

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

4.23 TRANSIT SERVICES (TN)

CONTENTS

- TN-1. *Transit Service Improvements*
- TN-2. *Transit Service to Crissy Field*
- TN-3. *Presidio Internal Shuttle Service*
- TN-4. *Support of Transit Hub*
- TN-5. *Opposition to Main Post Transit Hub*
- TN-6. *Marin County*
- TN-7. *Ferry Service*
- TN-8. *Transit Plan and Alternatives*
- TN-9. *Presidio Trust Subsidy of Public Transit Services*
- TN-10. *Transit Passenger Loads*
- TN-11. *More Detail on Golden Gate Transit Service*
- TN-12. *Impacts of Tour and Charter Buses*
- TN-13. *Prohibit Tour Buses from Specific Gates*
- TN-14. *Status of Tour Bus Management Plan*

TN-1. *Transit Service Improvements*

Several commentors, including the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) Planning Department, the GGNRA Citizens' Advisory Commission, San Francisco Beautiful and Urban Ecology, suggest that the Trust make a stronger commitment to seeking improved transit service to the Presidio. The CCSF Planning Department suggests that fast and efficient transit service to key City, downtown and regional transit connection destinations that outperforms the automobile is a key mitigation for potential impacts from the projected large Presidio employment base. The CCSF Planning Department specifically suggests express transit service to downtown to connect to the Transbay Regional Transit Center, Ferry Building and BART as well as to Golden Gate Transit service. San Francisco Beautiful and Urban Ecology support extension of the historic streetcar to Fort Mason, and suggest that the Plan ensure the opportunity to extend that service through the densest portions

of the Presidio and to the Golden Gate Bridge. The GGNRA Citizens' Advisory Commission urges the adoption of an aggressive mass transit plan that includes the E-line, ferry service and buses.

The Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District and Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action suggest that the Plan identify what specific transit improvements are being contemplated by the Trust. Several commentors have specific suggestions for improving transit service to, from and within the Presidio, including:

- Operating the Muni #28 route on Lincoln Boulevard and other surface streets in the park rather than Doyle Drive;
- Terminating the Muni #41, #45 and #30 lines at the Letterman Digital Arts Center rather than Cow Hollow (#41 and #45) and the Marina (#30);
- Operating Presidio shuttle buses to connect with BART and CalTrain during peak commute hours;
- Providing shuttle service for business and public use, as well as increasing access to public transit;
- Providing direct transit service between the most urban areas of the City (e.g., Hunters Point) and the Presidio to provide children in these neighborhoods access to natural resources;
- Studying the potential for using existing nearby piers for passenger ferries;
- Reusing the remnants of railroad tracks between Fort Mason and the Presidio with some sort of public transit; and
- Considering building underground parking structures connected underground by a horizontal tram with direct access to Doyle Drive.

Response TN-1 – The Trust will continue to support the use of public transit by employees, residents and visitors, and will continue to work with MUNI and GGT to make improved transit service a reality. Planning of specific transit improvements is outside of the sole authority and responsibility of the

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

Trust and hence cannot be proposed as part of the Plan. The Trust supports several transit improvements being considered by Muni and GGT, and as indicated in Chapter Two of the Final Plan will continue to work with the relevant transit agencies to upgrade service to the Presidio as the on-site population increases. Improved express bus connection to downtown San Francisco and BART is an important service upgrade supported by the Trust. This may include modifications to the existing Muni 82X line, which provides service to and from downtown San Francisco, BART stations on Market Street, the Transbay Transit Terminal and the CalTrain Depot during morning and evening commute periods. The Trust is also in favor of and will work towards modifying existing operating rules that apply to transit providers from outside San Francisco such as GGT, so that their current bus service to and from downtown San Francisco can be used for travel within the City, including trips between the Presidio and the downtown area. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure TR-10 calls for supporting increased service frequency on existing Muni lines as warranted. The Trust will work with Muni to determine the most cost-effective service plan.

The Trust also supports extension of the proposed Muni streetcar E-line from Fisherman's Wharf to Fort Mason, and will continue to support the E-line extension beyond Fort Mason to the Presidio. The Trust participates actively on a committee that is working toward implementation of the E-line extension.

As described in the Trust's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program (included as Appendix D in the Final Plan), shuttle service internal to the Presidio and connecting to transit service immediately outside the Presidio is a critical component of an overall strategy to increase transit use and decrease automobile traffic. This shuttle service is already provided, and will serve increasing numbers of residents, employees, and visitors over time. Supplemental shuttle service from the Presidio to downtown transit connections is a feature of the TDM program which the Trust anticipates will be implemented in conjunction with Presidio employers in the future. The Trust currently makes its shuttle vehicles available to school and community groups upon request, and would support other options, if feasible, to connect the Presidio to populated areas south of downtown.

TN-2. *Transit Service to Crissy Field*

Several commentors, including the Golden Gate National Parks Association, request that the Trust seek ways to provide superior public transit and specialized transportation services to Crissy Field.

Response TN-2 – In July 2001, the Trust implemented internal bus shuttle service that directly serves Crissy Field in the Presidio. The Trust has recently altered and improved the Presidio shuttle bus service based on field observations and a survey of shuttle riders and Presidio tenants conducted in late 2001. The revised route(s) provide additional service to Crissy Field. Furthermore, the Trust has proposed a transit hub at the foot of the Main Post. The transit center would serve a variety of Muni lines and the Presidio's shuttle bus service. The proposed location of the transit center is very near Crissy Field, providing its visitors with easy access to transit service. The planned provision of transit service at or near Crissy Field has been coordinated with the NPS and the Golden Gate National Parks Association.

TN-3. *Presidio Internal Shuttle Service*

Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action requests that the Trust clarify whether the Presidio's shuttle bus will provide direct access to transit services outside the Presidio's boundaries.

Response TN-3 – In July 2001, the Trust implemented the Presidio internal shuttle bus service (recently named PresidiGo), and is committed to its continued operation in the future. The Trust recently altered and improved PresidiGo service based on field observations and a survey of shuttle riders and Presidio tenants conducted in late 2001. One of the new PresidiGo routes extends beyond the Presidio's boundary outside the Arguello Gate to provide more convenient links to local transit services currently operating on California Street. This service was coordinated with the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors (PHAN) and Muni, both of which support the new service. The Trust will continue to look for improved connections with other transit services within and surrounding the park. When looking to implement connections outside of the Presidio, the Trust will coordinate with associated neighborhood organizations and comply with City restrictions for large vehicles on neighborhood streets surrounding the Presidio. In addition to the

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

PresidiGo route, the Chestnut Street lunch shuttle buses also currently connect with other transit routes outside the park gates.

TN-4. Support of Transit Hub

Several commentors, including the CCSF Planning Department, Planning Association for the Richmond and the Sierra Club, comment that the Trust should commit to and clarify plans for a transit hub. The Sierra Club supports a transit hub that allows for convenient connections between Presidio internal shuttle buses, Muni buses and GGT buses, and suggests discontinuing the Presidio’s proposed transit center if the Doyle Drive transit becomes a reality and provides equal or better service. The CCSF Planning Department questions why a transit hub is shown in the Draft Plan but not mentioned in the Draft EIS, and requests clarification of the Trust’s plans for and commitment to the transit hub. The CCSF Planning Department also writes “The Trust has indicated that it would provide shuttle service from recreation areas to SF attractions. What will be the extent of this service in terms of frequency, headways, and projected ridership? How will the service be coordinated with MUNI? What will be the impacts of this service on adjacent neighborhoods?”

Response TN-4 – The Trust has proposed a transit hub at the foot of the Main Post that is expected to accommodate several Muni lines and the Presidio’s internal shuttle bus service. The transit hub is proposed for the northern end of the Main Post, near Crissy Field and Letterman, thus encouraging transit ridership to these districts. Transfers to and from GGT will remain at the Golden Gate Bridge Plaza and the bus stops on Richardson Avenue at Francisco Street. The Trust will continue to improve shuttle bus connections to and from these locations and the Presidio. The Final EIS analyses of transit services includes the transit center and the text has been revised to include a discussion of the proposed transit center, which was also proposed in the GMPA and thus, analyzed in the GMPA EIS.

In addition, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) plans a transit center in the Doyle Drive corridor that would facilitate transfers between the bus services. The Trust does not believe that such a transit center should replace the proposed transit hub at the foot of the Main Post because the Doyle Drive facility would be located too far from the population concentrated in the Main Post district, the central area of activity of the

Presidio. Nonetheless, the Trust expects that the PresidiGo would serve the Doyle Drive transit center as well as the Main Post location.

The Golden Gate Concourse Authority is examining a “cultural shuttle” service would serve Golden Gate Park, the Presidio and other GGNRA and San Francisco attractions. The Trust is very supportive of this effort, but such a service would not be operated by the Trust.

TN-5. Opposition to Main Post Transit Hub

The SFCTA requests that the Trust explain why a transit center is proposed in the Plan but was rejected as part of Doyle Drive planning.

Response TN-5 – The Trust has consistently sought good transit connections, and although it has proposed a transit hub in the area of the Main Post, it still supports another in the Doyle Drive corridor. A transit center in the Doyle Drive corridor would provide convenient connections between GGT, Muni and the Presidio Shuttle, and the Trust has been part of a Doyle Drive subcommittee (as part of the SFCTA study) that has examined potential locations for such a transit center along a reconstructed Doyle Drive. While supportive of the overall concept, the Trust does not support construction of a large facility in the Doyle Drive corridor that would use valuable park land to provide for timed transfers and layovers for all the GGT and Muni buses that travel along Doyle Drive.

TN-6. Marin County

The City of Sausalito, Tamalpais Valley Gateway Coalition and the GGNRA Citizens’ Advisory Commission suggest that the Plan provide for a coordinated and comprehensive transit system linking San Francisco with visitor destinations in Marin County, and encourage the expansion of and the coordination between the Presidio, San Francisco and Marin transit systems to facilitate easy connections for park visitors and employees. Similarly, the City of Sausalito requests clarification as to how the Plan would affect visitor transit to destinations in Marin County.

Response TN-6 – The Trust’s PresidiGo service currently connects with GGT and Muni #76 buses at the Golden Gate Bridge Plaza. These services provide transit connections to the Marin Headlands (Muni) and most Marin County

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

visitor destinations (GGT). Over the long-term, PresidiGo service will connect with the planned Doyle Drive transit center to provide even more convenient services. The Trust will continue to work with the NPS to determine the best way to link visitor destinations, considering both water and land transportation. It would be well beyond the Trust's mandate and ability, however, to fund and operate a comprehensive transit system connecting to regional visitor destinations.

TN-7. Ferry Service

The Sierra Club states that the Plan should not consider ferry service because of the expense of operating ferry service, and feels that revenue from parking fees would be more wisely spent on reducing the amount of development.

Response TN-7 – The Trust appreciates the issues of expense in consideration of ferry service. The Trust intends to continue to work with the NPS and the San Francisco Bay Area Water Transportation Authority to evaluate the feasibility of ferry access to the Presidio. Water transportation has the advantage of providing transit access that can bypass congestion on the roadways and bridges leading to the Presidio. Although these advantages could benefit Presidio-based employees and residents, it is likely that visitors would gain the greatest benefits from scheduled service to attractions such as Crissy Field and Fort Point or to special events at Crissy Field.

The ferries offer the advantage of service to Area A directly, so the Presidio Trust's major impetus would be to ensure that any potential ferry terminals would be adequately served by the Presidio Trust shuttle. The Trust does not anticipate funding ferry service. The use of parking revenues is discussed in Parking responses.

TN-8. Transit Plan and Alternatives

The Sierra Club suggests that the PTIP EIS include alternatives for transit service. The CCSF Planning Department suggests that the PTIP is primarily a policy and land use plan but should be an integrated land use and transit plan. (“The proposed transit center and replacement of Doyle Drive should be closely integrated with the plan's proposals. It is particularly important in the Letterman area and throughout the Presidio to have a strong TDM program to help reduce traffic impacts on adjacent off-site neighborhoods.”)

Response TN-8 – The PTMP is a policy framework that will guide decisionmaking on land use and management issues in Area B of the Presidio, including decisions regarding investments in transit services, and decisions regarding transportation demand management (TDM). A comprehensive TDM program is included in the Final Plan, which also articulates minimum performance standards and long-term goals for reducing automobile use. A transit center is proposed at the Main Post, and support is provided for the concept of another transit center associated with Doyle Drive. In all these ways, the Final Plan is the kind of integrated land use and transit plan requested by the CCSF Planning Department – much like the City's own General Plan. Existing and planned (alternative or supplemental) transit services are described, many of which rely on transit providers other than the Trust. These include extension of Muni service, ferry service, enhanced transit connections, and more. Within this programmatic or policy framework there will be ample opportunity to undertake the detailed operations and feasibility studies required to undertake these and other service enhancements.

TN-9. Presidio Trust Subsidy of Public Transit Services

The Sierra Club states that the EIS incorrectly considered increased demand for transit services as an environmental impact rather than as a mitigation measure for the impacts of development, and contends that financial assistance for transit services should be listed as a mitigation measure.

Response TN-9 – The analysis of alternatives is intended to identify areas in which additional transit service may be needed to accommodate the expected increase in ridership associated with the alternatives. Such an analysis is routinely conducted as part of environmental review to determine potential for overcrowding on transit vehicles and potential increased costs to transit service providers. Mitigation Measure TR-10 calls for supporting increased service frequency as warranted, and Mitigation Measure TR-25 calls for monitoring passenger loads. Both measures could result in support for service enhancements if warranted, including potential financial support.

TN-10. Transit Passenger Loads

The CCSF Planning Department requests that the EIS discuss existing and future transit capacities and Maximum Load Points (MLP), the relative transit demand for each alternative, and each alternative's contribution to ridership in

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

excess of line capacity at the MLP, if applicable. The CCSF Planning Department questions whether the transit ridership estimates cited in the EIS included the existing transit ridership for Area B. The CCSF Planning Department also questions when the described transit impacts would be expected to occur, and requests that the EIS identify measures that would allow for future Muni ridership to be accommodated and describe how these measures would be accomplished. The CCSF Planning Department questions the mitigation proposed to alleviate the effect of congested intersections on transit operations. The CCSF Planning Department also requests that the EIS include a map of the Presidio shuttle route indicating key transfer points to Muni and GGT, and questions whether the proposed Presidio shuttle route will comply with existing City restrictions on neighborhood streets outside the Presidio's boundary.

Response TN-10 – The Draft EIS described the increase in transit passenger loads associated with each alternative. More details of the transit analysis can be found in the Background Transportation Report. Muni baseline future (2020) ridership was assumed to be 127 percent of the existing ridership on each Muni route. The additional ridership expected to be generated by different land use scenarios as analyzed in the EIS, was then added to the estimate of future baseline ridership to obtain the expected future growth. This growth in ridership is based on data from the SFCTA Travel Demand Model and other Muni planning documents.

The Background Transportation Report provides the professional analysis of the maximum load point in each direction for each Muni line, and shows the number of transit riders the Presidio is expected to contribute to the total passenger load at the MLP and the expected total passenger load at the MLP in 2020 under each alternative. The analysis is conservative in that it assumes all of the transit riders generated by the Presidio would ride through the MLP on each Muni route. If Presidio-based passengers board after, or alight before the MLP, the effect on passenger loads will be less than indicated by the analysis. The resulting future passenger load factors on Muni lines will depend on any increases in capacity already planned for implementation. It should be noted that most Muni Presidio routes are in the reverse commute direction and have greater available capacity than downtown routes.

The Presidio's internal shuttle bus service has recently been adjusted in response to field observations and passenger surveys. The revised routes have

improved transfer connections to Muni and GGT routes. The Trust will continue to comply with applicable City restrictions on neighborhood streets outside the Presidio's boundary. Because the precise shuttle routes are expected to be adjusted further in the future, no map has been provided in the EIS; instead, the Final Plan has been revised, in response to comments, to illustrate generalized transit connections and transit hub locations.

TN-11. More Detail on Golden Gate Transit Service

The Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) requests that the EIS summarize GGT service by route, describe the impacts to affected GGT routes and how monitoring would help to mitigate these impacts.

Response TN-11 – Existing GGT service and ridership are described in detail in the Background Transportation Report. Because all GGT routes except Route 50 have the same route and stops in the vicinity of the Presidio, GGT routes were not analyzed on an individual basis. Current individual loads, boardings and alightings by route at stops in the vicinity of the Presidio are unavailable, as indicated by GGT staff and referenced at the beginning of the study.

The overall AM peak hour and PM peak hour existing ridership on each GGT route is also provided in the Background Transportation Report. The alternatives discussed in the EIS are expected to generate between 100 and 156 GGT riders during the AM peak hour and between 95 and 212 GGT riders during the PM peak hour in 2020.

If existing GGT service frequencies remain constant, the additional ridership would add additional standees to Route 4 in the AM peak hour, which currently operates at 105 percent of capacity. Four other GGT routes currently operate with load factors between 90 percent and 100 percent in the AM peak hour. If service frequencies remain constant, additional Presidio-based ridership could potentially result in passenger loads exceeding capacity. No routes have a load factor greater than 86 percent in the PM peak hour. Thus, additional Presidio-based ridership is not expected to result in load factors of 100 percent or higher during the PM peak hour. If ridership on GGT buses is distributed differently than current ridership, the higher load factor levels may not be reached. Therefore, monitoring of Presidio-based GGT ridership will

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

determine whether transit impacts actually occur. In addition to monitoring, Mitigation Measure TR-25 would require coordination between the Trust and the GGBHTD regarding potential improvements if needed. Coordination may include the political or financial support required to expand services.

TN-12. *Impacts of Tour and Charter Buses*

Several commentors, including the CCSF Planning Department, state that the EIS should address impacts associated with increased numbers of tour and charter buses coming to the park as the result of proposed programs. The CCSF Planning Department states, “The impacts of additional tour and charter bus traffic are not discussed in the EIS. Existing tour bus restrictions on City streets are not discussed in the transportation section. The existing Gray Line/Coach USA Trolley Hop Route and existing ridership should be described. How many additional tour and charter buses will be attracted to the Presidio under each alternative? How much of this future tour and charter bus traffic will be combined trips to Area A and B? Are there trips associated with the development of the Letterman Complex? It is vital that the full cumulative impacts on traffic of tour and charter buses, vehicles, shuttles, and construction vehicles at build-out of Area A, Area B, Letterman, and other foreseeable future projects in the area be considered. What are the potential impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists, and joggers of cumulative build-out in the Presidio and surrounding area. What mitigation measures are proposed for these impacts?”

Response TN-12 – The existing tour bus and charter bus traffic to and from the Presidio (both Areas A and B) is considered in the existing transportation analysis described in the Background Transportation Report. The Final EIS has been revised to include a description of tour bus use and restrictions. The transportation analysis of future conditions assumes that all additional Presidio residents, employees and visitors will access the park (including the 23-acre Letterman Digital Arts Center) via automobile, transit, or bicycle/walking. Some visitors may arrive by tour or charter bus rather than Muni or GGT, although the Trust expects that the Presidio’s new (free) internal shuttle bus service will be an attractive alternative to private tour buses for many visitors. Recent discussions with tour bus operators have indicated an interest in using the Presidio shuttle to provide for internal trips to the Presidio, thereby minimizing both traffic and parking impacts of the tour buses.

To minimize the potential effects of tour buses and charter buses in both Area A and Area B of the Presidio and adjacent neighborhoods, the Trust will work with the NPS and the City to develop a strategy for tour bus management, as discussed in the Final Plan. The coordinated strategy will consider bus size, frequency, noise and vibration, use of alternative-fuel vehicles, routing, permitting, idling and parking, interpretation (i.e., tour bus programs for explaining the park’s resources and history), and venues to be served.

TN-13. *Prohibit Tour Buses from Specific Gates*

Several nearby neighborhood groups suggested that the Trust prohibit tour buses from accessing the PHSH district as well as from use of the Arguello Boulevard, 15th Avenue, and Lincoln Boulevard/25th Avenue gates. Cow Hollow Neighbors in Action states that the EIS should describe measures to ensure that tour buses would not utilize restricted City streets.

Response TN-13 – Tour buses are currently restricted from City streets outside the 25th Avenue, 15th Avenue, Marina Boulevard and Gorgas Avenue gates. The restrictions at the 15th and 25th Avenue gates are interim, pending completion of tour bus management plan. Neither the Trust nor the U.S. Park Police has the legal authority to enforce the City restrictions. However, when providing information to tour bus operators with access information, the Trust informs the tour bus operator of the existing restrictions on these City streets, and suggests access routes consistent with these limitations. The Trust will continue to advise tour bus operators about the City restrictions and identify alternative routes when contacted or otherwise providing information. In addition, the Trust will work with the NPS and the City to develop a comprehensive tour bus management plan as described in the Final Plan. The Trust expects that one of the outcomes of the consolidated tour bus strategy could be restrictions similar to the City’s for areas just inside the gates that could be enforced by the U.S. Park Police.

TN-14. *Status of Tour Bus Management Plan*

Several commentors, including the CCSF Planning Department and the Golden Gate National Parks Association, request that the Plan clarify the status of the tour bus/charter bus management plan. The CCSF Planning Department states “What is the status of the tour bus/charter bus management plan referred to in the Draft PTIP? What are the elements included in the plan

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

4. Responses to Comments

that would keep tour buses off neighborhood streets and control their numbers, timing, and access? This plan will have to conform to existing restrictions on City streets. Because of the unhealthy and potentially dangerous effects of tour buses on residential streets within the City of SF, the tour bus/charter bus management plan must ensure that access to and from the Presidio is via Doyle Drive (HWY 101), Park Presidio (HWY 1), Geary Blvd, and Lombard Street.”

Response TN-14 – To ensure the orderly movement of tour buses and minimize their impact both within the park and in adjacent neighborhoods, the Trust will be working with the NPS and the City to develop a comprehensive tour bus management plan. The plan will address bus size, frequency, noise

and vibration, use of alternative-fuel vehicles, routing, permitting, idling and parking, interpretation (i.e., tour bus programs for explaining the park’s resources and history), and venues to be served. Work to date on the plan has included vehicle counts, tabulation and observations of tour bus characteristics, compilation of relevant restrictions, and noise and vibration analysis of various size buses. No target date has been set for completion of the study; however, work is well under way.

The Trust agrees that restrictions must be coordinated with the City. The Trust will consider the option of working with the City to revise restrictions to ensure that in the end the park goals are achieved while protecting adjacent neighborhoods.