CHAPTER 4. TIER ONE ACTIVITIES – ENABLING STRATEGIES

This Chapter describes the three Tier One strategies. These activities focus on how to coordinate existing resources in the Study Area. These activities are considered enabling strategies, because, on their own, they do not cause people to shift travel modes. Instead, these activities provide the framework and support to implement TDM programs within the Study Area. They build the capacity of the City, University and other key agencies to address TDM activities. They are critical to supporting the community's transportation goals and objectives.

PARKING 1.1 BUILD ON COOPERATIVE PARKING MANAGEMENT EFFORTS

Activity Description

The City, University and local businesses are already working cooperatively to provide information about parking, set sensible rates and coordinate special event access. These efforts should be fully supported and taken to a higher level. Specifically, each entity in the Study Area that controls a supply of parking should join together to cooperatively manage their resources. The group should begin with the University and City, but it should be expanded to include LBNL, churches, private businesses and others that own parking spaces. (An overview of existing parking spaces in the Study Area is included in the existing conditions report.) The group would be responsible for coordinating parking rates, policies and information programs. The group may also contract out management of individual lots so that it will be cost effective for small lot owners to make their spaces available to the public when not needed by the owners. The organization can be informal at the beginning then evolve into a formal organization governed by a simple MOU, or later become a full JPA or TMA in order to better define the responsibilities and liabilities of member entities.

Rationale/Benefits

There are two main reasons for cooperative parking management: Improving service to the users, and expanding available supply.

- **Improved customer service**
  Currently, there are dozens of entities in the Study Area that govern their own parking supplies. The City and University are the largest providers of parking, but private businesses and churches control thousands of spaces as well. Nearly every lot has its own policies for rates, time limits and general public availability, and some of this information is not available at all -- let alone in one, customer-friendly place. In fact, simply getting information about the current rates at the City-owned garages or after-hours public availability of UC lots can be very time-consuming, even for would-be parkers who are familiar with the Study Area.

A cooperative parking management group could help set signage and public information standards about available parking. They could produce a simple "Welcome to Berkeley" brochure that details all the available parking areas and the policies that govern them. They could work with individual parking owners to coordinate rates and policies so that they are simpler for the public to understand. They could help garage attendants communicate with each other and with the public to direct motorists to alternative locations when one or more lot is full.

- **Expanded available supply**
  Currently, the many small suppliers of parking have little incentive to maximize the use of their lots, or to provide excellent customer service except to their own visitors and employees. For example, many medium-sized employers in the Study Area have parking lots and garages that could be used evenings, weekends or for special events. Similarly, the many churches in the Study Area have various large lots that are used primarily on Sunday mornings. While some of these groups have found ways to raise extra money by selling their excess capacity to the public, many others allow their lots to go vacant, even when parking demand is at its peak.

  There are many reasons for this waste. Private organizations are rightly concerned about any liability they entail by opening their lots to the public. Security concerns are raised. There is also some expense entailed in simply managing a public lot: collecting fees, arranging for enforcement, posting signs, dealing with increased maintenance. For small- and medium-sized lot owners, economies of scale prevent them from making sufficient revenue to overcome the drawbacks of renting their lots to the public. Moreover, the primary benefits of increased accessibility do not accrue to these owners -- it is other businesses that benefit.

  To overcome these obstacles, the cooperative parking committee should contract with a third-party parking management organization to work with small lot owners to make their facilities available to the public. There are many companies that specialize in this sort of work, such as the Parking Company of America or AMPCO. These companies typically lease private lots and provide everything necessary to make them available to the public, including liability and management. If the parking management companies were for some reason not interested in bidding on this work because the potential profits were too low, the City should consider providing some direct subsidy, since making better use of the existing supply will be cheaper than building a new parking structure.

  Ideally, every lot that could be made available to the public would be managed by a single parking management organization, allowing for the most seamless

customer service and lowest overhead cost. UC's Parking and Transportation department could perform this service, allowing for total seamlessness among UC's lots, City lots and off-hour use of private lots.

Issues

- Considerable staff time would need to be dedicated to this effort.

- Skilled facilitation would be required to organize the group, since there may be limited trust among the potential partners.

- Deciding the priorities of the group will be challenging, since there will be tension between those who favor short-term versus long-term parking, and those who favor over-subscribed spaces at lower rates versus easily available spaces at higher rates.

- If UC is selected to perform day-to-day operations of City and privately owned lots, care will need to be taken to ensure the public and business owners believe their interests are well represented.

- If greater than 10% of UC lot revenue and/or space occupancy comes from the private sector, UC's tax-exempt financing of its structures could be jeopardized.

- It will be challenging to obtain support from existing lot owners and private management companies.

Examples of Success

- There are numerous Business Improvement Districts or business cooperatives around the country that are directly or indirectly involved in the management and/or construction of parking, including Tempe, Arizona, and Burbank, California. These organizations are formal partnerships of businesses and property owners that voted to accept an assessment on their properties to fund improvements the city would not otherwise provide.

- **Aspen, Colorado**
  In the City of Aspen, Colorado, land constraints and a lack of affordable housing for seasonal workers were causing the small town to be overrun by vehicle congestion. Local businesses and the City formed a Transportation and Parking Committee to address the problem. The result was the formation of the City of Aspen Transportation and Parking Department, which manages over 4,000 parking spaces, as well as promotes transportation alternatives. The City sells permits for $5 per day to allow people to park in the RPP zone, offers limited all-day SOV parking, sells all-

day on-street spaces for carpools at discounted rates, and is developing remote parking on the outskirts of town. The remote lots will be financed by the city and costs will be reclaimed with fees from developers who do not want to meet parking requirements.

- **Bellevue, Washington**
  The City of Bellevue, Washington has made shared parking supply a strategy for accommodating vehicles in downtown. The parking supply in downtown Bellevue has not increased since 1980, although development and employment have. The City will approve shared development or use of parking facilities on separate properties when there is a convenient pedestrian connection between the properties and where directional signs are provided. If the uses have overlapping hours of operation, the number of stalls provided must equal the total of the individual parking requirements for all the uses served reduced by 20%. Further reductions can be approved. The City has taken the development of shared parking a step further by including the Bellevue Downtown Business Association in the development of the downtown area plan. The City's goals include:

  - identify specific locations for shared parking
  - develop shared-use agreements between property owners
  - dedicate more of parking supply to short-term parking than to commuter parking

Keys to Success

- Include all stakeholders

- Build trust among the relevant parties

- Identify a customer service oriented operator

- Identify the benefits that will be realized by current parking owner/managers and the community at large

- Maintain focus on the community goals and objectives identified in Chapter 1.

Next Steps

- The City and University should jointly lead the effort to establish a cooperative management group.[1]

- Contract with an outside specialist with expertise in parking, group facilitation and organizational management to assist in the effort.

- Immediately involve key area stakeholders, including representatives from the Study Area's business, cultural and entertainment industries, along with known private owners of parking.

- Clearly define the council's mission as a group.

- Collaboratively revise the following council goals and develop additional ones to meet group needs:

    – Manage all on- and off-street parking so that all components function as part of the same parking system.

    – Support downtown revitalization through parking policy, parking supply and demand management.

    – Support the community vision to improve livability and vitality of Berkeley's core through the objectives defined by the community (see Chapter 1 of TDM Study).

    – Monitor parking demands within the Study Area and develop policies and plans to support parking demand according to the community vision.

- Develop decision-making principles to direct strategy development. It should be determined whether UC should be encouraged or discouraged from helping to manage non-UC spaces or whether an outside operator should be brought in.

- Develop one to three strategies to collaboratively operate the entire parking supply. Strategies could include a downtown parking district operated and managed by UC, retailers, or an external non-profit or for-profit third party. Steps to guide development of the options and select a preferred option include:

    – Conduct a peer review of other similarly-sized downtowns

    – Identify the specific benefits and drawbacks that cooperative management of parking supply will provide from stakeholder and community perspectives.

---

[1] University leadership is critical, because the University may be the most logical entity to manage a joint supply. City leadership is critical, because it is also a large owner of parking and because it can represent the needs of the City on the whole.

- – Collect data on existing parking supply, price, policies, allocation and utilization (can build upon data already collected through the TDM study and other studies). Data would be used to facilitate future decision-making.

- Hold a public meeting on the draft strategy options

- Recommend a management strategy to City Council and UC management bodies.

- Negotiate contracts among lot owners, lot operators and, if appropriate, the parking management committee and implement the strategy.

- Develop a parking utilization evaluation/monitoring plan for future decision-making.

- Develop a two-year work plan for the council that includes the other elements identified in this TDM Study related to parking (See Parking 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, and 4.2)

Estimated Costs/Cost Examples

- City and University staff time: average of 5 hours per week for the first six months of council formation = 120 hours each

- Six month contract for facilitation and coordination (could include peer review) = $25,000 - $40,000

- Costs for parking management could be shifted from many individual operators to one entity handling management. Parking revenues should exceed annual parking management budget.

- Nelson\Nygaard conducted a peer review for the City of Salem, Oregon of nine parking systems ranging in size from 593 parking spaces to 12,000 parking spaces. Among these systems, the average number of full-time administrative positions per sparking space was 1 to 1,110.

- The operating budget for the City of Aspens' Parking & Transportation Department is $850,000, which includes a staff of 14 FTEs, including six full-time enforcement officers. Parking programs gross about $1.5 million in revenue each year. Aspen states it could operate the same services on a smaller budget, but chooses to support outreach, education and research programs that are beyond basic operating expenses.

TRANSIT 1.1 FORM A TRANSIT COORDINATING COUNCIL AMONG AC, UC, LBNL, BART, AND THE CITY

Activity Description

The goals of the council would be to:

- Develop customer-oriented transit services that can meet the unique needs of downtown Berkeley, its surrounding neighborhoods and the University.

- Develop transit services that are user-friends and coordinated from a user perspective.

The role of the council would be to:

- Ensure that the wealth of overlapping services in the area complement and coordinate with each other;

- Identify how existing service providers can better work together;

- Reduce feelings of competition between the systems;

- Facilitate coordination and planning of several of the activities recommended by this study;

- Begin joint planning of services; Develop long-range and short-range plans for transit in the Study Area;

- Jointly explore the feasibility of non-traditional services, such as community buses and demand-responsive shuttles to serve the Study Area and its environs;

- Develop services that meet the specific needs of Berkeley;

- Identify how to best use each agency's resources and look for opportunities to coordinate resources;

- Identify system gaps (e.g., continuous shuttle providing two-way connections between Berkeley BART and Sather Gate, late-night service to library, etc.); Identify which agency can best fill these gaps;

- Seek joint funding and grant opportunities;

- Include transit plans in future City development;

- Produce marketing materials that describe all available forms of transit.

Rationale/Benefits

- AC Transit, BART, UC Berkeley and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories each provide transit service in the Study Area. These providers and the City should work cooperatively to manage and expand their services in the Study Area. These agencies currently work independently of one another, but each is making a significant investment in transit.

- Many of the recommended TDM strategies hinge upon transit. Improving the effectiveness of transit is contingent upon cooperation between these agencies.

- The University's Class Pass program has been very successful in its first year. The University and City must work with AC Transit to realize the greatest potential gains from this program. The council is a mechanism to accomplish this, and a mechanism for developing additional cooperative arrangements between organizations.

- The potential benefits to the potential partners are immense. Specifically:

    – University: increased transit service

    – City: transit service that is customer focused so that people who have a choice of modes will want to ride

    – AC: increased ridership and revenue

    – Community: transit service developed to meet their needs

    – LBNL: shared vehicle resources, shared marketing, economies of scale

    – BART: All shuttle connections improve BART ridership. Maximize off-peak BART capacity

    – All: Better marketing

Issues

- Roles will need to be clearly defined. One of the agencies on the council must take a leadership role for coordinating the council and getting it started. This role should be filled by the City of Berkeley, or an expanded TRiP *(see TDM 1.1)*

- Staff time. City staff will need budgeted time to develop the council and perform start up and administrative tasks.

- Benefits will not materialize overnight.

- Each agency will have to make compromises and share resources to make this work.

- The process for developing such a coordinating council is not clear-cut. It will take strong leadership from the City and University to make it a reality – a difficult task when time and resources are already strapped.

Examples of Success

- **Try Transit Committee, Menlo Park, Stanford, and Palo Alto**

  The Cities of Menlo Park and Palo Alto joined with Stanford University and three transit agencies to form the Try Transit Committee. The Committee worked together to produce a transit information map that covered three counties and half a dozen transit agencies; implemented a signage program for the downtown Palo Alto transit center; improved transbay bus service in the Dumbarton corridor; shared resources to help each jurisdiction develop specific, coordinated shuttle programs; and coordinated marketing strategies.

- **University of Washington**

  To serve the University of Washington in Seattle, a task force made up of faculty, staff, students and Seattle Metro and supported by the Executive Vice President of the University and the Seattle Metro Board was developed to jointly plan transit service. The task force added 60,000 annual hours of new transit service to serve the campus. UW pays $7.9 million annually to the three area transit agencies.

- **Go Boulder**

  In Boulder, Colorado, the City's leadership has brought the University of Colorado, the Denver Regional Transit District and the community to the table to develop a community bus system. The community bus system provides unique, high frequency shuttle buses within Boulder. The City led the development of these services by obtaining CMAQ and other grants and establishing the first of the routes on its own without cooperation from the RTD. The community bus system now operates several routes, all of which are run by the RTD.

Keys to Success

- Identify the lead agency responsible for the initial development of the Council. (In the case of the University of Washington, the University took this role. In the case of the University of Colorado, the City of Boulder took this role.)

- Identify the potential benefits to each involved agency.

Next Steps:

- Dedicate University and City staff time to coordinating this council.

- Identify leadership roles and responsibilities between the University and the City. Contract with outside facilitator for one year to coordinate project start-up and bring parties together.

- Explore potential for Berkeley TRiP to serve a critical support and administrative role over the long run *(see TDM1.1)*. The ability for TRiP to fulfill such a role would come later in the development of the Council and the restructuring of Berkeley TRiP.

- The University and City council organizers should invite AC Transit and BART and LBNL to the table to discuss the formation of such a council. To encourage the participation and buy-in of these agencies, the University and City coordinators should develop a proposal explaining the purpose of the council and how each agency can potentially benefit from this council (see rationale/benefits above).

- Identify the department or role within each agency that can best represent the agency on the council and be accountable for potential council actions.

- Include in Berkeley's General Plan a policy to participate with neighboring jurisdictions in subregional transit planning activities.

- Include in Berkeley's General Plan a policy to coordinate and lead AC Transit, the University and other private shuttle providers in collaborative planning and joint marketing strategies.

- Bring parties together: UC, City, AC, BART, LBNL, TRiP, West Berkeley Shuttle

- Begin the council as an informal committee. Parties should jointly determine the long-term preferred structure of the coordinating council – JPA, MOU, Informal Committee. An MOU could serve to cement service agreement. While UC and LBNL could not sign a JPA, they could sign parallel agreements.

- Develop council mission, goals and objectives.

- Develop a five-year council work plan and timeline (the projects identified throughout this report as needing the assistance of the council should create the basis for such a workplan)

- Determine how often the council will meet and which participating agency is responsible for calling meetings. Estimate the staff hours that the council will require. It is expected that the council should meet bi-weekly for the first six months, then monthly. An average of 6 hours/week per staff person should be expected, including meeting time.

- Obtain endorsing resolutions from AC, BART, LBNL, University and City for the council, its structure, its work plan, its monitoring program, and staff time commitments.

- Develop the work plan into annual projects. Identify the lead agency for each project and identify cooperative roles.

Estimated Costs

- City and University staff time: average of 6 hours per week for the first six months of council formation = 145 hours each

- 12-month contract for facilitation and coordination = $15,000

TDM 1.1 DEVELOP A LEADING TDM AGENCY

Activity Description

Berkeley TRiP is designed to provide commute services to the City as a whole and to act as the Employee Transportation Coordinator for the UC campus, serving students, staff and faculty. TRiP's structure provides a basis for expanding town-gown cooperation on transportation issues. A TRiP-like agency should be developed to carry out, champion, and lead many of the projects outlined in this report.

This agency should have the four-fold mission to:
1.   Develop, implement and manage an aggressive TDM program for City employees to meet the City's goal to be a model TDM employer;
2.   Provide an on-site University TDM program that serves UCB customers;
3.   Develop, implement and manage a TDM program to serve all Berkeley employees and/or residents;
4.   Become the planning body that will staff and champion the Parking Coordinating Council, the Transit Coordinating Council, and the development of TDM activities included in this study.

Institutional oversight and funding commitments need to be determined to ensure that this agency functions as a true partnership and has a stable funding base. The agency should develop a comprehensive work plan, so that it is positioned to be a leader in transportation planning and management for the Study Area.

Rationale/Benefits

- There are community and University TDM needs that cannot be met by the existing configuration of Berkeley TRiP.

- A leading TDM planning and implementation organization is critical to ensure that TDM services are delivered throughout the Study Area.

- The City has not had as large an oversight role as the University in the management of TRiP. Increased City management of a TRiP-like agency will better meet community goals.

- The City's draft general plan includes a policy statement to establish the City as a "model employer" regarding trip reduction, and to work with other public institutions to establish alternative commute programs. The City should put the necessary resources into this organization to fulfill these policies, develop an employee TDM program for City employees, and develop mechanisms to work with other employers.

- A barrier to the development of a comprehensive transportation alternative program in Berkeley is a lack of staff time and unclear lines of responsibility between the University and City.

- There is general agreement that TRiP needs more attention. This is an opportunity to expand TRiP's mission or completely restructure the existing TRiP organization and functions.

Issues

- It is difficult to serve the needs of both the University and the City and serve them well.

- While TRiP has a Commute Mobile with on-campus hours, the lack of a permanent, convenient, on-campus location is a deterrent to faculty and staff participation in commute benefit programs. Since faculty and staff represent 34% of the drive alone market in the Study Area, more customer-oriented service should be provided to them.

- Finding the right staff to realize this vision will be difficult.

- After many years of fulfilling a more narrow role, it will be a strategic challenge to make TRiP a leader in the community. It will require the backing and acknowledgment of City Council and University leaders.

- One option is to eliminate the existing TRiP organization and develop a new body (or bodies) to fulfill the above four-fold mission. This could present political difficulties and send the wrong message that Berkeley is "abandoning TDM" if not handled appropriately.

Examples of Success

- **Go Boulder**

  The City of Boulder, Colorado has a staff within its public works department that is dedicated to finding creative solutions for Boulder's transportation problems. As a result, Boulder has developed some of the most innovative and successful transportation management programs designed to serve both the community and the university. Berkeley TRiP could be nurtured into this kind of organization.

- **Aspen, Colorado**

  The City of Aspen, Colorado developed a Transportation and Parking Department to manage city-wide parking and promote alternative transportation. The goals of the department are to reduce SOV use, encourage commuters and visitors to ride transit, keep downtown employees from parking in prime on-street parking spaces,

and preserve the aesthetic appeal of the town. The City Council adopted a guideline to maintain current levels of parking with no net gain or loss of parking due to new development.

Next Steps

- The funding partners must confirm the following suggested approach. An alternative is to accomplish several of the preliminary tasks with a small workgroup of the funding agencies, instead of through a Board of Directors.

- Develop an active Board of Directors for TRiP. In prior years, TRiP staff were responsible for convening the Board. The Board has not met in approximately two years. The funders of TRiP must take greater responsibility for leading TRiP.

- The Board should include members of agencies with whom TRiP will need to work to develop a shared vision for transportation management in the Study Area, including: UC Planning, UC Parking, City Planning, City Parking Management, AC Transit, BART, City Manager, the Telegraph Area Association, the Downtown Berkeley Association, Cultural Trust, Lawrence Berkeley National Labs, Alta Bates, and others.

- Gather information and data about TRiP's accomplishments and strategies as basis for visioning workshop

- Conduct a visioning workshop with the Board to review the role and purpose of Berkeley TRiP and the community commitment to the organization. This visioning should be unconstrained by budget realities. The goal of this workshop is to broaden the vision of what TRiP can do and how TRiP could support the interests of the different board members. This visioning workshop should address issues such as:

  – The leadership role of TRiP versus its role as an implementing agency

  – The relationship to City Planning, University Planning and UC Parking & Transportation

  – The potential advocacy role of TRiP within the community

  – Its current short-comings

  – Its accountability structure, including which entity or entities hires, fires and oversees staff

  – Its organizational mission, goals and objectives

- Based on the resulting vision, develop a scope of work for a revised Berkeley TRiP, a staffing plan and a budget. The scope would include the programs outlined in this TDM Study, such as:

  – Develop and commit to a monitoring program for existing TRiP services *(see TDM 2.1)*. Evaluate existing services and understand the resource levels required for these. Determine where greater efficiencies can be developed. Specifically look at the staffing resources required to administer each of TRiP's programs and the cost of each program. Determine the cost-benefit of the various activities and identify the market being served.

  – Become the agency responsible for carrying out the City's draft General Plan policy to be a leader in TDM. (e.g. Develop a TDM program for City employees, recommend changes to city employee parking policies, develop city-wide TDM incentives) *(See TDM 3.1)*

  – Serve as the staff committee to the Transit Coordinating Council *(see Transit 1.1)*

  – Become the agency responsible for developing the plan to facilitate draft General Plan policies to encourage other agencies, employers and institutions to match or exceed the City of Berkeley's trip reduction and emission reduction programs for their employees (once the City establishes its own program). Develop an accountable strategy for conducting employer outreach and maintain an informational database about City employers. *(See TDM 2.1 and TDM 3.1)*

  – Evaluate TRiP's role as a transit pass outlet, including costs, benefits, options for providing this important service, options for partnering with transit agencies to provide this, and the ability of this function to serve the commuter market.

  – Promote the Alameda County Guaranteed Ride Home program and develop and administer a city Guaranteed Ride Home program that reaches smaller employers. *(see TDM 2.2 and TDM 3.1)*

  – Lead joint community marketing *(see Transit 2.3)*

  – Lead the effort to continue student support for Class Pass and ensure future passage of an increased Student Fee *(see Transit 2.1)*.

  – Coordinate efforts with AC Transit to develop a swipe technology for Class Passes that is compatible with UC Student ID cards. *(See Transit 2.1)*

  – Promote school pool programs at Berkeley schools (using the infrastructure developed by RIDES for Bay Area Commuters) by actively working with schools and PTAs to host on-site recruitment and education events.

  – Lead the development of the community EcoPass program *(see Transit 3.1)*

  – Prioritize strategies based on applicability to Berkeley, effectiveness, and affordability.

- Define which services are designated for the University, City, city-wide employers, and the community.

- Develop a budget and staffing plan based on the new vision and the levels of service outlined in the scope. Funding sources would include: UC Berkeley, the City's general fund (for programs for City employees), a transportation development impact fee, and city parking revenues.

- Obtain City Council and University endorsement for the scope and budget plan, including the direction of city parking revenues.

- Develop a staffing plan for Berkeley TRiP to hire the appropriate numbers of staff members at the appropriate skill levels.

- Staffing will be a critical element of the future success of a revitalized TRiP. TRiP will need strong leadership that can work well with both the City, the University and other employers, and who can politically champion the development of new projects. The appropriate staff will need to have excellent community relations skills, creativity and enthusiasm.

- The executive director would then further develop the scope of work into a five-year work plan with specific goals for each of the prioritized programs.

Estimated Costs

These costs are for the administrative work of re-evaluating Berkeley TRiP. They do not provide cost estimates of the budget for a re-structured agency, since there are many potential outcomes of the visioning process. These potential outcomes range from eliminating the TRiP organization to developing a completely new organizatioin.

- City and University staff time: average of 3 hours per week for six months of council formation = 75 hours each

- Facilitated visioning workshop = $2,000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF FIGURES