LRVs to be stored on the loop during times when they will be needed for ballpark service.

10.5. See response to comment 6.8.

10.6. See response to comment 6.20.

COMMENT NO. 11

From: Chris Barnett <cbarnett.sf@gmail.com>

Subject: Comment Re: Mission Bay Loop Environmental Assessment

Date: June 9, 2013 3:34:48 PM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

Hello--

My opinion about the location of this loop is informed by having worked in Dogpatch for 9 years from 1988-1997, by being a 25 year resident of SF who pays attention to the changing land use and developments of the City, and as a CAC member for the former Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Area, where I continue to be involved with community development issues, especially related to the former Schlage Lock site owned by Universal Paragon Corporation.

It strikes me as short-sighted to position the loop that far north. Taking into account the impending development at Pier 70 and other developments and changes up and down the Third Street corridor, as well as the D10 waterfront, it seems that a more accurate response to where development will unfold in the coming decades would be to at least position this loop at Pier 70, if not as far south as Cesar Chavez. After all, the density of Mission Bay will quickly spread further into the neighborhoods immediately to the south, as it has already been doing for some time. Situating the loop this way anticipates the changes in land use for neighborhoods south of Mission Bay, and will help improve T-Third service as those changes take place.

Sincerely,

Chris Barnett
1360 Goettingen Street
San Francisco CA 94134
415.990.4203

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 11

Support for alternative locations at Pier 70 or Cesar Chavez Street are noted. The project site lies immediately adjacent to Pier 70 at the Port of San Francisco. As noted in Section 1.1, ridership on the T-Third Street segment in Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods is also anticipated to increase with rising need to access new high-density retail, and commercial establishments in these neighborhoods. The proposed project would not preclude a future station on Illinois Street in the vicinity of Pier 70, which would provide the access to new retail and commercial establishments and future developments in the Central Waterfront neighborhoods and Pier 70. SFMTA will coordinate with the Port regarding future plans for Pier 70 and Crane Cove Park, as these plans are currently in early planning and conceptual design stages. See Master Response No. 4 regarding current and future land use.

See Master Response 1 and 2 regarding screening of alternative locations.

See also response to comment 8 above.

COMMENT NO. 12

From: Janet Carpinelli <jc@jcarpinelli.com>

Subject: MTA Mission Bay Loop Project--Comments

Date: June 10, 2013 5:18:00 PM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

Cc: MTABoard <MTABoard@sfmta.com>, "Boomer, Roberta" <Roberta.Boomer@sfmta.com>, "leona.bridges@sfmta.com" <leona.bridges@sfmta.com>, "cheryl.brinkman@sfmta.com" <cheryl.brinkman@sfmta.com>, "Bruss, Andrea" <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>, Carpinelli Janet <janetcarpinelli@comcast.net>, "Cohen, Malia" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "malcolm.heinicke@sfmta.com" <malcolm.heinicke@sfmta.com>, "jerry.lee@sfmta.com" <jerry.lee@sfmta.com>, Eppler JR <jreppler1@gmail.com>, "tom.nolan@sfmta.com" <tom.nolan@sfmta.com>, "joel.ramos@sfmta.com" <joel.ramos@sfmta.com>, "christina.rubke@sfmta.com" <christina.rubke@sfmta.com>, Steve Hester <shester@MCRTrust.com>, Craig Waddle <craig@vanguardsf.com>, Tristan Butler <tristanjames79@gmail.com>, Kit Hodge <kit@sfbike.org>, Shahum Leah <leah@sfbike.org>, MOSS Steve <4010@pacbell.net>, "Kim, Jane" <Jane.Kim@sfgov.org>

Darton Ito
Project Manager
SFMTA
1 South Van Ness~7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

June 10, 2013

In Reference to:

Mission Bay Transit Loop Project, (18th/19th/Illinois/Third Streets) San Francisco, CA

Federal Transportation Agency is the lead agency and SF Municipal Transportation Authority is the project sponsor

DOT Allocation for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Activity (TIGER) funds.

Attached on letterhead and in this email:

Janet Carpinelli
282-5516
President
Dogpatch Neighborhood Association
1459 18th St., No. 227
San Francisco, CA 94107
www.mydogpatch.org

Attachment to Janet Carpinelli's email (June 10, 2013)



Darton Ito
Project Manager
SFMTA
1 South Van Ness—7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

June 10, 2013

In Reference to:
Mission Bay Transit Loop Project, (18th/19th/Illinois/Third Streets) San Francisco, CA
Federal Transportation Agency is the lead agency and SF Municipal Transportation Authority is the project sponsor
DOT Allocation for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Activity (TIGER) funds

Dear Mr. Ito:

Thank you for your presentation in the Dogpatch neighborhood on June 4. Disappointingly, we did not see any movement from MTA's previous presentations. This goes back at least 10 years when MTA originally met with us (The Dogpatch Neighborhood Association and other neighbors plus subsequent meetings) and at the site to discuss the loop at 18/19th Sts. and Third/Illinois Sts. At that time we stated that the site was bad for our burgeoning neighborhood and sited the new residential developments on the horizon at the very site as well as throughout Dogpatch. I concur with the comments made by Bill Schwartz (who was at the meeting last week) of the Committee For Reevaluation of T-Line Loop, which you received on June 6.

Additionally I must point out that the San Francisco Planning Dept.'s Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning completed in recent years after several years of planning, seems to have been ignored in this Draft Environmental Assessment. Many blocks surrounding this proposed loop have been rezoned from industrial to UMU, which in the current economic climate, has yielded proposals, and already some permits for 1,000's of new residential units from Mariposa St. to 23rd and 24th St. between Illinois St. and

12.1

1459%8th%Street%227%San%francisco%California%4107%



Pennsylvania St. This development will bring in up to 5,000 new people within the next 5 years and 10,000 within the next 15 years. Dogpatch needs the transit service, not a loop that does not serve but does cause congestion and major inconvenience for residents and businesses at the loop's proposed location.

12.1
cont'd

IF, however you were to move the loop south to the 24th/25th St./ Illinois St area either on the street or in MUNI Metro East, you will serve this community, which currently has a dearth of public transportation, as well as serving Mission Bay. The investment of \$10 million (your team's estimate at the meeting) would be well spent to get a FORWARD thinking plan instead of one based on 10-15 year old data that is no longer accurate. This area is flat, zoned industrial/PDR, not residential/UMU and currently and in future will have much less traffic/congestion/interference with residential/retail uses. MTA can probably buy some of that adjacent or close by industrial land, if it does not have enough room on the existing Metro East site or in the street.

12.2

AND, since you can run E-line historic single cars on the existing LRV tracks with slight modifications to the station platforms and ten cars are available now, while you revise your planning/implementation of the loop to the 25th St. location, you can quickly get additional service going from the Ferry building/Market St. to 4th and King streets and on down south through Mission Bay to 25th St. in Dogpatch. MTA will be running the historic cars to the 4th/King St. station as part of the America's cup this summer (as it did last year) so you will have a starting point which will be fairly easy for you to extrapolate and make permanent and extended.

12.3

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Janet Carpinelli
282-5516

President

1459%8th%Street%227%San%francisco%California%4107%

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 12

12.1. As noted in Section 1.1, ridership on the T-Third Street segment in Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods is also anticipated to increase with rising need to access new high-density retail, and commercial establishments in these neighborhoods. The proposed project would not preclude a future station on Illinois Street, which would provide the access to new retail and commercial establishments and future developments in the Central Waterfront neighborhoods and Pier 70. See Master Response 4 regarding current and future land use.

12.2. Support for an alternative location at MME or in the vicinity of 24th Street is noted. See Master Response 1 regarding locating the loop at MME. See also response to comment 5 regarding consideration of a loop near 24th and 25th Streets.

12.3. At this time the SFMTA has no plans to operate historic streetcars beyond Fourth & King Streets, nor on the proposed Loop.

COMMENT NO. 13

From: "J.R. Eppler" <jreppler1@gmail.com>

Subject: Mission Bay Loop Project - Comments

Date: June 10, 2013 4:38:35 PM PDT

To: "Ito, Darton" <Darton.Ito@sfmta.com>

Cc: MTABoard <MTABoard@sfmta.com>, "Boomer, Roberta" <Roberta.Boomer@sfmta.com>, "leona.bridges@sfmta.com" <leona.bridges@sfmta.com>, "cheryl.brinkman@sfmta.com" <cheryl.brinkman@sfmta.com>, "Bruss, Andrea" <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>, "Cohen, Malia" <Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org>, "malcolm.heinicke@sfmta.com" <malcolm.heinicke@sfmta.com>, "jerry.lee@sfmta.com" <jerry.lee@sfmta.com>, "tom.nolan@sfmta.com" <tom.nolan@sfmta.com>, "joel.ramos@sfmta.com" <joel.ramos@sfmta.com>, "christina.rubke@sfmta.com" <christina.rubke@sfmta.com>, "billschwartz@idiom.com" <billschwartz@idiom.com>, "jc@jcarpinelli.com" <jc@jcarpinelli.com>

Darton Ito
Project Manager
SFMTA
1 South Van Ness – 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

June 10, 2013

Re: Mission Bay Transit Loop Project

Dear Mr. Ito:

I write to express my concern regarding current plans to install a transit loop along 18th, Illinois and 19th Streets in San Francisco’s Dogpatch neighborhood (the “Transit Loop Plan”). Bill Schwartz, President of the Committee for Reevaluation of T-Line Loop, has provided me with a copy of his June 6, 2013, letter and the petition attached thereto. Having reviewed these materials and the Draft Environmental Assessment for the project dated May 3, 2013, I am forced to question whether the Transit Loop Plan, as drafted, best serves the residents and businesses of Dogpatch and the adjacent Potrero Hill neighborhood. I further request that the comment period for the Environmental Assessment be extended one month, to July 10, 2013, so that the plan can be further presented to Dogpatch and Potrero Hill residents and so that the Potrero Hill Boosters Neighborhood Association (the “Boosters”) may address the matter at our regular meeting on June 25, 2013.

13.1

The lack, or delay in building, of additional infrastructure necessary to accommodate the current residents of Potrero Hill and Dogpatch is of significant concern to our neighbors, particularly in light of the significant commercial and residential development planned over the next several years. While the value of a turn around for the T-Third line (and perhaps an eventual terminus for an E-Embarcadero line) is apparent, also apparent is that the Transit Loop Plan fails to accommodate the actual growth that has occurred since its drafting over a decade ago, much less the ongoing changes to the neighborhood. The proposed plan serves only the northern half of the neighborhood while conflicting with the use patterns of the streets on which the loop would be set. It pushes onto increasingly residential streets light rail vehicles when the currently existing MUNI Metro East Facility would seemingly accommodate the loop without conflicting with commercial, residential vehicular and bicycle traffic. In placing the turn around at the 25th Street facility, the whole of the neighborhood would have access to the increased transit flow

13.2

13.3

without seeing a significant diminution of the current streetscape. The Environmental Assessment does not convince me that this alternative has been fully explored.

**13.3
Cont.**

Further, I believe there is the opportunity for important public education and comment on the Transit Loop Plan. While it has been long in the planning, neighborhood residents have not had a significant amount of time to digest that the project is finally moving forward. Giving the Boosters an opportunity to review and comment on the Transit Loop Plan will help ensure that the eventual construction best serves stakeholders along the T-Third line. Thus, I request a one-month extension to the comment period.

13.4

I look forward to hearing back from you and working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

J.R. Eppler
President
Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association

RESPONSE TO COMMENT NO. 13

13.1 and 13.4. The SFMTA has considered the request to extend the comment period. The SFMTA has provided multiple opportunities for public involvement in the proposed project, including public meetings in February and June 2013. Notices of the environmental review of the proposed project have been provided to the community in accordance with the requirements of NEPA. The FTA and SFMTA have provided a time for interested parties to submit their questions and comments to the agencies in accord with standards set by NEPA and CEQA. No comments were received from the Boosters as of July 19, 2013.

13.2. As noted in Section 1.1, ridership on the T-Third Street segment in Mission Bay and the Central Waterfront neighborhoods is also anticipated to increase with rising need to access new high-density retail, and commercial establishments in these neighborhoods. The proposed project would provide the access to new retail and commercial establishments and future developments in the Central Waterfront neighborhoods and Pier 70. See Master Response 4 regarding current and future land use. See response to comment 5 above and Master Response 2 regarding alternative locations to the south of the proposed Loop. See Master Response 4 regarding current and future land use.

13.3. Support for an alternative location at MME is noted. See Master Response 1 regarding the location of the proposed Loop at MME. See Master Response 5 regarding bicycle circulation and safety.