CHAPTER 7. TIER FOUR – NEW PROGRAMS

This chapter focuses on Tier Four programs: those that are primarily longer-term and higher-cost options to address future changes or growth. Because of the more complex and speculative nature of these programs, this chapter provides less detailed "Next Steps" than the previous three. Many of these program areas may call for additional studies that are beyond the scope of this report. These are identified throughout the Activity descriptions. Nevertheless, this chapter also contains many of the most compelling ideas discussed to date for improving quality of life and economic vitality in the Study Area.

PARKING 4.1 DEVELOP AN AREAWIDE PARKING PLAN

Program Description

Once the Parking Coordinating Council has improved the efficiency of existing parking resources, their next major step is to develop an Areawide Parking Plan. The goal of the Parking Plan will be to guide future parking development in the Study Area in a coordinated manner. One of the most important components of the plan will be to determine what the reasonable limits are on the supply of parking in the area, and how this supply should be managed. The information in Chapter 9 of this report can be used to inform the development of the parking cap.

Rationale/Benefits

- Because of the limited street right-of-way leading into and out of the Study Area, and because of the many negative impacts automobile use has on key quality of life indicators, there is ultimately a finite amount of parking that the Study Area can reasonably accommodate.
- The street capacity leading into the Study Area is limited. Congestion will increase on Study Area streets if mode split remains at levels constant to today.
- Transit capacity is good, but not saturated, offering alternatives to drivers affected by limited parking supply.
- Activities in this TDM Study focus on improving transit. Limiting parking and improving transit complement each other to make transit the predominant mode choice.
- Future growth and development in Berkeley mean that land opportunities for parking will be constrained, and that the cost of providing parking as part of development will continue to increase.

Examples of Success

The following table examines how several North American cities have attempted to set limits on the effects of the automobile in their downtowns by restricting parking supply.

FIGURE 7-1
DOWNTOWN PARKING REQUIREMENTS IN OTHER CITIES

City	Goals and Programs	Parking Requirements
Oakland	Attract 10,000 residents downtown. Promote commercial development.	No maximums. Minimums: Residential: 1/unit Retail and Commercial: No parking required for small projects. 0 - 1.6 spaces per 1,000 sq ft for larger projects.
Portland, OR	Reduce car trips by 20% over 15 years. Parking maximums in many areas, including downtown. Available parking focused on short-term shopping trips. Free fare bus zone throughout downtown.	No minimums. Maximums: Residential: 0.5 - 1.3/unit Retail: 1/1,000 sq ft. Office: 1/1,425 sq ft. In 1975, the city set a downtown parking cap at 40,000 spaces in downtown, including existing spaces, spaces that had already been approved but not built, and a "reserve" from which new spaces would be allocated. The cap moved up to 44,000 by the late 1980's and moved up again around 1995.
San Diego	All development must include a comprehensive transportation management plan, including on-site childcare, transit pass availability, etc. Development fees to Central City Transit Improvement Fund pay for transit improvements and street amenities.	Residential: Minimum: 0.1 - 0.5/unit. Maximum: 0.2 - 2.0/unit Retail and office: 1/1,000 sq ft maximum
San Francisco	Downtown Plan strongly restricts parking as a land use in greater downtown area. Transit Impact Fee of $5/sq foot of office development collected.	Residential: 0.25/unit minimum. Other uses: none required Projects that propose 150% or more of required parking are subject to development review.

FIGURE 7-1
DOWNTOWN PARKING REQUIREMENTS IN OTHER CITIES (CONT.)

City	Goals and Programs	Parking Requirements
Seattle, WA	Aggressive programs to reduce car use. Amount of parking required varies by access to transit In-lieu payment allowed instead of parking, along with substitutions: offering transit passes for five years allows 15% reduction in parking requirement. Office uses of more than 10,000 sq ft must have transit coordinator. No parking requirement in historic districts.	High transit access areas: Residential: no minimum. Retail: Min. 1 per 3,125 sq ft after first 30,000 sq ft. Office: 1/1,851 sq ft after first 30,000 Moderate transit areas: Residential: no minimum. Retail: Min. 1 per 1,330 after 30,000. Office 1/1,785 after 30,000
Vancouver, BC	Aggressive strategies to reduce cars. Free fare bus zone. Excellent pedestrian infrastructure. Amount of parking varies by access to transit. All developers pay fees for infrastructure, transit operations, neighborhood daycare, replacement housing and parks and open space. City pays for 60% of required parking in historic districts. In-lieu fees available instead of parking.	Most transit areas: 1/1500 sq ft max. 1/1150 sq ft min. Moderate transit: 1/1150 sq ft max. 1/950 sq ft min. Least transit: 1/950 sq ft max. 1/880 sq ft min.
Bellevue, WA	Since 1980, parking supply has remained constant at about 31,000 spaces off-street spaces, despite significant development and employment growth. City has set parking minimums and maximums and has pursued development of shared parking supply.	Min's and Max's vary by land use type
Boston, MA	In 1977, Boston adopted a freeze on commercial parking open to the public (not employer-provided employee parking). While the number of commercial spaces has not increased, the number of spaces exempt from the freeze increased 26% just between 1984 and 1987, which has led to an ineffective program.	

Sources: Tess Taylor, City of Oakland, FTA and Urban Ecology.

- **1995 FTA Parking Review**
  A 1995 review of parking strategies conducted by K.T. Analytics[1] for the FTA found few cities that had implemented parking caps, although many had areawide parking plans that included maximums, lower minimums, preferential parking for car and vanpools, timed curb parking and peripheral parking combined with shuttles. The only examples of area caps that K.T. Analytics found were in Portland and Boston (discussed in the table above).

Next Steps

Arriving at a final, defensible number will require considerable operational and financial analysis. Chapter 9 of this report can help inform next steps, as outlined below:

- Identify specific benefits and drawbacks of developing an area-wide parking plan/cap from each stakeholder's perspective.
- Articulate and reach consensus among the PCC on the goals of developing such a plan/cap. Goals might include:
  - Develop a plan that supports the vision of the Study Area as described in Chapter 1;
  - maximize and manage the capacity for auto storage;
  - identify the capacity that won't be accommodated by vehicles and plan accordingly
  - increase parking supply within a set of constraints based on projected future demand
- Form a subcommittee of the parking council to develop the plan – City and University involvement are key. Obtain outside consulting services to analyze cap potential.
- Collect data on existing parking supply, price, policies, allocation and utilization to facilitate future decision-making. (Can start with data collected through TDM Study. The TDM study does not include data on privately-owned, employee only lots. This data would be necessary to support the plan.)
- Conduct a peer review of similarly-sized downtowns

[1] K.T. Analytics, Inc., "Parking Supply Management," US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, May 1995.

- Develop a Study Area parking plan that:
    - includes cap levels at five year increments
    - parking maximums
    - requirements for site specific parking plans
    - developer agreements specifying particular parking conditions
    - procedures for allocating new parking to new development
    - tools for allocating parking demand among users
    - quality of life indicators such as public health and pedestrian comfort levels that can be used to monitor the success of the cap
    - measures to ease congestion by eliminating search traffic or spreading out peak travel demand periods
    - considers a city-wide or Study-Area wide ordinance that employers who provide free parking for their employees offer parking cash-out
    - provides developer incentives to projects that do not pressure the parking cap
    - establishes criteria under which the cap may be adjusted or re-evaluated -- To create a parking cap that is meaningful, it will have to be flexible to accommodate unexpected changes in the economy or growth patterns that could undermine the assumptions that were initially made when the cap was set. This flexibility, however, cannot undermine the goals of the parking cap. Thus, clear policies about when and how the cap will be re-evaluated must be developed.
    - develops evaluation tools. The Parking Coordinating Council must review the cap, parking plan and parking strategies on an annual basis against the developed criteria. Any changes should be approved by the PCC and City Council
- Adjust supply accordingly (see Parking 4.2)

PARKING 4.2 ADJUST PARKING SUPPLY TO MEET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY LIVABILITY GOALS

Program Description

This program is a primary implementation step of the Areawide Parking Plan described in Parking 4.1. The study should recommend whether the parking system should be allowed to grow or shrink, and how the remaining spaces should be allocated for short-term, long-term and residential use.

Rationale/Benefits

- The areawide parking plan may recommend parking levels that are higher or lower than the existing supply. The next step is to implement policies for how to bring the existing and planned supply into alignment with the parking plan.
- If the cap is set above the current supply, many local residents will express concern. Strategies must be developed to communicate how and why the cap level was set. Obtaining community buy-in for the cap is perhaps the most effective way to increase the supply of parking in the Study Area, because it offers assurances of future conditions.
- Taking the steps to realize the parking plan will be more difficult than developing the plan. Community trust and support for the plan will be enhanced if quick, decisive action is taken following the development of the cap.

Next Steps

If the cap is set below the existing supply...

- Establish the year when parking can begin to be added to the supply in accordance with the cap timeline.
- Establish development policies for how new development should accommodate trips. Strategies include an in-lieu transit fee or shared parking arrangements. (A satellite parking development fee is not recommended. While effective at reducing automobiles in the Study Area, it does not support regional automobile congestion relief.)
    - Establish plans and policies to make the development policies feasible. If a transit fee is set, identify the strategies and programs that will be funded by this fee. Ideally, the activities in the TDM Study would be identified.

    - If shared parking arrangements become an alternative for developers, establish policies on the parking minimum requirements for shared use; develop strategies to incentive existing parking owners to share parking.
- Develop strategies for shared parking. This is iterative of the Parking Coordinating Council (Parking 1.1) and the Areawide Parking Plan (Parking 4.1).
    - Develop strategies and policies to encourage shared use of parking among these land owners.
    - Pro-actively identify parking lots and users where shared parking arrangements further the goals to accommodate trips.
- Over time, the cap level will meet and exceed the available parking supply.

When the cap exceeds the existing supply...

- Identify the "reserve" capacity which can be allocated each year.
- Develop parking maximums for different types of land-uses to support the cap and help manage requests within the cap.
- Develop incentives for new development projects that do not add parking
- Develop policies to allocate the reserve. Policies should focus on shared parking that is used throughout the day.

TRANSIT 4.1 IMPLEMENT SOUTHSIDE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING BANCROFT AVENUE

Program Description

The City, University, residents and merchants have discussed whether the current one-way street configuration of Bancroft Avenue is the best design based on the community vision. From a TDM perspective in which transit, bicycling and pedestrian travel is given priority over vehicle travel, Bancroft should be considered for conversion to a two-way transit priority street if doing so improves transit travel time in the short run and protects it over the long run.

There are, however, many issues associated with making the street bi-directional, including continued delivery access and the loss of on-street parking. Because the TDM Study is not an engineering study, it cannot make a final recommendation on this issue, but has deferred all recommendations regarding Bancroft Avenue to the Southside Plan and has sought to inform that study to the greatest extent possible.

Rationale/Benefits

Converting Bancroft to a two-way street would:

- Improve and protect transit travel time in this corridor
- Allow transit riders to more easily navigate the transit system
- Provide a more direct connection between Downtown and the Southside
- Slow travel speeds, and thereby improve pedestrian safety
- Provide easier bicycle access to campus
- Eliminate a physical barrier between campus and the community
- Improve pedestrian safety

Next Steps

The TDM Study defers to the recommendations made in the Southside Plan.

TRANSIT 4.2 IMPLEMENT HIGH QUALITY TRANSIT ON THE KEY CORRIDORS SERVING THE STUDY AREA

Program Description

Develop a long-term transit strategy to implement high quality transit on the key corridors. This involves supporting and championing existing AC Transit efforts along San Pablo and Telegraph Avenues and developing a further vision for corridor transit.

This vision could include light rail, subways, suspended rail, Curitiba-style busways, and/or Smart-Corridor transit preferential measures. The goal should be to provide the most attractive transit service in the most cost effective manner.

It may be necessary to reconstruct College, Telegraph, Shattuck, University and Bancroft Avenues to provide the most high quality, frequent, high speed transit between the Study Area and surrounding communities.

Rationale/Benefits

- Berkeley's constrained street widths require that growth in the area be accommodated through increased transit use. If transit is constrained by the same congestion, little growth will be possible.
- While light rail appeals to many people, further study is needed to determine whether it is the most effective means of attracting large numbers of people to transit. In many communities, busways have proven just as effective at a fraction of the cost.
- While the "quality" and "permanence" characteristics of light rail vehicles are compelling, travel time remains the most important factor in mode choice decisions. If light rail does not have an exclusive right of way, it does not compete well with the automobile. Automobile capacity or on-street parking may need to be reduced in order to make room for dedicated rights of way for transit.
- Light rail can be extremely expensive, and construction may be disruptive to existing businesses and residents. Thus, it is critical that the City and Transit Coordinating Council begin early discussions about the technology and strategies that will meet Berkeley's needs into the future.

Next Steps

- The City and University must dedicate sufficient staff time to show a firm commitment to AC Transit's Major Investment Study for the Telegraph/Foothill/International Boulevard corridor.

- The City, University and AC Transit must raise the importance of implementing improvements in Berkeley's corridors to the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and MTC.
- The City of Berkeley must work to ensure that AC's first efforts at improving San Pablo Avenue are delivered on time and with a high degree of success by showing its commitment to funding agencies and by cooperating with AC's planning efforts.
- Through the Transit Coordinating Council, issue an RFP for the development of a long range plan for transit in the key corridors.

TRANSIT 4.3 RECONSTRUCT THE DOWNTOWN BART STATION AND PLAZAS

Activity Description

This activity represents the implementation phase of Transit 3.2. It is placed in Tier 4 due to the considerable capital expense involved. The Downtown BART station should become a friendly, more attractive public space that draws people to transit and provides easy, safe transit use. Recent improvements at the station are a first step toward creating a vibrant economic center that not only supports alternative transportation, but is enhanced by it.

Rationale/Benefits

- Major transit centers need to be special places in order to help transit users feel like first-class citizens.
- The Berkeley BART plaza is the center of Downtown Berkeley and should be developed as a transit-oriented commercial and residential area.
- Redeveloping the BART plaza is important to realizing Berkeley's plans to evolve downtown into a Transit Oriented Development.

Issues

- Cost
- Design changes could impact traffic movement or merchant visibility
- Aesthetic or economic development concerns may eclipse transportation concerns

Next Steps

- See Transit 3.2
- Ensure that any design or reconfiguration efforts incorporate both economic development and transportation planning.
- Transportation improvements that must be included in any redevelopment of the BART plaza are:
    - Improve the ease of understanding the transit system in the Study Area by providing clearly readable, attractive system maps and directions in the above-ground BART plaza area;
    - Improve its function as a connecting hub between Downtown, the University, and the Southside with directional signs;

- Provide ample, convenient, and clearly marked bus drop-off and pick-up locations.;
- Provide a an automobile drop-off/pick-up area for transit passengers;
- Provide a taxi waiting area that does not compete with bus access or disrupt traffic lanes;
- Serve as a gateway for transit travelers. The main exit from BART should welcome people to Berkeley, by opening toward the City and Campus. A visible pedestrian line of travel should lead from the main BART egress into the Downtown (i.e. Shattuck Avenue), and then on to the Southside and UC Campus;
- Improve the perception and reality of safety at BART and at the bus stops serving the BART station by eliminating the natural hiding and lurking spaces that exist at the present location. Design the plaza as a bright, open space;
- Develop a sense of place in downtown Berkeley, by creating a vibrant urban plaza;
- Further Berkeley's plans for transit oriented development in Downtown; and
- Improve transit rider amenities at the location.

TRANSIT 4.4 PROVIDE A DIRECT BART CONNECTION TO SAN FRANCISCO IN EVENINGS

Activity Description

The last Richmond-San Francisco train currently leaves Downtown Berkeley station at 6:54 PM on weekdays and 6:20 PM on Saturdays. Thereafter, passengers must transfer at MacArthur or 12th Street stations. The transfer at MacArthur, even though cross-platform and generally well timed, discourages patrons from using BART. The transfer can become mis-timed when system delays or activities in San Francisco disrupt one or both of the lines.

Benefits/Rationale

- Direct evening connections between Berkeley and San Francisco have long been desired by Berkeley's performing arts organizations, among others.
- Night classes at UC Berkeley should be well-served by transit.
- Many UC Berkeley staff and faculty work past 7 PM.

Issues

All of these possible actions have significant cost, scheduling and political implications.

Next Steps

- This activity should be pursued after BART is included in the EcoPass program and the EcoPass is offered to area employees as well as students.
- The City and University should work cooperatively with BART to arrange for one of more of the following:
  1) Construct and operate a turnback north of downtown Berkeley so that short runs of the Richmond/Daly City line could be offered later into the evenings, particularly on Friday and Saturday night. This service would be similar to short runs on the Pittsburg/Bay Point lines that turn back at Concord.
  2) Simply extend the service hours on the Richmond/Daly City line to meet Berkeley's needs.
  3) Make significant improvements to the MacArthur station so that it is a more pleasant place to transfer. Potential improvements include: constructing a glass or solid wall between the tracks and the freeway to reduce noise and wind, extending the station roof to the ends of the platform to reduce noise, wind and weather, and making aesthetic improvements to the industrial style station so that passengers are more comfortable.

TRANSIT 4.5 EXTEND BART SERVICE HOURS AND/OR PROVIDE COMPARABLE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION UNTIL 2:30 AM

Activity Description

Late night transit service in the Study Area is limited, with only the AC Transit Line 51 and short-run UC shuttles running past midnight. Transit frequency on Telegraph should be at least every half hour during the night and there should be regular connections into San Francisco until at least 2:30 AM. Given BART constraints, a "super-regional" bus agency that provides express services across county lines should be developed.

Rationale/Benefits

- The Study Area is a 24-hour community
- Transit systems must meet the late-night travel patterns of a University community
- Night-time transit is critical to the arts' community
- Night-time transit is critical to supporting car-free lifestyles, welfare-to-work commitments and an active nightlife

Issues

- BART's track maintenance needs and limited cross-over tracks may make it difficult to impossible to significantly expand BART's service hours.
- Ongoing operating costs will be a significant issue and cannot be met with either BART or AC Transit's current resources.

Next Steps

- The City and University should pressure and work with MTC and BART to launch a study of late night regional transit needs.
- The City and UC should collaborate with other institutions and groups that will benefit from late night service to increase the support and momentum for this concept.
- The study should explore the limits of the existing BART system given maintenance requirements, and options to mitigate those limitations, (e.g. new cross-over tracks).
- The study should look at how surface transit options can best meet the remaining needs.

BICYCLE 4.1 CREATE BETTER BICYCLE ROUTES THROUGH AND AROUND THE UC CAMPUS

Activity Description

Develop a campus bicycle plan that can be integrated into the City-wide bicycle plan. The plan should:

- Identify and/or develop North-South and East-West campus bikeways
- Create easy bicycle access points on the borders of campus
- Integrate campus bicycle access points with the City's bike network
- Develop on-campus bike signage that is integrated with sign strategies discussed in this study and, most importantly, with the City's bike network signage
- Develop policies for bicycle walk zones
- Identify strategies to increase bicycle capacity on shuttles
- Identify plans for improving and increasing bicycle parking, including long-term and dormitory storage
- Create a bicycle promotion strategy

Rationale/Benefits

- The UC campus is currently a barrier to through bicycle traffic, especially in the north-south direction and along its edges.
- Steep grades, limited right-of-way and high pedestrian volumes are severe impediments to improved bicycle routes on and around the campus.
- One-way traffic on Bancroft and high volume, high speed auto traffic on all perimeter streets also limit bicycle friendliness.

Next Steps

- The University should issue an RFP to develop a campus bicycle plan ($15,000 - $20,000 effort)
- The City should plan improvements to the streets that surround the campus, including Hearst, Gayley, Bancroft and Oxford, in order to make them more safe for bicycling.

BICYCLE 4.2 PROVIDE SECURE BICYCLE PARKING IN THE STUDY AREA

Activity Description

Provide long-term bicycle parking options in the Study Area for commuters. This could involve building bike cages or a surface-level BikeStation to complement the station located within the BART station. Long-term bike parking within City-owned garages can also be explored.

Rationale/Benefits

- Encourages more bicycling among commuters
- Alleviates the fear of bike theft which is a significant deterrent to increased levels of cycling

Issues

- Could entail significant capital and ongoing operating costs
- May consume valuable land in important areas

Next Steps

- Assign staff resources
- Research options and costs for providing long-term bicycle parking
- Identify locations for parking
- Develop a marketing campaign

HOUSING 4.1 ELIMINATE MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS IN COORDINATION WITH AREAWIDE PARKING PLAN

Activity Description

Adjust zoning and development requirements to eliminate the minimum number of parking spaces that must be constructed in combination with new housing development. This will allow developers to pursue "car-free housing." Improve the Residential Parking Permit program to restrict residents of car-free housing projects to purchase these permits.

Rationale/Benefits

- Excessive parking requirements contribute significantly to the high cost of housing and the difficulty of building new projects on in-fill sites.
- This strategy can lower the cost to build housing, which will help increase the overall housing supply in the Study Area and make such units more affordable to local students and employees.

Next Steps

- The University should promote increased campus housing as a mitigation strategy for its Long Range Development Plan. These units may be within walking distance of the campus, or they may be within existing transit corridors in Berkeley or neighboring communities. If sufficient units can be built in other locations, it may also be possible to provide new transit options.
- The City should work to protect the on-street parking supply from further crowding. This can be accomplished by strengthening enforcement efforts and restricting eligibility requirements for Residential Parking Permits. That is, residents of new buildings that do not provide parking may be ineligible to receive a permit for adjacent on-street spaces.
- The City and University should continue to work with the City of Oakland to promote new housing development in the Telegraph Avenue corridor.
- The City should explore means to further promote housing to serve area employees, including requiring a housing component as part of overall Transportation Management Plans for new development.

HOUSING 4.2 DISAGGREGATE THE COST OF PARKING FROM RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL RENTS

Activity Description

Require commercial and residential landlords to separate the cost of parking from total rental fees in order to reveal the true cost of parking to consumers, allow potential "parking cash-out," and encourage shared-use parking.

Rationale/Benefits

- Including parking costs in rental fees creates a hidden incentive to own cars and drive them more frequently.
- While presently unenforced, California's parking cash-out law remains in effect, and may be enforced in the future. This law is a great incentive to encourage employees to use alternatives to driving alone. The law, however, is only applicable to employers who subsidize leased parking, where the cost of the parking lease is disaggregated from building or land rental fees.
- Revealing the true costs of parking to consumers, helps consumers make free-market choices accordingly.

Next Steps

- The City should implement requirements that landlords in Berkeley must disaggregate the costs of parking from overall rental fees.
- The City should implement a shared parking ordinance and work with local developers to ensure that any project parking be available at market rates to both tenants and other potential users.

HOUSING 4.3 INCREASE HOUSING SUPPLY TO BETTER MEET NEEDS GENERATED BY LOCAL JOBS AND STUDENTS

Activity Description

Housing is a critical element of an overall traffic reduction effort in communities where affordable housing may not be available locally to all types of workers and students. This strategy includes four elements.

- **Fix the overall jobs/housing imbalance.** For decades, the Study Area has been creating far more jobs and student enrollments than it has created housing units. As a result, additional demand has been placed on the transportation system. Because new housing units are not being built in areas readily accessible by transit or walking, the additional transportation demand has been especially heavy on the roadway and parking components of the transportation system. In order to accommodate future growth in jobs or students, new housing should be built within walking distance of the Study Area and along new or existing transit corridors.
- **Ensure new housing units meet the needs of local employees and students.** When constructing new housing, it is important that the units target the buying power, demographics and personal preferences of the Study Area employees and students. Housing units in the Study Area that are not appealing to these groups will instead be used by people who commute elsewhere, doing nothing to alleviate local traffic problems.
- **Prioritize local employees and students in new housing developments.** As a university, UC Berkeley has an especially important role in providing housing, since it can restrict its units to UC affiliates and their families. Campus housing units therefore result in a one-for-one reduction in commuter-vehicle trips into the Study Area. The City should also explore options for purchasing or developing housing for its own employees. The City may also explore requiring large developments to include a dedicated housing component as part of overall developer requirements. Fairness in Housing laws rightly forbid the City from placing employment or enrollment restrictions on housing units currently available to anyone.
- **Implement draft General Plan recommendations regarding new housing in the Study Area and surrounding neighborhoods.** The draft General Plan recommends establishing a *minimum* height limit in the Downtown and encouraging housing above retail. It also eliminates the minimum parking requirement for new housing units in the Downtown Transit Oriented Development area.
  These provisions and others support the construction of more housing that is well suited to the types of jobs in the area. Increased density, if done carelessly, will generate significant opposition among local residents. Any increase in density must be done very thoughtfully to improve the design character of the Study Area and reduce negative impacts.

HOUSING 4.4 EXPLORE INCENTIVES FOR INSTITUTIONS THAT ENCOURAGE MORE OF THEIR EMPLOYEES, STUDENTS AND VISITORS TO LIVE LOCALLY

Activity Description

Some communities offer mortgage assistance or other support to police officers or teachers who live locally. Others encourage more full-time jobs rather than part-time or have "living wage" ordinances to make it more likely that local workers can afford to live nearby.

Rationale/Benefits

- When employees and students live locally, using alternatives such as walking, bicycling, and transit become easier.

Issues

- This program would be very politically contentious if it involved mandates rather than encouragements.

Next Steps

- As part of its development review process, the City should reward developers and employers who make efforts to encourage their employees to live locally.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF FIGURES