SFTP Needs Assessment

- Planned Growth
- Existing and Future Transportation Conditions
- Aspirational Scenarios: “What would it take to...”
  - Achieve a state of good repair
  - Get to approximately 50% below 1990 greenhouse gas emissions
  - Achieve a non-auto mode share above 50%
  - Accommodate population/employment growth with no change in commute

- Focused Sector Analyses
  - Visitor Trips
  - Goods Movement Trips
  - School Trips

- SoMa Core Circulation Analysis
- Institutional Challenges
Visitor Sector Transportation Needs
Visitor Trips: How do visitors travel within the city?

The top modes of transportation visitors *intended to use* within the city also varied depending on the visitors’ origin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Bay Area Visitors</th>
<th>Domestic Visitors</th>
<th>International Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal automobile</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable car</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNI light rail and buses</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNI streetcar</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental car</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Francisco Convention & Visitors Bureau 2010
What are the Transportation Needs of the Visitor Industry?

More and clearer information for tourists about travel options:
- Free maps; section on SFMTA’s website geared toward tourists
- Alleviate the perception of hostility to drivers
- More availability of parking cards; all parking meters should accept credit cards

Better management of existing resources:
- Loading zones and parking areas for tour buses
- Alleviate crowding on F-Line; transit planning for big weekends/events

More/new services or amenities:
- E-Line to Fort Mason
- Late-night BART service; continued weekend Caltrain service
- Bike sharing; funding for Jefferson Street shared-street project
- More and cheaper taxi service

Initial Visitor Outreach Groups
- Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority
- Fisherman’s Wharf CBD
- Union Square BID
- Convention & Visitors Bureau
Goods Movement Sector Needs
Focus of Goods Movement assessment

- Recent changes in conditions
- Most common problems
- When and where problems are worst
- How people address problems
- Ideas and potential solutions
Rules of the game

- Yellow zones are for loading and unloading by commercial vehicles
- Vehicles without a commercial license plate may be cited or towed
- Effective times vary; indicated by signs on the meter or by stencils on the curb
- Monthly public hearings to legislate new colored zones; no fee for yellow zones
Changes in conditions in recent years

- More competition for curb space
  - large employer shuttles
  - UPS/FedEX deliveries to more locations at more hours (e-commerce)
- Deliveries to large buildings take longer due to tighter security
- Bike lanes, cycle tracks, parklets (make it trickier to park)
- Improved signage and marking of yellow zones
Most common problems:
yellow zones, yellow zones, yellow zones

- Too short
- Not enough of them
- Not sufficiently enforced
- Hours in effect aren’t appropriate
- Some are too close to crosswalk
- No curb cuts near some of them (for hand trucks)
- Trucks have to double park (drivers get fined, get clipped by passing traffic)

Also: congestion, access to downtown and freeways
When and where problems are worst

- Morning (commute traffic), early PM (lunch-time, people running errands)
- On narrow commercial streets with transit service (Van Ness, Mission, Polk)
- Market Street: No parking for vehicles with less than six wheels
- Downtown core, as expected
How businesses deal with the problems

- Double-park and pay for any tickets
- Park nearby and deliver with hand-truck
- Try to make the delivery again later
- Have merchant pick up order at another location or meet truck at the curb
- Schedule delivery hours around street-cleaning and commute hours
- Use vans or smaller trucks
- Consider night-time deliveries
Interviewees’ ideas and suggestions

- On commercial streets, make one side of the street a giant yellow zone
- Trim tree branches above yellow zones
- Relax double-parking enforcement

- Deliverers and merchants tend to have opposing views:
  - Yellow zones versus general-use spaces
  - Longer vs shorter hours for yellow zones
  - More versus less enforcement of yellow zone violations
Summary

- Goods movement is vital to SF’s economic competitiveness and livability.
- City must continually refine/rationalize locations and hours of yellow zones.
- Parking supply should be managed in an integrated manner at the neighborhood level, and through a community process.
- Identify opportunities through neighborhood or area plans to pilot projects or demonstrate best practices from other cities.
School Transit Needs
Motivation for the School needs assessment
Why focus on transit?

- Improve transportation options for school children
  - City/State budget crisis led to transit and school bus service reduction

- Reduce/manage car trips to school
  - Community concerns of safety, congestion in the areas surrounding schools

- Biking and walking strategies have been studied extensively and are being implemented through Safe Routes to School programs

- Much less is known about why kids in SF choose not to ride transit
Existing conditions

- Many schools, scattered throughout (approx. 100 public, 140 private)
- ~7,500 students in SF, of which 75% public, 25% private
- MTA programs 3 Muni peaks; all with varying levels of crowding
- Transit use rises with student age
- Budget crisis has resulted in reduced transit and school-bus service
- New school-assignment policy could mean more students go to school closer to home

### School transportation mode split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elem.</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50-60%</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/bike</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ranges reflect differences between AM and PM
Elements of our Needs Assessment
Focus groups and online survey

- **Online survey**
  - Open for 6 weeks
  - Over 1300 partially completed surveys: 750 parents, 500 students, 70 other
  - Over 1100 completed surveys

- **Student focus group**
  - Hosted by Dept. of Children, Youth & Their Families
  - 20-25 public high school students in attendance

- **Parent focus groups**
  - For parents of middle and high school students
  - One each on west side and east side
  - Participation reflects diversity
Students:
How much would these improve your transit ride to school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faster ride / less waiting / no transfers</td>
<td>84.0% (357)</td>
<td>12.2% (52)</td>
<td>3.8% (16)</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive fares or passes</td>
<td>52.1% (219)</td>
<td>31.2% (131)</td>
<td>16.7% (70)</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or train went closer to school or after-school activity</td>
<td>50.7% (214)</td>
<td>30.3% (128)</td>
<td>19.0% (80)</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer ride (security cameras, on-board police, etc.)</td>
<td>29.6% (125)</td>
<td>42.1% (178)</td>
<td>28.4% (120)</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner ride (less trash, graffiti, etc.)</td>
<td>39.3% (164)</td>
<td>40.5% (169)</td>
<td>20.1% (84)</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better walking / biking routes and bike parking at transit</td>
<td>21.7% (90)</td>
<td>37.7% (156)</td>
<td>40.6% (168)</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.9% (42)</td>
<td>15.3% (19)</td>
<td>50.8% (63)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If other, please specify: Show Responses 51
Parents:

How much would these improve your kid’s transit ride to school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faster ride / less waiting / no transfers</td>
<td><strong>72.8% (386)</strong></td>
<td>21.9% (116)</td>
<td>5.3% (28)</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expensive fares or passes</td>
<td><strong>43.1% (220)</strong></td>
<td>33.5% (171)</td>
<td>23.5% (120)</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or train went closer to school or after-school activity</td>
<td><strong>47.2% (237)</strong></td>
<td>31.9% (160)</td>
<td>20.9% (105)</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer ride (security cameras, on-board police, etc.)</td>
<td><strong>68.3% (357)</strong></td>
<td>24.1% (126)</td>
<td>7.6% (40)</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner ride (less trash, graffiti, etc.)</td>
<td><strong>46.8% (234)</strong></td>
<td>39.2% (196)</td>
<td>14.0% (70)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better walking / biking routes and bike parking at transit</td>
<td>22.3% (107)</td>
<td>29.2% (140)</td>
<td><strong>48.4% (232)</strong></td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40.7% (35)</td>
<td>8.1% (7)</td>
<td><strong>51.2% (44)</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If other, please specify: Show Responses 55
Respondents’ most common comments reflect general transit concerns

- **Top concerns:**
  - Buses are crowded
  - Buses don’t come often enough
  - Buses don’t come on schedule, bunch up
  - Rides take too long, including long transfers

- **Additional concerns:**
  - Some bus drivers are “unprofessional”
  - Not all stops have NextBus displays or display is unreliable
  - Buses and trains are dirty
Some concerns are more student-specific or more common among students

- Drivers and fare inspectors are “rude” or “mean”
- Drivers sometimes skip stops, passing up students
- Bus routes to after-school activities not often direct, requiring circuitous routes, long transfers, or long walk
- Numerous safety/security concerns
  - Walking/waiting environment
  - Sexual harassment
  - Bullying and fighting
  - Vagrancy/drunkenness
- Issues on some lines/routes can be worse than on others
Suggested improvements we heard
Improving Muni service will address the main concerns

General improvements:
- Enhance on-time performance
- More frequent service
- Bigger buses/more capacity
- Faster rides

More specific to school service:
- Muni “ambassadors” on buses
- More effective security cameras on buses
- “Kid-sensitivity” training for operators
Draft recommendations
Will need to consider funding and system implications

- Improve overall transit performance
- Explore means-tested fares through MTC study and explore potential free Muni Youth Pass
- Explore education/outreach campaign
  - for youth and drivers
  - ambassador program
- Strengthen school safety/access project pipeline
  - Safe Routes to School (SR2S) grants
  - Prop K Traffic Calming Program
- Explore/expand TDM strategies, eg SchoolPool
- Support all-door-boarding pilot program