# Responses to Transportation Parameter Comments and Questions

Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (CAC)

*February 8, April 13 and May 9, 2016 Meetings*

*Note: recommend changes to the RFP Principles and Parameters are shown in gray. The remaining responses are to general questions, clarification requests, or transportation comments beyond the scope of the Balboa Reservoir RFP. Responses and comments are organized into the following categories:*



## PARKING AND AUTO OWNERSHIP

| | PUBLIC COMMENT | CITY RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | Provide sufficient parking so that people who want to drive can park.<br><br>When we were at 100,000 students both reservoir lots were filled. | Staff recommends revising City College Principle 1 with the following text in bold: *Ensure that development at the Balboa Reservoir site does not negatively impact City College's* ***current and future*** *educational mission and operational needs.*<br><br>Staff also recommends revising Transportation Principle 3 as follows: *Manage parking availability for onsite residents while* ~~*coordinating parking management with*~~ ***managing parking to meet*** *City College enrollment goals and* ***coordinating*** *with City parking policies for the surrounding neighborhoods.*<br><br>In order to best support City College's enrollment goals, the TDM Plan will recommend the best ways to *maximize access* to Ocean Campus given a limited amount of resources available. For example, subsidized transit passes could provide the same or greater access to City College than the equivalent number of parking spaces, at a fraction of the costs. Ultimately, transportation planning is not a zero sum game between parking and transit. The Reservoir proposal and the TDM Plan will include a mix of solutions to maximize access, mobility and safety. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Include and address parking for a future performing arts center | As has been stated at numerous BRCAC meetings and in other forums, there is no reason that a potential housing project at the SFPUC site should constrain CCSF's plans for a Performing Arts and Education Center. Accordingly, staff recommends adding language regarding the future performing arts center, its parking demand and congestion to Transportation Parameters 1(c) and 3(c) and City College Parameter 4(b).<br><br>A future performing arts center will include parking. The amount of parking may vary widely depending on demand management planning, pricing, and the size and make-up of the center itself. As with the Reservoir site, parking cannot be designed or managed without an understanding of the project's development program and people to be served. The RFP parameters acknowledge the need to plan for parking, to coordinate with City College, and to create a joint TDM program to best manage access and parking in the area. |
| | Overall we are concerned about parking for CCSF. How much, where, and who pays for it? | TDM identifies measures that reduce the demand for parking and therefore congestion. The "how much, where and who pays" depend on a number of factors, including development program for City College and the Reservoir, the CCSF facilities master plan, and the TDM measures City and City College implement. At an estimated cost of $80,000 per parking space provided, it is in everyone's interest to reduce the need for providing parking while ensuring that parking is available to those who need it. |
| | With increasing incomes, even with the different generations, do you get more car ownership/usage? | Yes, auto ownership increases with income generally. But geography in San Francisco is a greater determining factor of auto ownership than income - especially locations with greater access to transit and services. For example, Bayview, which has less transit accessibility and less of a complete set of retail, has more auto ownership than the wealthiest parts of Nob Hill and Russian Hill. In any income category there's a broad spread of household auto ownership interest. |
| | Unbundling parking makes sense, but does it lead to two classes of parking space-ownership? Can low-income households obtain parking? | Income-restricted affordable units can also have the price of parking be pegged to income, which requires cross-subsidy; but money to subsidize parking for low-income people has to come from somewhere else – increased rent for market-rate units, or less money spent elsewhere. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | A different way to look at this question is: if we have limited resources to create opportunities for low-income households, what's the best way to spend that money? If we can build housing in places and with features that allow residents to successfully address their work and personal needs without owning their own car, that housing becomes that much more affordable. Instead of parking, for example, we could spend money on subsidized daycare; developer responses to the RFP should answer questions like this through a demonstrated understanding of our target populations and communities in need. |
| | In the projects that are unbundled, do the market-rate owners end up owning most of the parking? | Not necessarily. Low-income households, particularly single mothers have some of the most complicated lives of all San Franciscans and place an extremely high value on their time; they are often the people that want to drive the most because that means being able to spend more time with their families. |
| | Is there a way we could have a residential parking permit program without the huge cost? It's something we need for the neighborhood, and it benefits everyone equally. I think people feel it's unfair to have to pay a lot to park in front of their house. Is there a happy medium? | The current price of an annual residential parking permit is $111 or 30 cents a day. It is priced to match cost recovery, so the City is not generating revenue. It is not realistic to expect residential parking permit fees to be lowered in any one neighborhood over another. However, if parking is truly a challenge in the neighborhood, RPPs are a cost-effective way at limiting those who compete for limited parking spaces. The SFMTA is currently evaluating the RPP program and will recommend changes late in 2016.<br><br>Learn more about the SFMTA's RPP evaluation and potential changes, including upcoming meetings, at https://www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/residential-parking-permit-evaluation-reform-project |
| | CCSF students I work with often ask about MUNI schedules, are there plans for putting up MUNI schedules? | There are great transit apps on smartphones. But for folks who don't have smartphones we can look at other products, such as transit screens in the lobby of buildings. Whole Foods nearby has one of these. It is encouraged in the City's TDM framework and can be implemented at City College or future development on the Reservoir. Sometimes you might have wind in your neighborhoods and it would be nicer wait in the lobby of your building and know exactly when you need to leave to get your bus on time. Conveniences like these can contribute to |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | increased transit ridership |
| | There are often cars parked on the edges of my driveway that prevent me from pulling in or pulling out. | This is a recurring challenge around the City. We encourage you to apply through SFMTA for "red tips" or red curbs painted at the edge of residential driveways to discourage this illegal parking. You can learn more by calling 311 or here: sfmta.com/services/streets-sidewalks/installation-requests/new-color-curb |
| | Does Nelson Nygaard (the TDM consultants) have examples of other neighborhoods which draw upon your expertise? | Nelson\Nygaard has prepared various TDM plans throughout the U.S. for a wide range of communities, universities and private campuses, both large and small. We have contributed and/or led in the preparation of TDM plans throughout San Francisco and assessing transportation resources for all constituents within each TDM plan area. See several examples at http://nelsonnygaard.com/?s=tdm |
| | Make parking areas retrofittable in case future needs change | The City is open to future re-purposing of parking areas in the case of changing needs. This level of detail is beyond the scope of the RFP, and should be discussed and addressed later in the community design process. |

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

| | PUBLIC COMMENT | CITY RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | Need to keep in mind people today too | If and when changes occur to the Reservoir site, they will occur gradually and over time. City College parameters 1b and 3c include language about phasing changes and minimizing congestion, parking, and air quality impacts.<br><br>The TDM Plan will include short-term recommendations for the Balboa Area, some of which will be independent of the any Reservoir development proposal.<br><br>The TDM consultants are conducting travel behavior surveys of City College students and employees, as well as of neighbors, to incorporate current priorities and needs into the TDM plan. SF Environment has also completed a similar survey in Ingleside, the relevant results of which can be addressed in the TDM Plan.<br><br>At the same time, SFMTA and Planning are responding to identified needs and community requests with respect to Balboa Park Station Area Improvements, Ocean Avenue improvements and San Jose/Geneva improvements. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | There's an elephant in the room. I think everyone would be in favor of taking public transit if it worked. If we can't get the transportation fixed then this process doesn't work. We need to make sure we are well coordinated with MTA. | SFMTA coordination is improving as a result of this CAC process. The project has a dedicated point person and several concerns will be investigated as a result of public comment.<br><br>At the same time, a significant number of transportation projects in the Balboa Park area have been completed, initiated or designed in the last two years, and will continue to be implemented. They focus on increasing transit access, walkability and pedestrian safety to and near the Balboa Park Station. See: MTA presentation on 4/13 and Balboa Park projects at http://www.sfmta.com/projects-planning/projects/balboa-park-station-project-status-map<br><br>In particular, Muni Forward has increased frequency of 8 lines serving the area, including the K line. The "core capacity" study is examining how SFMTA and BART can increase capacity through San Francisco's core – which has implications on all trains that run to and from downtown, including the J, K and M. Recommendations from this study will ultimately improve service to and from Balboa Park Station. New K-line cars and BP Station yard improvements will also increase K-line reliability.<br><br>With respect to requests for shuttles, while the City does not speak for City College, student shuttles are something that can be studied in the Balboa Area TDM Plan process. |
| | Fix traffic on Phelan: coordinate signals, fix bike lanes, create turn lanes, change signals when school is out of session | City staff have heard concerns regarding Phelan and will be working to address circulation issues in parallel to and in conjunction with developer negotiations and with the CCSF master planning process.<br><br>Many have asked about signal coordination on Phelan Ave and at Phelan and Ocean Avenue. Overall, the signals are coordinated to prioritize movement on Ocean Avenue and buses exiting the City College terminal loop.<br><br>Regarding queueing on Phelan Avenue, much of the signalization and street is designed to maximize pedestrian and bicycle safety in an area with a lot of both activities. For these reasons, it is not SFMTA's plan to revert bike lanes or pedestrian safety measures. However, some congestion could be addressed by removing street parking to add turn pockets/turn lanes. If residents are |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | generally in favor of reviewing the turn lanes and turn pockets, Balboa Reservoir CAC and SFMTA staff will work to identify a process for exploring alternatives.<br><br>Opportunities for circulation improvements will also be identified in the TDM Plan. The Plan will provide one document that compiles several transportation, circulation and demand management recommendations into one place – making it easier to coordinate future changes between the City, the future developer and City College.<br><br>Additionally, Transportation Principle 1 and Parameters 1a, 1b, 1c, 3c require the developer to minimize congestion in a number of ways. |

## TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) in the RFP

| | PUBLIC COMMENT | CITY RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | The developer, CCSF, and the City need to work together to create a parking solution | Agreed. This is the intent of transportation parameters 3b, 3c and City College parameter 3b, 3c, 3d.<br><br>In response to public comment, staff is recommending streamlining transportation parameters 3c and 3d, as well at City College Parameter 3b, to identify, rather than encourage, transportation parking solutions with City College. The new parameters read:<br><br>*Working with City College and the City, describe in detail an appropriate parking and transportation demand management strategy that accommodates City College students and employees. If expert analysis demonstrates that shared parking is a viable approach, explore accommodating City College affiliates and other non-residents in shared parking facilities (garages where the same parking spaces are utilized by residents during nights and weekends and accessible to all others, including City College students, faculty, and staff, during weekdays).*<br><br>While the RFP cannot specify a comprehensive parking solution without knowing the development program for the Reservoir and in the City College master plan, the parameters make clear that the selected developer must plan to pursue a solution collaboratively with the City and City College.<br>In a parallel effort, the TDM Plan process will include a |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | variety of short-term and long-range transportation recommendations for not just the Reservoir, but the area encompassing the adjacent neighborhoods and City College as well. It is designed as a toolkit and a starting point for coordination between different jurisdictions in the Balboa area. |
| | All parking should be built with electric vehicle capacity for future, and with charging stations available on Day 1 | Sustainability Parameter 5(d) requires electric vehicle charging and building electricity capacity to accommodate future charging loads. |
| | Add "transit" to urban design principles | Transit and transit access have been added to urban design parameter 1(c) and Principle 2 |
| | Regarding the 60% automobile mode share in Principle 2(a): Is there information that can be shared with the community about what would be an appropriate benchmark? | The 60% share of trips by automobile (automobile mode share or AMS) is based on the planned AMS of 60% for this area in San Francisco's 2040 transportation model. That share is lower than today's 71% AMS, due to local roadway capacity and planned transit-network improvements. 60% AMS is in line with many transit-rich neighborhoods in San Francisco. Those with a lower AMS are closer to or within the downtown core.<br><br>The State Office of Planning and Research suggests that even with conservative estimates, TDM measures can result in at least a 15% reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) – a measure that is related to AMS. This 15% reduction would deliver a 60% AMS in its own right. Combined with the expected transit-network improvements, it is possible that AMS for the Reservoir site or the neighborhood could be even lower than 60%.<br><br>However, given that we do not have a development program yet, it is premature to say by how much. The ultimate scheduling of targets can come later when more is known about the development program and design. |
| | 60% mode share is too high for a transit rich neighborhood like this one. | |
| | We want to mitigate the negative impact of automobiles. What are other examples of automobile mode share programs we should be considering for this project? | There are a number of TDM measures used to decrease auto mode share, including:<br><br>• Site-level transportation coordinator at Reservoir Development site<br>• On-site transportation information (at bus stops, grocery stores, etc.)<br>• Transit pass programs for future site residents<br>• Bike sharing programs<br>• Unbundled parking at Reservoir Development site residents<br>• Car share vehicles<br>• Ride matching services<br>• Expanding RPP zone to preclude future Reservoir |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | site residents/guests from parking in adjacent streets<br>• Physical enhancements such as creating a more enjoyable/safer walking and biking experience along Ocean, Phelan and other streets<br><br>The draft TDM ordinance includes an extensive menu of other measures. Many of these have been used in other development agreements in the context of the city's overall transportation strategy. See more at http://sf-planning.org/shift-encourage-sustainable-travel |
| | How will proposals from developers hold up to this very complicated TDM analysis? How can you really tell if their TDM proposals are the right mix or guesswork? | As discussed at the May 9 BRCAC meeting, the RFP process is meant to select a developer partner and a project proposal for further study and negotiation through a years-long community engagement process. The selection of a developer proposal does not carry with it the final approval of a transportation strategy. In fact, the California Environmental Quality Act only permits such final commitments after the entire project has been appropriately defined and studied.<br><br>With that as the context, the RFP responses should demonstrate a thorough understanding of TDM, include a mix of creative transportation solutions, and be consistent with their development proposal and financials.<br><br>On a second note, you are correct – TDM is complicated because people's lives are complicated. We can predict some aspects of people's lives but we know there will always be a degree of error and unpredictability. To that end, RFPs or planning should really focus on outcomes. The CAC conversations are focused on this question: what are our priorities and desired outcomes?<br><br>We can identify what our priorities would require, and then start discussing with the community and relevant stakeholder groups the trade-offs we will have to make between these requirements.<br><br>To an extent, the RFP has already begun the difficult process of trade-offs among priorities and outcomes. Priorities around open space, housing affordability and transportation have risen to the top. By understanding priorities and desired outcomes, we can monitor the developer's progress towards those outcomes and establish measures if they are not met.<br><br>One outcome can be automobile mode share; another |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | could be motor vehicle traffic generation. At the same time, another desired outcome may be a certain housing affordability target or housing for a certain demographic range.<br><br>The RFP should generate an array of proposals which will serve these priorities in different ways; one may provide a lot of housing affordability, while another may provide more residential amenities. There is no one correct answer. Ultimately, ongoing conversations and future design workshops will help arrive at a proposal that accommodates as many of the highest priorities as possible. |
| | Is developer required to fund transit passes for new residents following the first set of residents? | Staff is recommending editing the RFP to include transit passes or allowances for the lifetime of the project, as consistent with the draft San Francisco TDM Ordinance and other development agreements in the context of the city's overall transportation strategy. |
| | How does new TDM legislation affect the site? | Future EIRs will measure transportation impacts in terms of Vehicle Miles Traveled and Trips Generated. The more driving miles or trips a site generates, the worse its impact analysis will score. |

## BALBOA AREA TDM PLAN & DATA COLLECTION

| | PUBLIC COMMENT | CITY RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | When is the TDM Plan going to be finished? Will the TDM plan be conducted while school is in session and collect data when students are present? | The aim is to finish the plan before the end of 2016.<br><br>It utilizes student data from Fall 2015, Spring 2016 and trends from earlier years when relevant.<br><br>Should more data collection be required, we have identified a means to do so in the fall. |
| | The RFP is going out before a legitimate TDM plan is possible. The RFP should be delayed until after the results of the TDM plan. | This question implies a notion that if the RFP is issued we will lose the opportunity to incorporate the TDM Plan recommendations into a Balboa Reservoir project proposal. In fact, the situation is precisely the opposite. For Reservoir-related TDM strategies to be implemented we need to issue the RFP and select a developer partner to allow for successful negotiation of rights and responsibilities with respect to those strategies. Otherwise the desired investments in transportation strategies improvements, not to mention other public benefits cited in the BRCAC process thus far, will be further delayed. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | To take a step back, the TDM Plan will provide a suite of short-term and long-range recommendations for a larger project area, encompassing the Reservoir site, adjacent neighborhoods and City College. The TDM Plan is expected to be delivered by the end of the year, which under current timelines should coincide well with the selection of a developer partner under the RFP. See more at sf-planning.org/balboatdm.<br><br>The RFP is designed to start the conversation with the right parameters and performance outcomes, but there is no way that the responses will provide a final program or all the solutions for the Balboa Reservoir without further development of the proposal through community engagement and analysis. It is up to the developer to respond to the RFP with a creative mix of solutions to achieve those outcomes. The developer responses should demonstrate a thorough understanding of the critical role these TDM negotiations will play in the project's success and identify any new or expanded creative transportation solutions for further study in conjunction with the TDM Plan recommendations. The developer can base their proposals on the City's draft TDM Ordinance (legislation expected this fall) and precedents around the City. |
| | Student data must be clear and thorough | The City is doing all it can to work collaboratively with City College, share and collect additional data. Many thanks to the City College staff for taking on additional work during an extremely busy time. The City has initiated a travel survey of students and employees on campus. City College as well has emailed a similar but more robust survey to all CCSF students and employees. Consultants are also collecting parking data, traffic data, and intersection data – in addition to many data sets that have been collected in the past few years. Should data collected be insufficient in the Spring, the City has identified a way to survey additional students in the fall. |
| | We need better data. How many are coming in the evening? How many are single parents? | We are currently receiving student data from City College about where students are from, times and locations of attendance, and travel behavior. Data on parents or single parents is not available, however the travel behavior survey includes questions that ask about previous other destinations in their daily journey, such as childcare. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Data will be collected from AM and PM peaks, on-street and off-street parking. |
| | Do you have data on how Uber and Lyft increase congestion in this area? | **Unfortunately, the data does not exist. The SFCTA will be looking into this in the very near future, as transportation network companies like Lyft and Uber begin to share data under specific agreements with public agencies.** |
| | Some millennials want to drive still. Seniors are staying active and mobile later into their lives. Will these kinds of things be addressed? | Some people of every generation may want to drive for some or all trips. The goal of the TDM Plan, and associated TDM strategies that we may see implemented, is to support sustainable modes for those who want to choose them. This means enabling people who own cars to make some of their trips on foot, transit, bike, etc. if they want to do so, as well as supporting people without cars to get around. And, auto mode share goals acknowledge that there will be many trips for which people do choose to drive.<br><br>It is true that some millennials still drive and that many seniors are living and driving longer. As we plan for future generations, we can still also understand broader trends – which show that, increasingly, San Franciscans are choosing transit, biking, walking or carpooling over driving alone. And we can also plan in ways that increase the safety and ease of those choices. In this way, driving would be more available for people who *need* to drive, while safe, viable travel options are available for those who choose not to drive. Having a mix of TDM solutions makes it possible to plan for broader trends and to manage collective transportation behavior, while acknowledging that exceptions will remain. |
| | Can your firm run sensitivity analysis? If you go up on parking, how does it affect traffic congestion? | The TDM will include a parking demand sensitivity analysis that considers various scenarios to assess the effects to parking and auto congestion based on varying parameters, including motorists paying the full cost of parking for the development project and other on-/off-street facilities in the area. |
| | What's the baseline now? Identify what is. How does that compare to what a development on the site might bring? | The TDM analysis and any future environmental review will compare future development scenarios to a baseline scenario.<br><br>Additionally, several studies have identified existing traffic, transit and parking conditions in the area. A summary is available in an existing conditions report here or at sf-planning.org/balboareservoir |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Emphasis should be on pedestrian safety | Pedestrian safety, accessibility and mobility are the highest priority in the urban design, transportation, and public realm parameters of the Balboa Reservoir RFP. The future respondents to the RFP must prioritize pedestrian safety on the site and are encouraged to partner with the City beyond the site. |
| | The walk to BART is crowded with street furniture and unclear; it is unpleasant, and does not consider the pedestrian experience | The Ocean & Geneva Corridor Design project was designed to address this need, based on ongoing public and CAC input. The Corridor project produced concept plans for improving pedestrian and bike access to Balboa Park Station along Ocean and Geneva. Funds are being sought to move elements of the concept plan to the next level of design. |
| | This is an opportunity to secure protected bicycle lanes connecting Balboa BART, City College, 19th Ave and SF State | |

## Other

| | PUBLIC COMMENT | CITY RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|
| | Westwood Park is respectfully asking that it be worded as CCSF, OMI, Sunnyside Westwood Park, and other adjacent neighborhoods. | Change UD Principle 2(d) - Appropriate landscape design and/or a reasonable distance shall buffer adjacent properties, including Westwood Park, Sunnyside, City College and Ocean Avenue residences, in order to protect residents' privacy. As per the San Francisco Residential Design Guidelines, minimize impacts on privacy and light, through site orientation, setbacks, breaking lines of sight between buildings, landscape and topography. (See Public Realm principles for further development parameters relative to these adjacent properties.)[1] |
| | It would be helpful to be more precise with the RFQ/RFP so that the developers know exactly what we're asking for. | The RFP is designed to start the developer partner selection and negotiation process with a mix of parameters and performance outcomes that best represent community priorities. It is up to the developer to respond with a creative mix of solutions to achieve those outcomes. As has been noted at prior meetings, the parameters represent a level of detail and response to community concerns that is rarely seen at this stage of the development process. Typically, these considerations are elicited through community engagement and environmental review only after a project proposal has already been formed. Once the developer proposal that is most responsive to these considerations is selected, then those further processes will remain as a means to further refine the strategies and the proposal itself. |

[1] Revision of "adjacent neighborhoods" was originally made to include *all* adjacent residents, including in Westwood Park