

Ocean Beach Master Plan - Public Workshop #3 - Feedback received via written comment sheets

Summary:

Total of 15 comment sheets received; one only contained the front page; one did not have a copy of page 4 on the back; one received via mail

Do you have general comments, suggestions, ideas?

1. Great outreach process with test scenarios. The team should consider that research of Phil King from SF State who conducted (a study) regarding the cost / benefits of hardening the shoreline vs. more natural solutions for Ocean Beach.
2. Way to go! A great hone-in from the workshop #2 test scenarios. Seems plausible – I look forward to seeing the implementation plan.
3. Make sure all elected and appointed governmental representatives receive this plan, in person with explanation to ensure that this plan actually gets included in future decisions. When I walked in I felt moving Great Highway was not a good idea. Ben Grant was able to explain better than just seeing the written plan – instead of fighting with nature to save the road, remove the road and help nature save the beach and bluff! Thank you for this opportunity to voice my opinions.
4. Very wise to focus on recommendations until 2050 with reassessment at 2030. A study re: Lake Merced Tunnel relocation/reconfiguration/ reinforcement is crucial in the short-term.
5. General comment regarding visuals: difficult to see small icons on map; more specific zoom-ins needed. Overall inclusion of diagrams of how dredging works, i.e. impacts.
6. The wind/solar street light will include fog in mind along the width of N. Beach.
7. Add weather-resistant interpretive stations to cover wildlife, geology, history; need an intense education campaign for neighborhood about long-term potential effects of climate change / sea level rise.
8. Plan A – move the road!
9. I'm not in agreement with the Zoo area Plan at all to bring the coastal highway drive in disrupting all the natural habitat for a trail that only the neighborhood would have access to really. These improvements along the already trails that need structure and nature's protective areas need looking at without building and destroying what's already there to enjoy: what about all the seniors that cannot get to the beach itself – what's a boardwalk cost and wheelchair access to the beach itself?
10. I think you need to keep artificial reef technology on your radar. It would have a lot of good effects.
11. Give high profile to the realities of climate change (sample below, pertinent only to San Mateo coast)

Key Move 1: Reroute Great Highway behind the Zoo via Sloat and Skyline

In general do you agree with this move:

YES: 12

NO: 3

No response: 2

Positive aspects or additional opportunities?

1. Connects Fort Funston, Zoo, and Ocean Beach recreation areas
2. New coastal trail; reduce cost maintain existing road
3. Adaptation to sea level rise; traffic improvement; increasing transit access
4. More room for natural processes (coastal dynamics); withdrawing from the coast better long-term strategy (more proactive); creation of a coastal trail – across to Fort Funston
5. Is the Lake Merced connection at all plausible?
6. 1.4; 1.1
7. Alleviates need for hardscape reaction to erosion affecting the southern Great Highway.
8. Mr. Grant put it well. Stop fighting nature – remove road and instead help nature stay beautiful. I suggest a roundabout at 1.1.
9. The protection of Lake Merced transport and source mains is good; 1.3 I think that the reconfiguration of Sloat is not (illegible) and needs better description.
10. Managed retreat
11. I think section has been comprehensively reviewed with regard to the needs of all affected institutions/agencies (zoo, DPW, GGNRA, etc)

Negative aspects or concerns?

1. Too much focus on parking
2. 1.7 input conflict: With proposed recycled water plant? Zoo plans?; 1.1 traffic impacts for Lake Merced Blvd, Sunset and Lower Great Highway need to be thorough analysis; 1.1 Maintain four lane Sloat and turning lane
3. Traffic will be a problem on Sloat. Need easier routing through avenues to help mitigate. Protection of bank swallow nest areas.
4. 1.2 The road should go both northbound and southbound. Trucks would turn left onto the Old Great Highway extension; travel north, turn right into the plant and turn right back onto Skyline southbound.
5. May create traffic jam. Prevent or interrupt the view!
6. Traffic
7. How can we bring this to the public attention so enough of the public understands the necessity and will back funding of needed changes? What sources of funding can be used to accomplish these infrastructure projects?

Specific input regarding the key move's components?

1. 1.4 Pull L-Taraval to zoo gate very positive improvement. Bus stop should take great safety and protection measures

2. LID improvement to adjacent neighborhoods should be funded by PUC. Perhaps a (illegible) grant program and PUC workshop on the LID improvements.
3. 1.3 LID could be great approach to addressing future SLR and inundation and storm surge; 1.4 Better transit access could mitigate any loss of parking spaces; 1.5 Key connection of open space / coastal trail very important
4. 1.3 Lake Merced watershed report calls for narrowing Lake Merced Blvd, freeing 2-3 acres for Lake Merced. Other path / bike trail improvements are recommended, many along Ocean Beach plan. Efforts to include projects in potential 2012 Rec Park (possibly PUC) bond. Other Ocean Beach projects might be included in bond. Need to identify and advocate now.
5. Look at movement of some zoo facilities to the top of OTP and around the Armory. Is the Army planning to move? Should be arranged. Anticipate greater traffic impact and seek ways to mitigate.
6. 1.4-1.6 excellent; 1.7 would like to keep some free parking; 1.3 good way to enhance safety and discourage J-walking
7. 1.7&1.8 I think that Armory Rd, or it may have been renamed, goes to the Armory. I think that road identified as Armory Rd is called Zoo Road formerly known as Park Road; 1.1. A traffic study is needed that better describes the impacts and routing of traffic to the treatment plant off of Skyline at Harding Park Rd and Zoo Road.
8. I think this aspect of the plan should have the highest priority. We cannot afford further erosion at the foot of Sloat and south without preparing for a permanent solution. The city must remove the rubble placed in a series of emergencies and it would be far better that we control the Great Highway closure as soon as possible instead of going for more temporary solutions that would have to be undone (or would not be given a permit in the first place).

Key Move 2: Introduce a multi-purpose coastal protection / restoration / access system

In general do you agree with this move:

YES: 11

NO: 0

No response: 5

Positive aspects or additional opportunities?

1. Definitely! Also need to keep space/green natural space.
2. If the Great Highway rerouting issues can be resolved
3. Withdrawal from bluff is a cost savings; like idea of wetland and interpretive center.
4. Provides a more useful green/nature/view space; potential wetlands at NW corner of zoo.
5. Cobble berms

6. Cobblestone berm better alternative to hard structures (needs to be studied); general withdraw approach is favorable.
7. Retreat and allowing for “natural” processes; cobble berms more environmentally friendly than shoreline hardening; infiltration swale great ecosystem service feature
8. Reopening / reuse of Fleishhacker building; address sea level rise and storm events; create of wetland adjacent to zoo parking lot
9. 2.8 Love idea of restoring Fleishhacker building
10. 2.9 Explains stormwater... is a great component; 2.8 Fleishhacker building should be renovated with sustainable features and be environmentally sensitive.
11. Start looking now for USGS, academic help with 2.10

Negative aspects or concerns?

1. Cobble berms will require on-going maintenance. Retreat may be faster than anticipated. What will be the 30-year erosion protection for the OTP?
2. Is there a long-term relocation recommendation for the pipe for after 2050?
3. Feasibility?
4. Cobble berm and sand could shift and expose pipe. Possible financial impact to damaged pipe (2.3-2.4) and cost of continual restoration of land.
5. I hope we can get 100 years out of 2.5, 2.8, and 2.9!

Specific input regarding the key move's components?

1. 2.1 Let nature shine; 2.2 add second wall; fill space with compacted garbage, adds weight to keep tunnel in place; I like using berm as wave power dissipation.
2. Study use of Fleishhacker Pool building for retail on public or non-profit use.
3. 2.8 Recent death of Mort Fleishhacker might open funding for warming hut. Need a strategy and plan to approach family.
4. Need specific analysis of Lake Merced reinforcement / relocation / reconfiguration! Could PUC fund this? Need to address the short-term as well as approach looks at 20-50+ years, but serious questions remain about 0-10 years
5. 2.9 Interpretive signage could include information regarding climate change and impacts to the coast; 2.10 adaptive management could be useful
6. Cost of stone berm vs. cost to maintain revetment
7. 2.7 detention swale (through zoo) can the zoo detain more stormwater for use within the zoo (washing etc) and lessen the overflow; 2.4 cobble berm great solution and seems to change seasonally (sand washing in and out).
8. These changes are mostly the more technical aspects needed to carry out and complete Key Move 1. Same sense of high priority, necessity, and need to find a range of sources of funding.

Key Move 3: Reduce the width of Great Highway to provide amenities / managed retreat

In general do you agree with this move:

YES: 10

NO: 3

No response: 2

Positive aspects or additional opportunities?

1. Potentially spreads traffic load. May allow better use of beach. Expansion of dune through migration is good.
2. LID improvements; better trails, trailheads, pedestrian access
3. Road diet!
4. Public recreation access increased while pod parking allows for more points of access; allow dunes to naturally evolve
5. 3.4 Restrooms needed, yes!
6. 3.4 more restrooms and add drinking fountains (using purified rainwater)
7. We already have amenities, improve upon them
8. The diagram suggests there will be opportunities for pedestrians in at least some areas of the berm to have an experience not dominated by the proximity to automobiles.

Negative aspects or concerns?

1. Traffic on busy days
2. I am not clear about amenities? Concerns: traffic impact.
3. The traffic impacts are significant. On warm weekend days there is a lot of traffic. Traffic seems to increase over time.
4. Traffic? How do Sloat businesses feel about this?
5. If traffic load not distributed better (even through neighborhoods), will be intermittent congestion.
6. Concerns @ Balboa, not on this section
7. Traffic should be redirected to 19th Ave. or Sunset rather than the Great Highway; plover education will be needed.
8. Looking at the diagram of the profile of Key Move 3, I would want a public meeting with pedestrians, surfers, cyclists, car drivers, emergency personnel, traffic analysts to review this. Need to understand the details better, get public buy-in.

Specific input regarding the key move's components?

1. 3.3 wall signage – I walk the beach (near or in the ocean) a lot. Although it isn't a major concern most of the time, I often lose track of where I am. If there was a non-obtrusive way of indicating one's location, signs indicating cross streets facing the ocean, that would be nice
2. I love wind and solar power and green roofs; concerned about bird safety with wind turbines and rodent explosion with green roof; what is included in an amenity pod?
3. Need seasonal physical barrier protection of plover habitat.
4. 3.1 Good opportunity to improve bike lane using LID features – needs to be

resurfaced; 3.4 solar might not be feasible; 3.7 LID could also address inundation and storm surge

5. 3.1 wide shoulder for cycling and for small retail amenities
6. Restrooms are always good - if done in accord with best management practices. Many park restrooms have been closed over the years. What can we bring to the design and management of those proposed here to make them worthwhile? To make them stay open?

Key Move 4: Middle reach native dune restoration

In general do you agree with this move:

YES: 11

NO: 1

No response: 3

Positive aspects or additional opportunities?

1. Restoration could provide ecosystem services
2. Love the sand ladders! Dune restoration imperative; continued sand nourishment is an important part of the equation; needs to be done for south Sloat (can dumping closer to the shore result in sand retention?); will the dredge retrofit happen in time to be factored in?
3. Dune restoration and expansion; better viewing
4. Let's go native plants!
5. We don't appear to have thought about the lower Great Highway here and in Key Move 3. The street is not uniform width and could contribute in a few selected places to the feeling of "you have arrived at a special place." This should not be expensive. Seek cooperation of the Friends of the Urban Forest. This could also help with neighborhood support and involvement.

Negative aspects or concerns?

1. On-going need for protection of plover habitat
2. 4.2 – I am highly allergic to ragweed pollen – is it really native here? (I thought I was free of it forever when I moved here)

Specific input regarding the key move's components?

1. 4.2 dune restoration can be a great educational tool to understand the beach and the efforts to protect it; important to highlight restoration efforts to the public.
2. I like that lower profile helps lessen loss of sand to roadway; please include signage on ocean side so you know where you are.

Key Move 5: Better connection between Golden Gate Park and Beach

In general do you agree with this move:

YES: 11

NO: 1

No response: 2

Positive aspects or additional opportunities?

1. Greening of the space
2. 5.4 Have you considered pedestrian bridges over the Great Highway. Too costly? Too great a gesture
3. Addition of bike lanes; improved access, pedestrian crossing
4. Creation of a sense of place and arrival
5. Narrowing lanes will slow traffic down and allow for safer crossing
6. Permeable parking is great; rainwater capture for drinking fountains
7. Particularly like 5.8. Connect these more substantial project motifs with simple improvements I've suggested for key moves 2 and 4. Give identity to the eastern edge of this Ocean Beach corridor.

Negative aspects or concerns?

1. Permeable pavement will need more maintenance than the roads receive now. Who will pay for and provide the maintenance? All of the sand drains along the Great Highway are plugged with sand and creates pockets of flooded roadway.
2. Loss of parking spaces will move cars into side lots of GGP. Not likely to be fewer cars. Need anticipate that.
3. Fee parking
4. Amenities should cater to bike / ped users more than car users
5. Skip 5.7. Fee parking not appropriate here. 5.4 is important. If done well, a big plus. If not of top quality: everything from durable materials to broad public appeal -- it would be better to hold off on this and not force it. With other elements in place, something right could suggest itself.

Specific input regarding the key move's components?

1. I like the inclusion of public art and convenient, well spaced restrooms; trees in lot may block my view
2. No fee parking should be introduced; discourages lower income folks from visiting the beach; access and parking should be free
3. 5.2 maintain "watching the water;" this can be solved with sheltered seating areas, for picnics, parties, resting; 5.7 parking fees are not a good idea; reduces affordability of a great public space.

Key Move 6: Bicycle + pedestrian improvements north of Balboa

In general do you agree with this move:

YES: 11

NO: 1

No response: 1

Uncertain: 1

Positive aspects or additional opportunities?

1. Important to allow space for walking (leisure and strolling) and runners; even separated areas
2. Two lanes would hopefully slow traffic down. Safety improvement for peds and bike is a must, very positive aspect of this proposal.
3. Really need bike lane; east side seems more practical
4. Helps to resolve potential bike and car conflicts
5. Increased bike and pedestrian access
6. Better pedestrian access / circulation
7. Segregated bike lane!
8. I appreciate how much you are trying to do here for pedestrians and cyclists and how much limiting car traffic would improve the area. So I'm rooting for this to work!

Negative aspects or concerns?

1. Should also serve Cliff House area(?) more than currently proposed
2. Be careful not to sacrifice good pedestrian access when expanding bicycle access
3. 6.1 I live nearby - have for 45 years. Weekend, holiday, special events, and warm weather traffic may be more than 2 lanes can handle. If a traffic study that covers these heavy use times has been done, I'd like to know more about it. The problem is, there are no major alternative routes because of the topography.

Specific input regarding the key move's components?

1. Bike rental areas; souvenir/snack shop areas
2. 6.3 Parked cars could buffer bicyclists from traffic
3. Restrooms at 6.1 and 6.4
4. Study whether Fulton St. could take some of the north of Balboa traffic and if so, how to get people to drive there instead.

From Post-it Notes on Boards

General comment board

- Impact and danger to wildlife (pelicans and other birds) of offshore and tidal power turbines (fish and surfers)
- Cost analysis
- Unhappy no "Just Revert"
- Fix the seawall now!
- Why no status quo analysis
- Create a 'non-armed force' – put people to work helping their country / state / city – everyone must serve 2 years

- Re: Offshore wind
 - Not aesthetically pleasing

- I would rather see the new stove pipe wind devices on everyone's house rather than trash the seascape
- Concerns about effecting these on birds

- Re: Onshore wing
 - negative impact on beach / wild experience
- Re: Tidal Power
 - won't this hurt / effect sea life?
 - Concerns about effects of these on fish and other sea life
- Re: Wind/solar street lights
 - add fog light to it?
- Re: wind + solar energy-operated restrooms
 - Ensure that the turbines are bird safe

Key Move 1:

- Near 1.6 and 1.8: Wherever there are bathrooms there should also be showers for surfers!
- Fleishhacker building could interpret history of building, coastlines and any future changes expected
- 1.1 Study this intersection (Lake Merced Watershed Report)
- If dumping all traffic to come around the Zoo and onto Sloat – you have to have at least 4 lanes of traffic – otherwise that wouldn't work
- Please add restrooms at 1.7 parking area
- Must have more Sloat beach parking @ 1.7. Sloat St parking not enough and too far from beach.
- Zero cost analysis
- Road engineers say you can move Great Highway to Sloat and reduce Sloat? Wtf?
- Build secondary wall w/ compressed garbage to help protect tunnel
- 45th and Sloat recalibrate signals
- [Line pointing to Fort Funston] Per Jon Loiacano
- Jetty study at Fort Funston to keep sand at Ocean Beach

Key Move 2:

- 2.8: Should include outdoor showers for surfers

Key Move 3:

- Zero cost analysis
- Open auto access from neighborhoods mid beach to Great Highway
- PUC should provide funding for LID improvements in neighborhoods
- Re: parking rendering – Love this! (Another person wrote: Me too!)
- Re: parking rendering – Appreciate allowing nature to do its thing
- Re: Section D – Specific Lake Merced Tunnel relocation / reconfiguration . reinforcement study needs to happen in short term
- Near 3.3 (between Kirkham and Judah) tsunami concerns, sea wall
- Near 3.7 (between Quintara and Pacheco) tsunami concerns

Key Move 4:

- Cobble berm looks/seems natural in Ventura
- In Ventura, we restore our sand dune and it looks great after a few years
- Seems dicey.... Lots of unknowns around sand changes
- Zero cost analysis
- Modular boardwalks would be better with handrails
- Please keep those of us with disabilities in mind; we need more wooden benches on both sides of Great Highway
- Right now the distances are too great between benches along the bike path at the Great Highway

Key Move 5:

- Zero cost analysis
- Keep beach elements low and non-intrusive at O'Shaughnessy lot
- Where's the restroom (at end of Balboa)
- Near 5.1-5.2 Move restroom (from Judah?) here
- Near 5.3-5.4-5.6 Recalibrate signals

Key Move 6:

- Zero cost analysis
- Restrooms at the end of Balboa on the beach