**USF On-Street Parking Percentage**

(6) Where is there a discussion of the lack of restriction on dorm students garaging their cars on the boundaries of USF where there is unrestricted parking 24/7 except for street cleaning once a week and that street cleaning times are from 6-7 am so the dorm students can move and re-park their cars before the commuting students arrive?

(10a) Does the total campus population of 11,000 include Fromm, Koret and other regular populations and irregular populations (special events) that also constitute USF affiliates?

(10b) Were the collected data compared with prior from prior IMPs and studies and which ones were actual counts vs. estimates based on comparable data from other sources? That is, did the consultants go around the neighborhood and identify the cars based on their license plates (for location) or how long they stayed in one location? How did they arrive at the 15% occupancy rate? That is, were the numbers of drivers and percent of spaces occupied only based on mathematical projections or from actual countings?

(10c) It is stated at numerous points in the IMP that the “overall” on-street parking space occupancy are: 15% by USF affiliates Why isn’t a number given for “percent of occupied spaces as it is for residents and other uses as it is for residents and “other users”?

(10i) If the USF consultants intended to accurately count the numbers of USF affiliate parking, then Why didn’t they do a direct count of day and night parking occupancy (or even easier, unoccupied spaces) during long vacation periods (e.g., Christmas) when there are no other USF events and the students are gone, including dorm students?

(10e) What are “other uses” and how were they determined?

(10f) How were USF affiliates identified vs. residents and other uses?

The number of on-street USF parked cars was estimated using existing commute patterns to the University that were documented in the University’s transportation survey administered in 2010 and industry standard practice for estimating parking demand for other land uses in the area.

According to the draft transportation survey administered to the USF community, approximately 31% of USF faculty, staff, and students drive alone to campus (page 79 of the draft transportation impact study). Among those who typically drive to USF, 55 percent park on-street while 45 percent use a parking garage or lot. Two-thirds of those who drive to campus and park on street said that they can typically find parking within 3 blocks of campus (roughly the same distance as the parking study area).

To estimate the amount of on-street parking by USF faculty, staff, and students, 45% of the 31% of the total campus population who drove to campus were assumed to park on the street; however, the total number was also adjusted to account for people who did not come to campus every day and for arrival and departure times recorded in the transportation survey. For example, the survey indicated that only about 70% of those who drove to campus were on-campus during the peak time of day (between 12 and 1:00 PM). Therefore, Figure 12 in the Draft IMP (page 48) shows an arch to indicate that the percentage of USF parkers increases between 7:00 AM and Noon, and slowly decreases until around 11:00 PM. Therefore, at the peak time of day for USF faculty, staff, and students (approximately Noon), USF faculty, staff, and students occupy 15% of on-street parking spaces and represent 18% of parked vehicles, on average throughout the day. At Noon, when USF has the highest parking demand, approximately 25% of all on-street parking spaces are occupied by USF faculty, staff, and students.
The other uses indicated on Figure 12 of the Draft IMP represent the other land uses in the parking study area, including St. Mary’s Campus, the CCSF John Adams Campus, nearby public elementary schools and private schools, retail businesses, offices, banks, post offices, and restaurants. Parking demand for these uses were estimated based on standard industry parking demand ratios based on national surveys and reported in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation Handbook.

The parking demand for residential uses in the parking study area was estimated based on SFMTA’s records of issued residential parking permits, US Census American Community Survey (ACS) travel mode share, and ACS “time leaving for work” data.

The method to estimate the users of on-street parking was selected using engineering judgment and knowledge of the variability of on-street parking occupancy. Comparing nighttime occupancy to daytime occupancy would not help isolate the parking demand associated with USF faculty, staff, and students because on-street parking restrictions are generally relaxed between 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM and other people could park in the area that have no relation to USF, the surrounding institutional uses, or residential neighborhoods.

The parking study does not analyze special events at the University that would likely generate additional parking demand. As stated in the question, these events are host to irregular guests to the Campus. Events that occur after 5:00PM, when there is available capacity in on-campus garages, could use on-campus parking facilities. Events that occur during the day would generate additional parking demand that would need to be accommodated either through special use of on-campus facilities or locating additional parking in other facilities. As discussed in the Draft IMP, construction of a new parking garage is one way that this additional parking demand could be accommodated on-campus.

ENROLLMENT

(12) Does the term “USF affiliates” include all non-students like Fromm, Koret users and sport fans and attendees at other non-USF events who use USF facilities?

In terms of the enrollment information reported in the Draft IMP on page 65, the population detailed in Table 4 refers to USF students, faculty and staff only.

Page 23 of the Draft IMP has a section entitled Non-USF Affiliated Campus Users that refers to visitors and guests of the University, such as Koret members, sports fans and Fromm students.

The term USF Affiliates used in the Transportation Impact Study (TIS), e.g. on page iv of the TIS in the Appendix, refers to faculty, staff and students.

Recognizing that the term “affiliates” could be a source of confusion, the section originally called Non-USF Affiliated Campus Users will be re-named Campus Visitors and Guests in the Final IMP. Additionally, Fehr & Peers will not use the term in the final draft of the IMP.

(13) Are the non-USF students who are somehow affiliated with USF enumerated somewhere in the IMP?

Page 23 of the Draft IMP has a section entitled Non-USF Affiliated Campus Users that refers to visitors and guests of the University, such as Koret members, sports fans and Fromm students.
The title for the section Non-USF Affiliated Campus Users will be re-named Campus Visitors and Guests in the Final IMP to avoid confusion.

(14) How many thousands are there on a daily basis and at events per year?

As an open, decentralized campus, a comprehensive daily visitor count, encompassing every campus visitor, event, meeting, and seminar/symposia cannot be counted at the present time.

For the Fromm Institute, on average, there are approximately 450-500 Fromm attendees and 22 faculty members during any given session. The total Fromm enrollment has remained steady since 2003, at about 1200 people, however not all enrollees attend each session.

The Koret Health and Recreation Center provides a recreational and fitness environment for the USF community and over 12,000 community members. About 620 community members visit Koret daily.

USF’s NCAA Division I Department of Intercollegiate Athletics hosts athletic competitions throughout the school year. Each sport hosts between 10 and 22 competitions per season, depending on NCAA requirements. Average paid attendance at USF’s athletic events is 556 paid patrons/game, ranging from an average of 119 at baseball to 1,586 at men’s basketball.

In the case of events managed by the Events office, the records system does not currently track attendance or distinguish between USF and non-USF attendees at events. Over the course of this master planning process, the Events office has been reorganized and the University is examining the potential to develop a comprehensive system for tracking public use of the campus and endeavoring to articulate a formal outside user policy.

Less than one percent growth over the next ten years.

(15) What was it in the last ten years or the ten years before that and what did the IMPs say it would be?

See below.

(16) The IMP has no data from before 2011 for comparison.
What are the following data for each IMP from the first one in the 1970s

- the actual enrollment that was given,
- the projected enrollment that was given and
- the actual enrollment that occurred.

IMPs generally assume a 10-year planning horizon. The actual enrollment reported is the fall enrollment reported 10 years after the reported baseline enrollment.

1979: Enrollment reported in IMP: 6,931. Projection: “In the years ahead, the present level of enrollment is not expected to increase as the University moves into a steady state growth rate as the market for college students tightens” Fall 1989(1) 6,028

1993 Enrollment reported in IMP: 6,564(2). Projection: “The university does not intend to increase enrollment much beyond 7000 students …” Fall 2002(1) 6,688
1998  Enrollment reported in IMP: “just over 7,500 full and part-time students”. Projection: “The University does not intend to increase average enrollment much beyond 8000 students …” Fall 2008(1) 7,990

2004  Enrollment reported in IMP: 7,145(3). Projection: “USF has experienced stable growth in student enrollment (about 1.7% per year) in the past five years. This growth is expected to slow between now and 2015, flattening out at approximately 7,450 students.” Fall 2011(1) 8,731

2010  Enrollment reported in IMP Update: 8,106. Projection: “The (2004) IMP predicted that enrollment growth would slow but the actual increase in enrollment from 2003 to 2010 was 13.4%, representing an annual rate of growth of about 1.8%, roughly the same as the rate of growth the IMP indicated had been experienced over the previous 5 years. The upper end of the 2015 projection is based on an annual growth rate of about 1.7% per year consistent with the historic growth rate.” Fall 2011(1) 8,731

(1) Enrollment actuals are from USF Registrar reports. Please note that we do not have data to determine that the calculation methodologies in past decades are the same as the current enrollment calculation methodology.
(2) Data reported: November 1991 enrollment
(3) Data reported: Fall 2003 enrollment
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SMALLEST PERCENTAGE OF UNDERGRADUATES IN ITS RESIDENCE HALLS OF ANY OF ITS PEERS AND DORMITORIES ARE AT FULL CAPACITY.

There is no attempt to explain that the small percentage is due to the high increase in enrollment without building residence halls to match the enrollment increases. Instead, USF increased the number of students within each residence hall by making singles into doubles and doubles into triples and turning common areas into living areas. This also increased the number of commuting students while USF was reducing the on-campus parking to make way for additional academic and support space. For example, the green area between Fulton and Gleeson Library used to be a parking lot. Those cars were moved to UT streets.

The dorms were built for an enrollment of 6,850 in 1970 into which an enrollment of 8700 has been squeezed. Now the argument is that USF needs more students to pay for new student housing that is due to the lack of on-campus student housing caused by the prior enrollment increases. It is circular reasoning that has no end unless all the graduate programs are moved elsewhere and those buildings are renovated into classrooms and dormitories. It may be that the reason USF has not stated plans for the 90,000 Sq. Ft. Harney Science Building is that they plan to turn it into “temporary” dormitory while they “renovate” and “upgrade” other dorms. At the end, Harney may just become another dorm.

(17) Where is the data, past/present/future on ratio of commuting students to resident students?
Present & future ratios of commuting to resident students can be calculated from Table 4, page 65 of the Draft IMP.

Past IMPs:
- 1979: No data presented. “The majority of students do not live on campus due to the lack of residential facilities” (p15)
- 1993: No data presented. “About half the undergraduate students live on campus” (Appendix p13)
- 1998: No data presented.
- 2004: USF Institutional Master Plan, Table 2.1
- 2010: USF IMP Update, Table 2.1

(18) COMPETITIVE DEMAND is the argument for expanding enrollment even though the residence halls are at full capacity. Isn’t this backwards?

The above statement is incorrect. Competitive Demand in housing is not presented by USF as an argument for expanding enrollment.

The need to increase and improve housing is a marketplace and academic/social issue. USF is at a competitive disadvantage in attracting students because of the age and configuration of its residence halls. The ‘double loaded’ dormitory style is obsolete; there are not enough common areas and the configuration is inadequate for living-learning communities. USF’s peer institutions generally have more modern residence facilities that are configured to meet the needs of their students, thus USF is at a competitive disadvantage at attracting students.

It is also the case that USF houses 39% of its current undergraduate population, the least housing percentage among its peers. Campus housing has been shown to improve academic performance and positive social development. The University’s believes that providing more campus housing to undergraduates is a net benefit to its neighbors.

USF has not proposed or stated that: “… USF needs more students to pay for new student housing…”

The University has no intention of converting Harney Science Building into a residence hall, temporary or otherwise.

P. 9 IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS

Positive shift in USF neighbor relations

The primary concerns are:
- Enrollment growth and its effect on quality of life
- Pedestrian safety
- Traffic on neighborhood streets
- University-related parking on neighborhood streets
- Student behavior
- Students and staff passing through the neighborhood
- Noise at outdoor fields
• Noise and disruption from service and delivery vehicles
• Impact from one-time USF events and ongoing programs that draw outside attendance
• Quality of the physical environment, particularly at the University's neighborhood edge

P 10. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON TRAFFIC THROUGH 2022

19. How were the following statements derived?

Although it is currently estimated that 69% of trips to campus do not involve single occupant vehicles ...
(a). How does this estimate compare with prior studies done for prior IMPs?

This estimate compares favorably with prior studies. According to Fehr & Peers, the current drive-alone rate of 31% represents a 24% decrease from the drive alone rate recorded in 1991. Therefore the measure of trips to campus not involving single occupant vehicles would have increased over the same period of time. In 1991 the drive alone rate was 55%, therefore the trips involving all other modes was about 45%, significantly less that the current 69%.

(b) P. 10 Each of USF’s non-Hilltop Campus locations in San Francisco has relatively low enrollment and is expected to have negligible impact in its respective neighborhood.

Enrollment data is from the University Registrar. The statement that non-Hilltop enrollment is low relative to Hilltop enrollment is a conclusion based on the low ratios of those populations versus the Hilltop: e.g 138 Presidio students represent 1.5% of the Hilltop enrollment.

(c) P. 21 Population characteristics
8,731 students on hilltops

University Registrar; Fall Census 2011.

Registered Students
USF’s reporting database for the Student module is ODSP (Operational Data Store/Production). Student term (semester) program (as in college, major, degree, etc.) information is gathered into the academic_study view in ODSP (a view is a stored query that behaves like a data table). The registered_ind (registered indicator) in that view is populated by a function that checks course tables in Production and returns a Y or an N into academic_study in ODSP. So, anyone with registered_ind = Y for the term in question (Fall 2011, for example) is registered. Academic study also contains data from enrollment, advisor, and general student tables in ODSP.

Off-campus or on-campus
Students may be off-campus by program and/or by course location. Most students who are in off-campus populations are identified as such by cohort/branch-campus codes. These codes are attached to their student records in the views student_cohort or academic_study. Such off-campus cohort students exist in the School of Management and in the School of Education, as well as, to a lesser degree, in the School of Nursing and the College of Arts and Sciences. Examples of students who are off-campus by course location (the course campus identifier, which in this case is gathered into the student_course view) include (but are not limited to) those participating in University sponsored Study Abroad (also identified by an attribute code), those in the School of Management Financial Analysis, Investor Relations, and Risk Management programs (whose courses are held in San Francisco but do not meet on-campus), and those
School of Education Doctoral students who, having finished all their coursework (and therefore no longer coming to campus), are completing their dissertations.

The Fall 2011 Census total for off-campus (students identified by the criteria above) was 1106. The total student population was 9837. The on-campus population is the difference between the two, or 8731.

(d) P. 23

Non-Affiliated USF Campus Users

Fromm – 450 – 500 + 22 faculty with total enrollment at 1200

Source: Fromm Institute enrollment and faculty data.

(e) Koret – 12,000 community members

This number derived from membership data and is provided by the Director of Recreational Sports, Koret Health & Recreational Center.

(f) (Residents of the area bounded by California, Haight & Lyon Streets and 3rd Avenue are provided membership free).

A corrected statement in the Final IMP will read: “Residents of the area bounded by California, Haight & Lyon Streets and 3rd Avenue are provided membership at a discounted rate.”

(g) Koret membership includes access to a comprehensive fitness facility, fitness and wellness programs, outdoor recreation programs, and aquatics programs

This statement is a summary of Koret membership programs reported on the Koret website.

(h) Soccer Field – 1900 seats
War Memorial Gym 4,170
Benedetti Diamond – 450
Each sport hosts 10 – 22 events
Average paid patrons/game = 556

Seating capacity at athletic facilities is provided by Athletics Event Management. The number of competitive events is based on NCAA requirements and varies from sport to sport. Attendance information is based on Athletic Ticket Office records.

(20) Events managed by the Events office doesn’t track attendance or distinguish between USF and Non-USF attendees. There is no formal outside user policy. WHY NOT?

The organizational purpose for the USF Events Office is to schedule campus space for on-campus events. That function has not required tracking attendance nor determining whether attendees are on-campus community or campus guests because whatever information that data might provide has not been warranted by the offsetting costs of systems and labor required to collect it. As an open, decentralized campus, the University has not, to date, implemented an outside user policy.

(21) P 37 In some areas edge conditions are dominated by parking, service, and traffic concerns
This is derived from observation and assessment from individuals within and external to USF.

(22) P 38  UT is in the center of the campus between the Upper and Lower Hilltop Campuses

We cannot find this statement on page 38 of the Draft IMP.

The following is a Proposal to help alleviate concerns identified in the IMP and with the solution based on various elements of the Traffic Calming, Transportation, Housing, Parking, Enrollment, Landscaping and Student Behavior elements.

As stated on page 52 of the Traffic Calming Plan and on page 94 of the Draft IMP, the preferred traffic-calming plan that was voted on by the University Terrace Association includes pedestrian, bicycle, traffic calming features, and parking along Golden Gate Avenue. As the design for Golden Gate Avenue is developed beyond the conceptual phase, the preferred option presented in the Draft IMP will guide the development of design documents. Ultimately, the design for the street will be approved by SFMTA.

The University will not unilaterally consider a proposal separate from that which USF and UTA have jointly agreed.

Neighborhood concerns listed in the USF IMP

• Pedestrian safety
• Traffic on neighborhood streets
• University-related parking on neighborhood streets
• Student behavior
• Students and staff passing through the neighborhood
• Quality of the physical environment, particularly at the University’s neighborhood edge.

Solution:
A number of ideas in the following solution are already in the existing documents but put them together in a new overall concept.

Background

Since 1980 Golden Gate Avenue and University Terrace have been the north/south divide between USF’s Upper and Lower Hilltop campuses. This means that each day thousands of student pass through this divide going north and south while hundreds of vehicles are travelling east and west along as well as north and south on Terrace streets, frantically looking for parking. As long as there are cars parked on GG Avenue, there will be thousands of car/pedestrian interactions with potentially serious, even fatal consequences.
This problem has been recognized for years but there hasn’t been an impetus to develop a common solution. This was changed when there was a fatal accident at Chabot and Turk in which a USF affiliate pedestrian was fatally injured while on the sidewalk. The construction of the CSI resulted in a settlement agreement between USF and UTA, which has as its major element a traffic calming plan and the key element in that plan is to control parking, which will control traffic. The plan virtually bans parking by USF affiliates in UT’s BB residential parking permit (RPP) area. The result will be that cars will not be circling UT streets in search of a parking space. A second element will be to make the Terrace streets no access from GG Ave to prevent cut-through traffic. These two elements – no parking and no thru traffic – will have the added effect of making the Terrace streets pedestrian, bike and even child safe, because the only traffic will be UT affiliates, either residents or their visitors. This will not only dramatically reduce the number of cars but it will make it possible for pedestrians to safely walk down the middle of a Terrace street, thus avoiding the sidewalks, which are as narrow as 30 inches or less where there are street trees. It will also mean less litter from students in residents’ landscaping. Noise will be reduced because there won’t be car stereos blaring or car alarms being accidentally set off. All this will add to a collegial atmosphere and reduce reasons for negative interactions between UT residents and USF affiliates.

That is what UT residents and UTA have proposed, but it is only half of the job as long as GG Avenue is a unrestricted two-way vehicular roadway with a significant number of unlimited parking spaces, as presently planned. All the cross-walks, bike lanes, bulb outs and stop signs/flashing light in the world won’t prevent interactions between inattentive pedestrians and inattentive/impatient drivers looking for a free and unrestricted parking place in the center of campus on GG Ave. The only way to reduce vehicle/pedestrian interactions is to reduce the number of cars. This is most easily done by removing the attraction for cars (free parking places) so the drivers in their vehicles will have no reason to travel down GG Ave. other than dropping off a disabled student. The only vehicles on GG Ave. will be USF vehicles and commercial vehicles servicing USF.

The following proposal for USF is intended to be in synergy with the UTA’s traffic calming and parking proposal stated above. The sum effect will be to make the lower campus physically and aesthetically collegial with slow moving and quiet pedestrians and bikes and virtually no dangerous and sometimes noisy cars on GG Avenue between Parker and Masonic. It will replace the un-collegial, ugly and unsafe edge of parked cars with landscaping, bikes and pedestrians. This can be done simply by removing all of the on-street parking on both sides of GG avenue between Parker and Masonic.

Removal of 100 parking spaces on Golden Gate and 140 in UT will not prevent USF commuting student from finding on-street parking spaces. According to the Draft IMP, through the day there are over 700 unoccupied parking spaces within one-half miles of the USF center that can accommodate those lost spaces (P. 48.) However, the parking space statistics are much better than described in the IMP draft. First, and foremost, The parking spaces on the south side of GG Ave are mostly occupied by USF dorm students who don’t need them and therefore, the are only a small net loss in real
parking places. There are an additional 400 parking spaces along the remaining USF boundaries that have unlimited times and are also mostly occupied 24/7 by USF dorm residents, who have the lowest parking need priority. If these spaces had a strictly enforced time limit of 3-4 hours, they would no longer be acceptable to dorm students (based on a daily cost of $100+ in parking citations) and would become immediately available to commuting students. When these 400 spaces are added to the 700 already available spaces, there will be 1100 spaces to absorb the 200 spaces that would be lost by implementing this plan. Ideally, the relatively few spaces in the BB area on GG Ave. and Turk should also be eliminated and they would easily be absorbed by spaces a short distance away on the Terrace street. As it is presently, the BB spaces on GG Ave and Turk are mostly occupied by USF affiliates since UT residents have garages and can’t move fast enough to grab an unoccupied parking space. If the parking spaces on Turk were removed, trees could be planted in what is now parking lanes to further beautify and narrow this busy street and slow the pace by showing it is different in a nice visual way.

Removal of the parking spaces on GG Ave, along with the inability to enter Terrace street from GG, would make GG a virtual pedestrian and bike mall. With this wide street a parking free, one-way USF service drive would run along the south edge of GG Ave. It would be visually and aurally blocked by a median with trees and shrubs. This median is desirable for a number of reasons. It will only be used by USF service and contractor vehicles, similar to the taxi and bus lane at an airport and what is being done now to route the heavy vehicles for the CSI construction project. Since it will be one-way, the pedestrians crossing the single lane will only have to look in one direction to see a vehicle coming. The pedestrians will only be crossing a single lane before entering the much wider roadway that will have very few vehicles, mostly UT residents and their visitors. The median is also desirable as an attractive border between UT residences on the north side of GG Ave and the USF campus, both visually and absorb noise. Finally, it would take into account that the trees that are presently south of the USF sidewalk on GG Ave are reaching their maturity and will eventually need to be removed. In fact, more than one of them have been removed due to disease and another large one has come into conflict with the water/sewerage system. Now is the time to plan for their demise by planting tree to replace them, which is only possible in a median in GG Ave. There would be openings in the service drive to allow for access for emergency vehicles and detours if a vehicle were to breakdown and block the service drive. To the north of this landscaped median would be plenty of room for two way vehicular traffic limited to the few UT vehicular trips plus two way raised bike lanes unimpeded by cars backing out or whizzing by. The major interactions would be between bikes, and pedestrians with the bikes concentrated in raised lanes and posing a much reduced potential for serious accidents. This would add immeasurably to the collegial appearance and atmosphere as well as to the peace and quiet of the UT neighborhood and the housing value. The USF affiliate pedestrians will be able to walk down the middle of Terrace streets since there will be very few cars and those will be slowly advancing to their residences instead of reckless speeding to find a disappearing or too small parking space. The students will not be trashing the residents’ landscaped areas because they will be walking down the
middle of the street. This will reduce negative and even violent interactions between students and resident and replace the ugly border of parked cars and dangerous interactions between cars and pedestrians with a quiet and attractive pedestrian/bike thoroughfare.

This proposal is assisted by facts developed by the parking and traffic consultant which have shown that that there are plenty of unoccupied parking spaces in the vicinity of USF and the fact that there are many more parking spaces that would be available when dorm students no longer can park 24/7 for an entire semester at virtually no charge on the USF boundaries. These newly released spaces, along with those already unoccupied, are five time the number removed by this plan. The loss of potential BB parking spaces on GG Ave. and on Turk can be easily absorbed on the Terrace streets, once they are no longer occupied by USF affiliates.

The only significant change to plans in the present Draft IMP, would be for USF to accept loss of the parking spaces on the south side of GG Ave. which their own traffic consultants have shown is feasible. This proposal has shown that these spaces can be easily replaced by eliminating free 24/7 parking on the USF boundaries and this would also obviate the need for the proposed expensive parking garage under the soccer field. This essential element (removal of parking on the south side of GG Ave.) can be easily tested on a short-term temporary basis and in fact has been done on more than one occasion at the beginning of the Fall semester.

By implementing this plan, the following major concerns that were identified in the IMP would be significantly mitigated, with the only cost being a landscaped median on GG Ave. to match the planned landscaped median on Turk.

- Pedestrian safety
- Traffic on neighborhood streets
- University-related parking on neighborhood streets
- Student behavior
- Students and staff passing through the neighborhood
- Quality of the physical environment, particularly at the University’s neighborhood edge.

This proposal wasn’t presented at the UTA Traffic Calming Committee because it would have muddied the waters in UT developing their proposal by adding an element that was related to USF’s boundary parking. I have presented this problem and part of this solution (time limits on USF boundary on-street parking) to many USF administrators without getting any positive feedback other than a statement that USF agrees that dorm students shouldn’t be storing their cars on the city streets and that USF urges dorms students to leave their cars at home and that USF provides free Muni passes. Then they have said they can’t force students to leave their cars at home and can’t keep them from parking on city streets with the result that nothing has changed. This proposal shows that something can be done and it would have a positive result for almost everyone, including dorm students who would learn that there is life without 24/7 access to a car.
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For USF to not respond in a more proactive way to the opportunity to have a 400-500 car garage without paying a cent is hard to equate with their statements that they don’t want students to bring cars to campus to be stored on city streets.

The USF IMP consultants need to respond to this proposal and the issues it raises.

Martin MacIntyre

This section responds to comments received on the parking analysis and traffic-calming plan from Jeannie Quock and dated February 16, 2012.

Comment 1. Focusing on the limited-access-street barriers [barriers for short]:

A) The circuitous routes forced by the barriers, and the median, will increase the driving distances of University Terrace residents for most automobile trips away from, and the return to, home. What might be the amount of increase in accidents; fuel consumption, time, and automobile exhaust pollution attributable to the longer driving distances?

The primary purpose of the traffic-calming plan is to improve safety, particularly pedestrians, by limiting non-resident parking in UT and reducing traffic volume and speeds in the area. As acknowledged in past meetings, implementing measures to increase safety would have an effect on local driving patterns, including those of nearby residents.

As discussed in the February 7, 2012 UTA Traffic Committee meeting, the proposed median on Turk and partial closures at the southern end of the Terrace streets will require some residents to alter the routes they typically use to access their homes when driving, particularly when approaching from the east. The median on Turk would prohibit an eastbound left-turn onto a Terrace street. In most cases, residents would only be required to circle around the block, resulting in minimal increases in time, fuel consumption, and automobile exhaust as a result of the more circuitous route. For example, a resident of Annapolis traveling westbound on Turk could make a left at Chabot, a left onto Golden Gate, a right onto Parker, and a right onto eastbound Turk. A more likely scenario is that residents would modify their driving route to make access most efficient, and a resident of Annapolis might travel west on Geary or Fulton rather than Turk, then use Parker or Stanyan to turn onto eastbound Turk. Although the longer route would increase the amount of time spent on the roadway, there is not a correlation between the traffic calming plan and an increased collision rate.

B) What is the basis for assuming that the barriers will

- Significantly reduce the volume of USF visitor and student automobile traffic on Terrace streets and
- Discourage USF visitor and student utilization of most of the limited parking spaces in the residential BB zone?

The design of the partial closures to restrict access into the Terraces from Golden Gate Avenue is meant to discourage vehicles from circulating through the Terrace Streets looking for parking. Today, vehicles approaching from the west on Turk can make a right turn onto Parker, a left onto Golden Gate, a left onto Temescal, a right onto Turk, a left onto Chabot, a left onto Golden Gate, a left onto Chabot, and so on, “wigwagging” through the Terrace streets. A similar pattern can
occur starting on Golden Gate. As proposed in the preferred traffic-calming plan, a vehicle could turn onto a Terrace from eastbound Turk Street, but they would have to back track to Parker before returning to another Terrace street. This makes looking for available parking more inconvenient than today, discouraging vehicles from using the Terrace streets. As shown in the Traffic Calming Plan, research conducted where partial closures have been implemented indicates that partial closures can result in up to a 42% reduction in traffic volume and up to a 19% reduction in vehicle speed.

C) Many sports fans, USF Admissions Department visitors, and tourists looking for the Golden Gate Avenue view of St. Ignatius Church, come to the neighborhood. These visitors will be especially unfamiliar with the barriers and may experience the unwelcoming frustration of getting lost despite way finding signs. Has there been, or will there be, evaluation of the polluting and dangerous effects of the barriers, and median, specific to automobile drivers unfamiliar with the neighborhood?

As mentioned before, one of the purposes of the partial closures is to restrict vehicles from circulating through the Terrace streets searching for parking. If a driver unfamiliar with the area were attempting to visit Admissions or St Ignatius Church, the traffic calming measures in place around UT would help divert those visitors to the planned Visitor Centers on either Lone Mountain are at Parker & McAllister.

The institutional master plan has identified additional provisions to assist visitors who are unfamiliar with the area. Internet based apps could provide directions and maps; the placement of the visitor center and redesigned Parker Street entrance are intended to steer traffic away from UT and a comprehensive wayfinding signage program will ensure those unfamiliar with the area are directed to appropriate locations.

Comment 2. Other items:

D) Thank you for the idea of a median on Turk. Comment Noted.

E) What is the solution for the dangerous, noisy late night skate boarding?

A change in paving surfaces would likely deter skate boarding on nearby streets. Such strategies could be considered as detailed design decisions are evaluated during the implementation of the traffic-calming plan and would be subject to the mitigation fund decision process defined in the Settlement Agreement.

F) There are several references to this geographic area as basically a university neighborhood, without acknowledging the residential element of the neighborhood. Page 92, column two has examples. In the rewrite, will you please refer to this geographic area as a university and residential neighborhood?

Your suggested change has been made in the IMP document.

G) And please, the same for any gateway identifications? For example, if gateway signs identify the area as University of San Francisco, will there also be, of similar size and importance, a nearby identification of the area as University Terrace?
University identity signage, including gateway signs, are not part of the traffic—calming plan and as such, will not be funded by the traffic-mitigation fund. Depending on the type, character and location of proposed signage, the University would not likely object to UTA installing identifying signage outside the purview of the traffic calming plan.

H) A more direct solution to solving the problem of excess automobile traffic on the terrace streets is to restrict BB district parking to only cars with BB stickers. This restricted solution is supported by a majority of UTA survey responders and works in another San Francisco neighborhood [Telegraph?] and in parts of Berkeley. Will advantages of restricted BB parking be mentioned in the final since they are included in the draft?

The advantages of reducing the parking time limit for non-BB permitted vehicles on UT streets will be mentioned in the final draft of the IMP and Transportation study.

The SFMTA controls the particular parking restrictions for each residential parking permit zone. As noted in the most recent Traffic Committee meeting, SFMTA has indicated that it would not be likely to support any restriction beyond limiting non-resident parking to one-hour.

The non-resident parking restriction on Telegraph Hill Boulevard was implemented as a trial restriction to address a very specific problem related to heavy tourist traffic, very limited parking (approximately 29 spaces at the Coit Tower parking lot), and a narrow one-way in/one-way out street (Telegraph Hill Boulevard). The trial restriction on Telegraph Hill is only in effect on Saturday and Sunday during the summer, when tourist traffic is typically most heavy.

Although a BB-only restriction is unlikely to be accepted by SFMTA, a one-hour time limit on non-resident parking would discourage students from parking on BB streets, since most classes would be longer than the permitted time and vehicles remaining on the same block for more than one hour would be ticketed if adequately enforced.

I) The IMP states that the IMP will not have adverse effect on neighborhood character. Will you please tell me, how are the six big signs/barriers that will signify or state "do not enter" different from such signs near freeways?

The attached image shows a sign used in other residential communities where partial closures permitting bicycle access have been constructed. These signs are approximately the size of stop signs. The design of the partial closure will ultimately be approved by SFMTA; however, the closure could include low-level plantings appropriate to a residential neighborhood.
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