



CITY *of* BRISBANE

Complete Streets Safety Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, August 6, 2025 at 6:30 P.M. • City Hall, 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA

The public may observe/participate in Complete Street Safety Committee (CSSC) meetings using remote public comment options or attending in person. Committee Members shall attend in person unless remote participation is permitted by law. The CSSC may take action on any item listed on the agenda.

TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE

In Person:

Location: 50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA 94005, Community Meeting Room

Masks are no longer required but are highly recommended in accordance with California Department of Health Guidelines. To maintain public health and safety, please do not attend in person if you are experiencing symptoms associated with COVID-19 or respiratory illness.

Remote Participation:

Members of the public may observe/participate in the CSSC Meeting by logging onto the Zoom Webinar listed below. Please be advised that if there are technological difficulties, the meeting will nevertheless continue.

The agenda materials may be viewed online at [brisbaneca.org](https://www.brisbaneca.org) at least 24 hours prior to a Special Meeting, and at least 72 hours prior to a Regular Meeting. Archived videos can be replayed on the City's website, [brisbaneca.org/meetings](https://www.brisbaneca.org/meetings).

Remote Public Comments:

Remote meeting participants may address the Committee members via the Zoom Webinar or Call In Number. Meeting participants are encouraged to submit public comments in writing in advance of the meeting to tsantoyo@brisbaneca.org. Emails will not be monitored during the meeting.

Join Zoom Webinar:

www.brisbaneca.org/cssc-zoom

Webinar ID: 822 1307 7463

Call In Number: 1 (669) 900 9128

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Matthew Ordoña at (415) 420-5465. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Paul Bouscal (Vice Chair), Cristian Cabrera, Raymond Liu, Emily Wirowek (Chair), Dariusz Wodziak

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

- A. Consider any request of a committee member to attend the meeting remotely under the “Emergency Circumstances” of AB 2449

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- B. Minutes of July 2, 2025

OLD BUSINESS

- C. Baylands Draft EIR Comments Review and Discussion

NEW BUSINESS

- D. Discussion of Potential Halloween Street Closure

STAFF UPDATES

CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBER MATTERS

NEXT MEETING: October 1, 2025

ADJOURNMENT

Executive Summary

General comment is there should be parking meters or some type of parking enforcement that does not add work to the Police Department. The Police Department should be adding staff, perhaps a dedicated parking monitor, once the construction is complete and there is additional revenue to the City of Brisbane.

Page ES-6 - Bayshore Mobility Plan - Clarify and detail why this is the suggested modification for Bayshore Boulevard and detail what the rationale is outside of making it a local street. Clarify and detail what potential repercussions will be to other side streets. Detail if the traffic projections will move to the new local streets. Detail if Tunnel Avenue connects with the Geneva Bridge for flow of traffic from US 101. Explain and detail where the current traffic volume will be predicted to go. Explain and detail where the new traffic volume that is anticipated from the build out be projected will traverse.

Page ES-8 ES.4.1 - The projection of Sierra Point Parkway width of the road should include a bike lane and sidewalks. If the revised Sierra Point Parkway is part of the Bay Trail, the EIR and Plan should include and detail the bike pathways and sidewalks/trails as part for the Bay shoreline. Clarify if these modifications will change the current shoreline of the lagoon.

Page ES.10 - ES.4.2 - Clarify what kind of soil will be moved with the electrical conveyor system. Clarify if the soil is contaminated.

Page ES-15 - MM LUP-2 - Maximum parking ratios. Clarify and provide detail on where people will be parking. Clarify and detail on the street and off street parking. Explain and ensure that the Baylands is not creating the same parking problem somewhere else.

Page ES-16 Impact POP-2 Clarify and detail who owns the land where golden state lumber is located. Baylands Development? Clarify and detail who is responsible for the potential adverse economic effects.

Page ES-17 Impact AES-1 - Clarify and detail scenic viewpoints that will be impacted.

Page ES-18 What is the loss in revenue to the city of Brisbane if the buildings are reduced from 20+ story to 12 stories for commercial and 8 stories for residential? What are the potential added benefits to the greater community with larger commercial space? What are the potential added benefits for more residential housing? Are we providing more housing for various socioeconomic families? Are we continuing to be a welcoming community or are we limiting ourselves with the reduction of potential housing and commercial space?

MM AES-1a - Clarify if there are buildings in the current proposed plan within 350 feet of the Bay shoreline.

Page ES-19 MM AES-2 - Clarify if the trail width of 36 inches wide will be enough for a family with a stroller and holding a child's hand to comfortably traverse the trail. Clarify if two bicyclists can pass each other with ease at 36 inches width. Detail projections and predictions on the vegetation growth into the trails over time. Detail maintenance of the vegetation along the trail to ensure sight line visibility is maintained. Clarify that the trails are wide enough for a wheelchair.

Page ES-20 - regarding the public viewpoints at Geneva Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard, can you see the lagoon or the bay from this intersection at present? No? If the Baylands was leveled, would you then be able to see the bay and the lagoon from that intersection? No? If not, why are we considering this as an impact?

Page ES-20 - Clarify if the visual screening infrastructure along the North side of Geneva Avenue would obstruct views. For example would the combination of berms, decorative walls and landscaping to screen views potentially obstruct pedestrian, bicyclist and motorist views around corners, around parked vehicles.

Page ES-26 - Clarify why the suggestion is to only mark the mitigation areas around trails for three years.

Page ES-33 MM BIO-1g - Clarify if trail construction through butterfly host plant restoration areas will have signage during construction. Once trails are designed and implemented, detail and clarify if there will be educational signage.

Page ES-56 MM-TRA-2a - Clarify and detail how ADA compliant is defined for the extensions/additions for the Bay Trail.

Clarify and detail what the barrier will be between US Highway 101 and the Bay Trail. Must ensure no access to US 101 for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Page ES-57 Impact TRA-3 - Clarify the implementation of sidewalks on the full length of Bayshore Boulevard.

Page ES-58 - impact of TRA-3 - Make additional cut outs for drop off and pick up at the school. Clarify how many car lengths would be designed so that a queue will not impede traffic flow. Add an additional loading and unloading space for school buses for pick up and drop off.

Clarify the potential queues on Sierra Point and Geneva intersection.

Page - ES-60 MM TRA-3f - regarding the elimination or conversion of the Bayshore Boulevard and industrial way traffic signal, clarify who will need access to this area once construction is complete. Explain if the lack of a traffic signal there will create any impediments for motorists, pedestrians and/or bicyclists.

Page - ES-61 MN TRA-3g - Explain the lack of sidewalks. Strongly recommend the creation of a pedestrian bridge for children over Bayshore Boulevard for the safety of the children and families walking to school or to the enhanced shopping and cafes/restaurants in the development.

Page - ES-62 MM TRA-3j - Clarify if 10 feet is enough when modifying the cross section for roundhouse circle to provide a 10 foot parking lane. Clarify why providing at least one marked pedestrian crossing. It is in the best interests of pedestrians if all of them are marked.

Page - ES-63 - Clarify the roundabouts at intersections. Detail if the local regional traffic and the people of Brisbane are ready for roundabouts. Clarify and detail of roundabouts will create different traffic issues. Clarify if the roundabouts are efficient in this area.

MM-TRA-31 - Clarify if Caltrans will approve the roundabout of Sierra Point Parkway and Lagoon Road at US 101.

Page - ES-64 Regarding the intersections of Bayshore Boulevard at Geneva and Main Street, the developer should build pedestrian bridges at both intersections. The current design does not feel safe for children.

Regarding providing school crossing guards at the intersections, for how long during the day? How many days a week? For how many years? What about benefits? Who will the school crossing guard be an employee of? What's the long term expense of crossing guards versus a short term expense of pedestrian bridges? Where would children be walking to and from? The reality is where children walk must be considered not the route you want them to use. Is there coordination with Daly City officials?

Regarding designing of the drop off and pick up areas, detail that this will be designed efficiently and permanently so it is not a temporary impediment to normal traffic flow.

Page - ES-65 - Clarify that if Kinder Morgan is staying at their present location with their tanks, what barricades are being designed to contain access. Details should be provided regarding limited accessibility. Details should be provided regarding tanker access and the flow of traffic along Tunnel Avenue.

The EIR and Plan should detail the barricades that are being designed around CalTrain lines.

Page - ES-106 - Clarify what Transportation Demand Management program incentives for travel other than single use occupants will be offered.

Page - ES-108 - Impact NOI-4 - Clarify how the residents of the Baylands are going to be adequately protected from noise generated by rail operating within the Caltrain right of way. It seems improbable to eliminate the noise.

Project Description Section 3

There should be detail regarding night time lighting of all pedestrian pathways and bicycle pathways throughout every District. The safety and wellbeing of pedestrians and bicyclists should take priority over any City of Brisbane Dark Skies ordinance. The safety of pedestrians and bicyclists does not necessarily conflict with the Dark Skies Ordinance, however, the City of Brisbane should consider the HINs and the fact that these streets will be used not only for local residents and workers but regional traffic as well.

Page 3-22 Bayshore District It mentions a maximum of 1,150 off-street parking spaces are permitted with this District. There is no detail of how many on-street parking spaces. There should be consideration for on-street metered parking, on-street timed parking and on-street free parking.

There is no detail of off street parking garages. There should be details of parking for residential and commercial.

There should be considerations for free and paid City of Brisbane managed parking in lots or garages. Similar to the City of Burlingame, City of San Carlos, etc.

There should be detail regarding night time lighting of all pedestrian pathways and bicycle pathways. The safety and wellbeing of pedestrians and bicyclists should take priority over any City of Brisbane Dark Skies regulation.

Page 3-24 and 3-25 Roundhouse District The design of an adaptive use of the historic round house for open air theater with flexible seating and stage, community space, a cafe and other community uses is great. However, there is no detail for the parking for the visitors, bicyclists and strollers. There should be details on the accessibility of the Roundhouse open air theater for all citizens.

Similar to the Bayshore District, the EIR plan details a maximum of 1,200 off street parking spaces within the Roundhouse District. There is no detail of how many on-street parking spaces. There should be consideration for on-street metered parking, on-street timed parking and on-street free parking.

There is no detail of off street parking garages. There should be details of parking for residential and commercial.

Page 3-25 and 3-26 Icehouse Hill District The EIR details a maximum of 6,150 off street parking spaces within this District.

Most of this district is commercial office development. The notes detail "buildings where Active Ground Floor is required they must have retail, restaurants and other public/semi-public services. There is no detail of the parking plans outside of a maximum spaces. A detail of the

parking spaces being owned and operated by the private commercial businesses or the commercial building landlords is needed.

There is no detail or comment regarding on-street parking.

A detail of accessibility for all individuals to the ecological park needs to be added. Notes should be made for bicycle parking and vehicle parking. Details regarding private or public parking should be considered.

Page 3-26 Campus East District This is detailed as low density commercial space and the wetland area. There is a maximum of 2,485 off-street parking spaces permitted.

There is no detail of how many of these maximum parking spaces belong to Golden State Lumber and Recology. There is no detail of whether the parking spaces will be owned privately or publicly.

There is no detail of on-street parking.

There is no detail on parking (vehicular and bicycle) for accessibility to the Bay Trail.

Page 3-27 Sustainability District

There is no detail on the maximum number of parking spaces for this District. There should be.

There is no detail regarding parking for the people who fish in the lagoon. There should be consideration for a public restroom and water fountain where the current port-a-potty is residing.

No detail on accessibility to the Bay Trail and the lagoon in this District. There should be.

Page 3-30 Bay Trail The EIR notes that no improvements to the existing portion of the Bay Trail are proposed. The existing portion only contains bike lanes. The plan should be modified to create safe pedestrian access. This should connect the Bay Trail on the East side of 101 to the lagoon side.

Sunnydale Park - the detail of a large green space is great. However there is no detail regarding on street or off street parking surrounding the green space. The plan should detail the accessibility for all individuals and their chosen modes of transportation.

Page 3-31 Roundhouse Park The multi purpose community gathering space is needed. However there is no detail regarding on street or off street parking surrounding the green space. The plan should detail the accessibility for all individuals and their chosen modes of transportation.

Page 3-32 Brisbane Lagoon and Lagoon Park The open spaces are a welcome change from the present use of the Baylands. We must ensure accessibility for all to enjoy the beauty of the lagoon and lagoon park. This should include parking, appropriate night time lighting and pathways.

Page 3-33 Icehouse Hill The EIR notes visual screening of the adjacent Kinder Morgan Tank Farm in the form of vegetation. A detail of where the visual screening will be located is important. We do not want the visual screening to impair sight lines for the oil tankers or impair visibility for bicyclists, pedestrians and/or motorists along Tunnel Avenue.

Page 3-36 Table 3-2 Proposed Baylands Roadway Network - Bayshore Boulevard is not listed and it should be.

None of the descriptions, except East Park Street, West Park Street, Round House Circle and the local streets, included on-street parking and they should.

Page 3-40 Cross Section of Geneva Avenue Bridge - There is no detail or description of what the space below the bridge will be used for. The developers in collaboration with the City Community Development Liaison should discuss uses so the space do not have any unintended uses.

Page 3-41 Sierra Point Parkway Proposed Cross Section - This details the Bay Tail multi use path which is lovely. However, the hope is the cross section is not to scale. US Highway 101 and the Bay Trail should have a buffer so there are no auto-pedestrian nor auto-bicyclists incidents.

Page 3-43 Baylands Boulevard North of Main Street - The cross section details on Street parking. The descriptions should include if it is metered, timed with signage, or open at all times.

Page 3-45 Frontage Road Cross section - The drawing illustrates a wall dividing the buffer space and the Caltrain Easement. This detail should specify the height of the wall and ensure that the wall is providing division along the complete length of the Caltrains easement throughout the whole Baylands property all the way to the cross over of US Highway 101 at Sierra Point parkway.

Page 3-50 Figure 3-30 Baylands Pedestrian Network - Ensure there is a pedestrian and bicycle connection from Shared Use Path (Class 1) that goes through the Ecological Park and Icehill Park to the Visitacion Wetlands, Lagoon Park, and Bay Trail.

Page 3-53 Baylands Shuttle Routes - clarify who is paying for the fare-fee shuttle network. Clarify what agency(ies) will be involved in the shuttle network.

Transportation Demand Management - clarify who is providing the transit pass subsidies. Clarify what organizations will provide the transit incentive marketing.

Page 3-56 Figure 3-33 Lagoon Park Illustrative Concept Diagram - clarify the roadway jaunt for Sierra Point Pkwy near the Bay Trail that makes 3 sides of a cube. Is the roadway avoiding something? It would be better to have a straight roadway.

If the parking lot is full, detail the potential for over flow parking.

Page 3-57 - The EIR and the Plan would clarify and detail how close the landfill gas and leachate control systems are to the pedestrian, bicycle and roadways. Clarify and detail any potential hazards of the landfill gas and leachate control systems to pedestrians, families with strollers, and bicyclists.

Page 3-64 The Ecological Park - Figure 3-38 needs to detail parking. The detail says the Ecological Park will have small lawn areas and plazas. The details should include ADA accessibility. Clarify in the plan the slides are for various accessibility of children. Clarify if there will be various age level slides and structures similar to Washington Park and Orange Park.

Page 3-66 Figure 3-39 The detail for the shuttle stop is missing in the Figure.

Baylands Boulevard and Campus Parkway Cross Section in Figure 3-32 do not detail on street parking. There should be detail in Figure 3-39 for the parking and ADA accessibility to the ecological park.

Page 3-67 Wildlife Connectors - The EIR and plan should detail wildlife connectors to cross Bayshore Boulevard.

Page 3-99 Figure 3-50 Conceptual Rehabilitation of the Historic Roundhouse should detail parking and ADA accessibility.

Page 3-114 Bayshore Mobility Plan - There must be the addition of sidewalks along Bayshore Boulevard from San Bruno Avenue to Geneva Avenue.

There are other alternatives to enhancing connectivity for residents while acknowledging and accepting that Bayshore Boulevard is a regional through traffic artery. There could be a reduction of lanes to 3 with a movable median to move with commute hours and flow of traffic needs. A less expensive alternative is to reduce to 3 lanes with commuter traffic signals above the lanes dictating traffic flow, such as in the city of Santa Clara near Santa Clara University.

If the studies show that 60-80% of the traffic are not residents of Brisbane or workers in Brisbane, then where will the traffic go with the redesign and reducing the prominence?

The street must become safer. How that is achieved needs to be examined further.

The increase of shopping, employment and recreation in the Baylands will naturally increase the regional traffic into Brisbane. The General Plan Policy C.1 and the Bayshore mobility plan must take this into consideration.

The BMP must address the safety, accessibility and wellbeing of the Brisbane citizens living along Bayshore Boulevard. The accessibility must include access to the SamTrans bus stops, shuttle stops and other transit points.

Page 3-115 Geometric Design - There are potentially other ways to improve the safety. Add lights along Bayshore Boulevard to improve/increase the nighttime lighting along Bayshore Boulevard. Construct sidewalks along Bayshore Boulevard as there are none presently. Reduce the speed limits. More police enforcement of the speed limits on Bayshore Boulevard.

Adding two lane roundabouts throughout Bayshore Boulevard with the understanding that 60-80% of traffic will flow straight through the roundabout. Ensure that the lanes are wide enough for semitrailers to navigate safely through the roundabouts. This will inherently reduce the speed of traffic through the roundabouts. This would also provide emergency vehicle access points throughout Bayshore Boulevard to bypass stopped traffic on Bayshore Boulevard.

Page 3-116 Figure 3-55a - Add a pedestrian bridge over Bayshore Boulevard at Main Street.

With the addition of the median, will that encourage pedestrians to traverse across Bayshore Boulevard from various points in the Baylands development?

Clarify and detail in the EIR where regional traffic will be rerouted if not on Bayshore Boulevard.

Page 3-123 Transit access - The plan should address pedestrian accessibility to the bus stops on the East side of Bayshore Boulevard.

Intersection Design Features might include signage with blinking lights to alert motorists and bicyclists to pedestrian crossing.

Page 3-124 Bayshore Boulevard at Geneva Avenue - The EIR should define the protected pedestrian and bicycle crossing. This could include a pedestrian/bicyclist bridge over Bayshore Boulevard.

Page 3-125 Perhaps a roundabout at Main Street will better control traffic flow.

Page 3-126 Bayshore Boulevard at Campus Parkway could be a two lane roundabout.

Page 3-128 Bayshore at Guadalupe Canyon Parkway should better define the high visibility crosswalks.

Page 3-132 The Bayshore Boulevard at San Bruno Avenue does not detail the traffic signal light that the City is working to get a grant for. This traffic signal light should be included.

Transportation Section 4

Page 4.8-8 There should be considerations to add on-street parking permitted West of Bayshore Boulevard.

According to City Policy C.34, there should be sidewalks on all streets. The roadways currently providing internal circulation with the Baylands should be modified to add sidewalks on all streets. Lagoon Road and Sierra Point Parkway should be modified to allow on-street parking.

Page 4.8-12 Existing Transit Service - With the additional housing, the transit use of may increase from the study listed. What is the projected increase?

Page 4.8-16 Bicycle facilities - According to the survey done from 2017-2021, only 0.5% of Brisbane residents commute to work by bicycle on a regular basis. With the additional housing and the proximity to potential employers with the new commercial developments, what is the projected increase of bicycle commuters?

Page 4.8-19 Local Bicycle Facilities - With the extensive modifications to Geneva Avenue through the construction and development, it is possible that Geneva will transition to a Class IV bicycle route. What accommodations and protections are being considered for the increase along Geneva?

Page 4.8-20 Valley Drive is a busier thoroughfare and there are no bicycle lanes. Can bicycle lanes be added to at least one side of the road?

Bicycle Support Facilities - The report notes that bicycle support facilities may include showers and locker facilities, these types of facilities should be added near/at the CalTrain station if when built they are a safe space for bicyclists.

Page 4.8-23 Figure 4.8-6 denotes that Bayshore Boulevard is designated as an HIN. This should be addressed during construction to provide safer routes for youth along Bayshore Boulevard.

Page 4.8-24 In accordance with the state's climate goals and AB 1358, the Baylands plan should increase the sidewalks and bicycle lanes throughout all of the Baylands and make accommodations for streets that feed into the Baylands. This would potentially reduce the Vehicular Miles Traveled (VMTs).

Page 4.8-29 Transit Oriented Communities - Brisbane is a Tier 3 city under the Plan Bay Area 2050, however the note that maximum of one parking space per unit or lower for residential buildings is likely going to create a parking problem. Perhaps the maximum should be 2 parking

spaces per unit. Is the parking maximum for on-street parking or off street parking? Clarification may help with the parking management bullet points.

The completion of an access gap analysis should expand beyond a 10 minute walk. Youth do not walk as fast and as far as adults. Differently abled individuals may also live just outside an average adult's 10 minute walk. So the assessment for a gap may be missed by restricting the station access to only a 10 minute walk.

Page 4.8-32 Bay Trail Regional Plan - Closing the gaps on the Bay Trail will increase pedestrian and bicyclist use along the trail. It will also increase pedestrian, bicyclist and motorist use on streets to get to the trail. The Baylands Development Plan should include accommodations to increase the safety and accessibility of streets that provide access to the Bay Trail for all users.

Page 4.8-33 Local Roadway Safety Plan - Creating the Bayshore Mobility Plan may implement engineering countermeasures with motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian emphasis, but where will the motor vehicle traffic be re-routed to since Bayshore Boulevard is a designated Inter county transportation thoroughfare?

Page 4.8-34 San Mateo County Creating Safer Streets near Schools Report - The Get Healthy San Mateo County report notes that Bayshore School is a priority elementary school. Therefore, the Baylands must undertake the identified actions listed on page 4.8-34. The EIR should not state that they "could" implement some of these actions.

The actions should also include making sure there is enough off street parking for teachers, staff and volunteers at the middle school.

Page 4.8-35 Program C.1.b - The program states that the design plans for Bayshore Boulevard should not cause a substantial increase in vehicle miles traveled on Bayshore Boulevard or other routes through the City of Brisbane. However, it is a given that the VMT will increase with the additional housing created by the development, the additional commercial buildings adding traffic for employees and employees, and by adding additional entertainment and social locations in the Baylands. While the Bayshore Mobility Plan might be a good solution for motor, bicycle and pedestrian traffic on Bayshore, that will create additional influx of motor traffic and VMTs on side streets and other routes through the city of Brisbane. Perhaps causing once quieter streets to become more active with motor traffic. And perhaps adding more motor traffic on newly created residential streets in the Baylands development.

Page 4.8-36 Policy C.4 - Motorists use Bayshore Boulevard to generally avoid using US 101 or o to avoid US101 if traffic is building on US 101. The plan does not account for the actual use of Bayshore Boulevard and as drawn and pared down will likely increase confusion, congestion and increase the high injury network on that regional artery Boulevard.

Program C.4.c requires that all East-West corridor rail crossings are grade separated. The plan should detail if the grade separation is above or below grade and what measures will be taken to ensure the lack of accessibility to the railways outside of the Bayshore boarding station.

Page 4.8-37 Program C.22.b says that the complete streets infrastructure elements may be included depending upon context. Depending upon context the complete streets infrastructure "shall" be included. Since it is prefaced with being as determined by context and reasonable and practicable by the City of Brisbane, the infrastructure should be implemented.

The program should detail the types of traffic calming measures used.

The program should also include blinking crosswalk signs that are solar powered for safe pedestrian crossings.

The program should define and give examples of improvements to public transit and multi-modal connections to enhance city-wide transit access.

The program inclusion of street trees and other landscaping to enhance street scapes should be balanced with potential long term visibility impediments and the potential for regular maintenance of the street scapes to ensure visibility for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists.

Page 4.8-38 Policy C.30 should detail who will determine reasonable and practicable development and redevelopment of bikeways and or bicycle parking facilities. Members of the community should partake in the conversations.

Program C.34.b The Baylands plan must enhance and expand pedestrian access between Central Brisbane, the Caltrain station, Sierra Point Marina and the Bay Trail.

Program C.34.c This is important that there is more than enough on-street and off street parking that all automobiles will be disallowed from parking on sidewalks. The City of Brisbane as a whole has a large issue with keeping sidewalks clear for pedestrians, stroller walkers and Americans with disabilities.

Page 4.8-39 Program C.41.a - The presumption is that people working at and visiting the commercial offices and industrial spaces will be using transit alternatives. The 2017-2021 study clearly details that only 0.5% of Brisbane residents use alternative transportation methods. The City should ensure that parking does not become an issue because the City allowed the developer to build minimal parking in the hope and presumption human behavior will change to use transit alternatives.

Page 4.8-40 Add a Program/Policy for Street lighting to ensure the sidewalks are properly lit 24 hours a day 7 days a week to ensure the safety and health off all members of our community.

Chapter 10.52 TDM - there is no mention of pedestrians. There should be.

Page 4.8-42 Section 12.24.010 Street Design Standards - there is a note about maintaining a minimum 20 foot wide street width for streets without on-street parking. There should be a comment about width of streets with on-street parking.

Page 4.8-47 Active Transportation Facilities - There are several typos. The first Paragraph notes Table 3-4 and it should be Table 3-3. The first paragraph notes Figure 3-44 as the Baylands Pedestrian Network but it should be Figure 3-30. The Baylands bicycle and micro-mobility facility types are listed in Table 3-4 not Table 3-5 as noted on this page and illustrated in Figure 3-31 not 3-45 as noted in the EIR.

Who will pay for the fare-free shuttle network for Baylands residents and workers? For how long? There should be studies done on projected usage and then once/if implemented, there should be reviews of usage and how to enhance/encourage usage or discontinue the service.

In paragraph two, there are typos for the Baylands routes for internal and weekday connections. It should state Table 3-5 and Figure 3-42.

Page 4.8-48 Transit - There are typos. It should state Table 3-5 and Figure 3-32.

d. Parking Requirements - The reality based upon the 2017-2021 study shows 99.5% of Brisbane residents and workers are using a car. Perhaps a maximum off street parking spaces is not appropriate or enough.

If Assembly Bill No. 2162 prohibits local governments from imposing a minimum parking requirement on low-income housing projects built within one-half mile of a public transit stop, why is there a maximum? It seems to be more appropriate to consider the needs of low-income households and to not make parking an issue/concern/worry for the families and individuals. Parking should be accessible and not cost prohibitive.

Page 4.8-49 Regarding the Bayshore Mobility Plan, reducing the prominence of regional through traffic along Bayshore Boulevard seems lovely in theory. In practicality, where will the regional traffic go? It is less desirable to have the regional traffic using local streets to pass through the region. Maintaining and improving Bayshore Boulevard should be considered. Otherwise an explanation, prediction, plan for the obvious effects of the modification from a regional artery roadway to a local street must be included in the EIR.

Improving the look of the corridor can be done without reducing the lanes of traffic.

Providing protected intersections for Main Street and Geneva will be required. The plan should also include a protected intersection at Sunnydale.

Page 4.8-51 Minor Arterials - The EIR mentions that the intersects will be stop controlled as traffic volumes are expected to be substantially higher on the minor arterials than cross streets.

This is because of the increase of residents, employees and customers/patrons at the increased commercial offices, and the reduction of Bayshore Boulevard (a regional artery) to a two lane street. The plan should account for all-way stops instead of spending the money on a traffic engineering study at a later time.

Page 4.8-54 Clarify who will be responsible for the bike repair stations.

Page 4.8-60 The beginning of the sentence is missing in the fourth paragraph.

Page 4.8-63 Correction in BaylandsTraffic Zone, Figure notation should be Figure 4.8-8 not Figure 4.8-7.

Page 4.8-66 TDM Assessment - Detail the 2025 Specific Plan additional TDM measures even though there is limited research supporting quantifiable reductions.

Page 4.8-67 Table 4.8-9 There is a shuttle program and transit incentives listed for a 6.3% reduction in TDM effectiveness. However there is no detail as to who or what agency will be providing the Baylands Shuttle Service or projections on ridership. Due to the current funding limitations and limited ridership of the Brisbane Commute.org shuttle, will the Baylands shuttle be fully funded and have a stronger ridership.

The EIR should detail the "other TDM strategies required by the City of Brisbane or C/CAG". The EIR should clarify how much of the 7.9% reduction in TDM does this vague statement covers.

Page 4.8-68 Mentions a library as a potential land use with the project site. It would be great if San Mateo County built an additional library in Brisbane in the Baylands.

Page 4.8-77 Impact Assessment - The figures noted in the pedestrian and bicycle connection are wrong. The Figures are Figure 3-30 and 3-31.

Page 4.8-79 Ensure the developer implements the changes regarding the inadequacies of pedestrian and bicycle connections within the Specific Plan.

Bayshore Mobility Plan - It is great to add protected intersections at locations with vulnerable roadway users. However, that is not going to change the traffic flow or human behavior that Bayshore Boulevard is the quickest route from San Francisco down the peninsula if US 101 is congested. Please clarify and detail where traffic will go to reduce the High Injury Network.

Construction of the relocated Fire Station needs to accommodate the pedestrian sidewalk and bus stop. The City of Brisbane cannot continue to approve property improvements and give away the pedestrian accessibility on the sidewalk.

Page 4.8-81 Design the relocation of the Fire Station so that there are no traffic safety hazards. Regarding the temporary delays, it is inevitable that motorists must give way to emergency vehicles.

Page 4.8-82 MM-TRA-2b - Creating BRT lanes on the Geneva Extension is great in theory. However, if the BRT ends at Bayshore Boulevard to the West and Harney Street to the East, how much improvement to the transit was actually accomplished? There are presently no BRT lanes on Geneva West of Bayshore Boulevard and it is highly unlikely that the city of Daly City will eminent domain the driveways of the homeowners to add BRT lanes. In addition, Daly City just implemented speed cameras between Carter Street and Mission, so there will be nothing rapid about transportation in that section of Geneva Boulevard. So where will the BRT continue in the East? Into the Candlestick area? If the BRT is solely for the Geneva Extension, have we really increased the transit access or reduced VMTs? The likelihood of residents using the BRT will be limited unless there are connectors to other public transportation modes that are desirable for use by Baylands residents and employees.

Page 4.8-86 Regional Arterials - Bayshore Boulevard motorists actually travel much faster than 35 to 45 mph.

Page 4.8-88 Clarify and detail if Tunnel Avenue and Sierra Point Parkway will become regional arterials because of the modification of Bayshore Boulevard.

Page 4.8-91 Student Routes to school - Due to the potential number of young children and their families crossing from the Baylands across Bayshore Boulevard and/or Geneva it really is important that a pedestrian bridge be considered to create a much safer more permanent structure addressing the high injury network and safe route to school.

Appendix F2

Page 5 - Regarding the vehicle volumes, there is an assumption that BCMP will be implemented and be effective. Currently it's a major thoroughfare. That behavior will not change overnight. It is HIN. Bayshore is a main artery for traffic from San Francisco to the peninsula.

Page 6 - The Brisbane School District participated in caps activities for their report, but Bayshore School District did not participate in any activities. The developers must engage the Bayshore School District to properly account for their needs. The development team and city of Brisbane team needs to find ways to include the families and faculty of the Bayshore School District. We should have all stakeholders involved. The Bayshore school district should be consulted post the report.

Bayshore Elementary school has been identified as a priority public elementary school as well as a school with a history of high bike and pedestrian collisions. The report adds a bullet to prioritize infrastructure improvements for student drop off and pick up zones, high collision

intersections and mid-blocks. However it does not detail any suggestions for improvements, e.g. traffic calming measures, loading and unloading zones/carve outs, pedestrian bridges, etc.

Page 7 - Was the LRSP adopted by the County of San Mateo in 2024?

Geneva is on the HIN. The planners and Developers should improve Geneva Avenue so it is not a HIN. The developers should engage with Daly City's Vision Zero.

Page 9 - Brisbane General Plan Policy C.23 seek to retrofit existing roadways to create Complete Streets. The EIR should detail with a lot more specificity how and when in the plan. There should be a more detailed specific plan for the whole city of Brisbane. The plan should be reviewed on a regular basis, perhaps every 5 years.

Page 10 - Policy C.34 and Policy C.35 - The City of Brisbane should be doing this with all new construction within current Brisbane city limits. See new home on Lake/San Bruno. Or new homes on Thomas Avenue.

Speeding is identified as one of the leading factors for severe injury or death around the project area. The plan should address vehicle speed issues with more specificity.

Page 11 - Table 1 The City of Brisbane and the Bayshore School District should adopt a STRS local policy. The Brisbane community should been engaged for a Vision Zero Plan. A SRTS Task Force should be created for the City of Brisbane, the Bayshore School District, and the Brisbane School District. All stakeholders should be included.

Page 12 - Table 2 - There souls be a better, more specific definition of high visibility crosswalks. That might include Raised crosswalks, Blinking lights, or a pedestrian bridge.

The Plan should include specific locations for the installed actuated Beacons and speed bumps. The plan should discuss what factors were or will be considered when placing these.

Page 13 - Lower School Zone Speed Limits - The development should increase the lower school speed zone to outside the 500 foot zone. An analysis should be done with actual locations of current families in the school district and a map drawn to show all potential walking and bicycle routes to the elementary school and new middle school. Kids will still be walking/biking home beyond that. The plan should consider any laws/regulations regarding the 500 feet zone and consider whether or not the zone should be extended beyond what a law or regulation due to the safety and health of our youth. The City of Brisbane should consider a full expansion of 15/20 mph on all residential neighborhoods.

Baylands Development will provide street trees and greening on all streets surrounding schools. The plan should consider whether this creates long term visibility issues for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists. The plan should also consider the on going maintenance and costs and

who will be providing the funds to provide for the costs for ongoing maintenance of the the greenery.