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Part I

Background / Problem
Background

- Analysis of Alternative LOS Methodologies requested by Authority Board
  - What is the best way for the City to measure transportation impacts under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)?

- Technical Working Group (TWG) assembled
  - Planning Department, SFMTA, DPH, professional transportation planners, SFBC, SPUR, Walk SF, CEQA attorney

- TWG recommends alternative to LOS
  - Replace automobile LOS with Automobile Trips Generated (ATG)
  - Provide more effective impact mitigation
Why ATG?

- LOS measures the delay experienced by drivers at an intersection
  - LOS does not capture environmental impacts
  - LOS does not reflect the City’s policies and priorities
  - LOS results in an inefficient CEQA review process

- Environmental impacts ARE related to the automobile trips generated (ATG) by a project
## LOS does not capture environmental impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impact</th>
<th>Automobile Delays (LOS)</th>
<th>Automobile Trips Generated (ATG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>CO hotspots rare in Bay Area</td>
<td>ROG, NO&lt;sub&gt;x&lt;/sub&gt;, PM&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td></td>
<td>From cold starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Intrusion</td>
<td>Traffic volumes affect neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>At congested intersections only</td>
<td>Captures noise conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Delay unrelated to safety</td>
<td>SF DPH Vehicle-Pedestrian Injury Collision model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS does not reflect City policies

- LOS impacts are a predictable and unavoidable consequence of implementing the Transit First Policy
  - Improvements to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks require re-allocating auto and shared infrastructure to other modes
  - Mode shift will occur gradually as transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks are improved

- Climate Action Plan calls for reduction in driving
  - Auto tripmaking is 50% of SF’s greenhouse gas emission

- Mitigations to LOS are environmentally harmful
  - worsen conditions for pedestrians, transit, and bicycling
  - ...while inducing more driving
LOS does not reflect City Policies

Widening this roadway will improve LOS, mitigating any LOS impacts…

While worsening pedestrian conditions and inducing more driving.
LOS does not reflect City Policies

Providing a pedestrian crossing here would increase delays for right-turning drivers, potentially triggering significant LOS impacts...

Minimizing automobile delays takes precedence over minimizing pedestrian delays.
LOS results in inefficient CEQA review

- LOS analysis and impacts are:
  - Difficult for project sponsors to predict
  - Not transparent for project sponsors or the public
  - A burden to the “last project in” (last-in problem)
The “last-in” problem

Project #1
LOS = B
No Impacts
The “last-in” problem

Project #2
LOS = D
No Impacts
The “last-in” problem

Project #3
LOS = F
Significant Impacts!
The Problem

- Fortunately, CEQA grants local jurisdictions the authority to define impact measures and thresholds consistent with local policy...
- ...Constrained by State CEQA Guidelines and past practice
Part II

The Solution
2-Part Recommendation

- Per-Auto Trip Generated (ATG) Impact Measure
  - Each automobile trip added by a project contributes to impact
  - Projects that do not generate net new automobile trips have no impact

- Transportation impact mitigation fee (TIMF) program
  - Project sponsors pay per-trip impact mitigation fee
  - Fee revenues fund actions that help reduce new automobile tripmaking (by improving transit, walking, and bicycling as choices)
TIMF Improves Mitigation

- Mitigate local and citywide impacts
  - Revenues contribute to citywide program of projects
  - Portion dedicated to local area improvements
  - Neighborhood involvement in determining local mitigation measures

- More equitable and accountable (for project sponsors and the public)
  - Eliminates last-in problem; each project contributes in proportion to impact levels
  - More transparent process for identifying and mitigating impacts
  - Clear nexus between fee collected and projects funded
Process for Applying ATG Measure

Will the Project generate new auto trips?

Yes

Determine Impact: Estimate automobile trips generated or induced by the project

Determine needed mitigation: Calculate impact mitigation fee payment based on volume of trips generated / induced

No

Stop. No impacts in this area.
Part III

The Benefits
The Solution

- Environmentally protective
  - Consistent with CEQA
  - Captures incremental impacts
  - More closely related to actual environmental effects
  - More neighborhood involvement in determining mitigation measures

- Consistency with City policies and vision
  - Reduces time and cost to implement Transit First projects
  - More effective at discouraging auto-oriented projects

- Improved efficiency
  - More predictable for project sponsors
  - More transparent for the public
  - More accountability: mitigations linked directly to local and citywide improvements
Implementation Roadmap

- Authority Board approved final report in October 2008
- Conduct Nexus Study
- Authority to incorporate ATG into Congestion Management Agency (CMA) monitoring measures
- Planning Commission adoption of an ordinance approving the ATG measure and TIMF package
- Revisions to CEQA Guidelines?
Thank you!