

To: Planning Commission

From: Rob Wrenn

Re: Proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Framework. Oct 2, 2019 agenda.

Questions and Comments

Scope of recommendation

Is staff proposing that the Framework would apply in all areas of the city? Would Downtown, the Southside, the hills, South Berkeley and West Berkeley all fall under the same framework? The original referral about parking and affordable housing suggested changes in areas with good transit service. Is staff proposing allowing parking requirement reductions across the board regardless of proximity to transit? Tables 1 and 3 propose allowing a reduction to zero parking spaces. Does staff have an opinion as to where this should be applicable?

Cost of a Parking Space

In the May 1, 2019 staff report on Parking-Related City Council Referrals, staff stated that “One parking space can cost between \$35,000 and \$90,000 depending on configuration and location.” In San Francisco’s *Technical Justification Report*, cited staff’s report, it’s stated that “the upfront cost of constructing a [sic] garage structure parking and underground parking is approximately \$50,000 to \$80,000 per space, respectively, in 2014 dollars.” Opticos Design estimated the cost of public parking replacement at North Berkeley BART at \$85,000 per space.

In the Proposed TDM Framework staff report for Wednesday’s meeting, it is stated that “a reasonable estimation of the cost to provide structured parking is about \$20,000 - \$50,000 per space.” What led staff to reduce their estimate of the cost of parking? Does staff have data from the actual cost of current and recent projects in Berkeley? Is \$35,000 the cost of a ground level space? An underground space? Any examples?

Spillover and RPP Permits.

I’m pleased to see that staff are now supportive of unbundling parking. The Commission has already expressed support for this, but staff had expressed reservations in the July 17 staff report. The city’s Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) permit program can be used to help limit spillover effects. As it stands now, residents of new housing that has less than the parking required in the zoning ordinance are not eligible for RPP permits. Nor are residents of new buildings in C-T, R-S and R-SMU, where no parking is required, allowed to purchase RPP permits.

Here is the ordinance language:

C. 1. No permits shall be issued to residents in newly constructed residential units which do not meet the parking requirements established by the Zoning Ordinance unless a variance for parking requirement set forth in the Zoning Ordinance was issued. In the C-T Zoning District, the R-SMU Zoning District, and portions of the R-S Zoning District where no parking is required for residential uses, no residential parking permits will be issued for

occupants of residential units created after the effective date of the Southside Plan. The Current Planning division shall provide a listing of newly-constructed housing units to the Department of Finance.

2. No permits shall be issued to residents of Group Living Accommodations as defined in Chapter [23E.04](#) that are approved after January 1, 2012, unless the Zoning Adjustments Board specifies otherwise when it approves the GLA. The Current Planning division shall provide a listing of addresses subject to this paragraph to the Department of Finance.
3. In the R-2 and R-2A zoning districts, no permits shall be issued to residents of dwelling units with more than 5 bedrooms to which new bedrooms have been added subsequent to January 1, 2012. The Current Planning division shall provide a listing of addresses subject to this paragraph to the Department of Finance.
4. This subdivision shall not prevent issuance of permits to residents of permitted and legal nonconforming sororities, fraternities and student cooperatives who are not otherwise prohibited from obtaining them.

In any area where parking requirements are reduced, it would be important to amend the code on issuance of permits to prohibit issuance of RPP permits to avoid spillover impacts from the combination of unbundling and reduce parking requirements. This is simply a matter of extending a policy that is already in effect. Developers need to get the message that if they want residents with cars, they need to provide them with off-street parking. And prospective residents need to understand that if they opt not to pay for an off-street parking space, and try to park their car on the street that they can expect to get parking tickets.

Points Assigned to TDM Measures

The staff report states that “Staff relied heavily on the San Francisco TDM program’s *Technical Justification Report* for assigning points to each of the selected measures.” However, San Francisco’s report assigns maximum 8 points to “Contributions or incentives for Sustainable Transportation”, which is their equivalent for “transit passes”, while they only assign a maximum of 2 points to “bike share membership”, with that 2 points reduced to 1 point for 3 out of 4 land use categories (see page 13). Car share membership gets 5 points. Yet, staff suggest that bikeshare membership is as important as transit passes, when San Francisco says that incentives like transit passes have a much greater impact on trip reduction. What is the reason for assigning similar points to transit passes, bike share membership, and car share membership?

It would help to have more information:

Bike Sharing

How many people currently have annual bike share memberships in Berkeley? I can see the appeal for tourists and short term visitors but I would like to know how many longer term residents are

paying for memberships. D.C. has a successful bike share program but their annual fee is \$85 compared to \$149 for Lyft's Bay Wheels. How many bike sharing pods exist in Berkeley and how many people in Berkeley already have bike sharing pod within 1000'? I would think that most regular bicycle users, certainly those who commute by bicycle, would find it cheaper to simply buy a bicycle. Used bicycles are not that expensive and even new ones are within reach of most people.

Car Sharing

Car sharing has been around a whole lot longer than bike sharing. City Car Share was started around 2001. If there is any data, it would be useful to know whether car sharing memberships have been increasing or decreasing in Berkeley since 2001. How many of the available car share vehicles in Berkeley are electric or plug-in hybrid vehicles? The carbon footprint of a person who moves into a new apartment building with an electric car (providing with an unbundled parking space with a charger) would be less than that of a person who moves into the same building without a car but who makes frequent use of Uber, Lyft and car sharing. Have Uber and Lyft impacted car sharing in Berkeley?

Transit Passes

Does the city have any recent data on the effectiveness of transit passes for employees and residents? After the implementation of Eco Pass in Berkeley in 2001, a 2005 report showed that the drive-alone rate for city employees fell from 47.4% to 36.4%, while use of buses and BART increased. Are there more recent studies for Berkeley? Does AC have data on residential Easy Pass use? How many Berkeley residents have such passes?

Community Benefits and Who Benefits

With the exception of transit passes, the proposed TDM benefits would benefit the residents in the new buildings and the private companies providing the service (Zipcar, Bay Wheels). There is no substantial benefit to the larger community. The one proposed measure that does have a broader impact are transit passes since the money goes to transit agencies and the more money they have the more service they can provide. Even if residents don't use the passes, AC Transit, a seriously underfunded transit agency, would have more money to operate buses.

San Francisco's *Technical Justification Report* notes that TDM measures are amenities for the residents of the new buildings. If you have two similar units of the same size and quality, the owner of a unit offering transit passes and other TDM measures to residents could probably charge more for the unit than the owner of a similar unit without such measures could charge. As the report says: "developers may be able to recover some of the costs from providing these amenities".

There is another TDM measure that San Francisco gave a very high ranking to, namely "**shuttle bus service**", with 14 points. There would be obvious benefits to the whole community to have local shuttles to supplement AC Transit service. Why is that not on the list of TDM measures. There is also nothing for pedestrians. While San Francisco gives only one point for "**improve walking conditions**", it has benefits beyond the minimal impact it would have on reducing VMT (about the

same impact as bikeshare memberships). There are many intersections in Berkeley where changes should be made to make crossing the street safer for pedestrians

Affordable Housing

The original referral, “Green Affordable Housing” was about parking and affordable housing, but affordable housing has disappeared from view for the moment. In my view, the most urgent thing we should be doing, much more urgent than TDM measures, is to take steps to reduce costs and hassles and delays for developers of 100% below market affordable projects. One straightforward step is to eliminate required parking for such projects so that the City’s Housing Trust Fund, Measure U-1 and Measure O dollars can stretch as far as possible and help build as many units as possible.

With respect to any TDM requirements, they should not apply to 100% below market affordable housing projects. San Francisco’s *Technical Justification Report*, cited by staff, states:

Affordable Housing

The TDM Program does not apply to one hundred percent affordable housing projects because data shows that these types of projects generally do not include much Accessory Parking. [page 11]

September 29, 2019

Lapira, Katrina

From: Pearson, Alene
Sent: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 12:19 PM
To: Lapira, Katrina; Horner, Justin
Subject: FW: Proposed Transportation Demand Management Framework

From: Aaron Eckhouse [mailto:aaron.eckhouse@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 1, 2019 12:01 PM
To: Pearson, Alene <apearson@cityofberkeley.info>
Subject: Re: Proposed Transportation Demand Management Framework

I urge the Planning Commission to move forward tonight on eliminating all minimum parking requirements in Berkeley. These requirements are harmful to Berkeley's climate & housing goals; removing them would contribute to a more livable future for both Berkeley & the planet.

Berkeley cannot claim to be a climate leader while mandating that all new construction come with fossil fuel infrastructure, which is what parking spaces are. Personal cars are the single largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in California, in addition to their substantial contribution to local air pollution. [Research from Todd Litman of the Victoria Transport Policy Institute](#) estimated that the overprovision & underpricing of off street parking increased vehicle miles traveled in the United States by 16%. In other words, eliminating these parking subsidies could meet over half of the California Air Resource Board's target for VMT reduction needed to meet our climate goals.

Parking mandates also interfere with our ability to create adequate & affordable housing in Berkeley. Consider [this new 12-plex in Portland](#), with homes priced to be affordable to a majority of Portland area households. It's a design that [consistently produces](#) new homes affordable to middle income Portlanders. It's the same scale of building allowed in most of Berkeley's residential zone; but in all of them, even the more density-permissive R-3, it would be impossible to build due to off street parking requirements.

I have heard members of the Planning Commission suggest that waiving parking requirements without requiring something in return is a giveaway to developers; the phrase "value capture" has been used. I think this is badly misguided. Removing minimum parking requirements is not a concession to developers, but rather a positive good for our city & future. It allows & encourages more people to go car-free, making our streets safer & air cleaner. It moves Berkeley toward meeting its climate goals & helps secure a more sustainable & livable future for all humans, and indeed all life on earth. It is a change we should welcome & make immediately, without delay or precondition.

(If the Commission insists on a fee framework around parking, it should consider charging developers for each parking space they build, thus better aligning incentives with Berkeley's needs.)

Please be bold, and follow cities as diverse as San Francisco & Buffalo in eliminating minimum parking requirements.

thank you for your consideration,

Aaron Eckhouse