

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019**

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED
AFTER PUBLISHED AGENDA**

PH 19-024

HAYWARD DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN

LETTER FROM SHERMAN LEWIS (HAPA) 03.26.19

Robert Goldassio

Subject: FW: Downtown Specific Plan
Attachments: HAPA comments on LWC Dntn Specific Plan.docx

Public Comment:

From: Sherman Lewis <sherman@csu Hayward.us>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 8:51 AM
To: Damon Golubics <Damon.Golubics@hayward-ca.gov>
Subject: Downtown Specific Plan

Please circulate to the Planning Commission for Thursday's meeting.

Planning Commission:

I urge you to ask the City to do a traffic study of the Loop as outlined in HAPA's comments on the Specific Plan. The Loop has many problems--it has made traffic slower and increased through traffic on B St., among other things. Ask the City to study the cost of going back to two-way, with phasing, using LATIP funds. I recently confirmed with Caltrans that the funding in the AB 1386 account available now and from future revenues based on the City-Caltrans deal at \$117,513,719.

Please recommend that the City do an analysis of functionality, cost, and timing among three reforms at Mission Jackson Foothill: the oval, a traffic circle, and a regular signaled intersection there, and involve people in the choices.

Please think about whether Hayward should subsidize car access to downtown or emphasize growth based on rapid bus along the Cal State-downtown-Chabot corridor. To make such bus feasible, it needs to be supported by housing development emphasizing non-auto modes and be based on travel time budgets.

I think on some issues the consultants, especially Nelson Nygaard, got carried away by their own imaginations and came up with ideas that won't work in Hayward. Even rapid bus will be a tough sell for the auto-dependent.

I am available by phone and email.

--

Sherman Lewis
Academic Senator for Emeriti
Professor Emeritus, CSU Hayward
President, Hayward Area Planning Association
510-538-3692 sherman@csu Hayward.us

HAPA Comments on Hayward Downtown Specific Plan

The Hayward Downtown Specific Plan (Plan) shows great expertise across a range of planning professions and is by far the most progressive plan ever presented to Council. Nevertheless, the Hayward Area Planning Association (HAPA) has some severe criticisms of specific ideas which should not be taken as a negative attitude toward the rest. One major criticism focuses on parking subsidies and the other on the oval roundabout, which is inconsistent with the Vision.

1.2 Vision and Plan Goals

Our comment here is how to make the good better, by getting outside the self-imposed envelop of the Plan. It is hard to articulate this criticism as well as I, representing HAPA, would like. The Plan provides design detail for increased non-auto mode but does not discuss how all the policies taken together are a system that reduces auto dependency and car ownership while having high mobility. I would like to see a Vision statement of how a land plan for density over area, a transportation plan for non-auto modes, and pricing incentives can combine to achieve affordability, sustainability, mobility, health and safety, high design aesthetics, and community. Similarly, I did not find in one place a summary of the potential for shifting to non-auto modes combining, walk, bike, transit, and public cars and how these interact with density. I'd like to see the Plan say that a pedestrian neighborhood system could start closer to BART, prove itself, and grow from there.

The Plan generally fails to give a sense of the potential for non-auto modes to access to downtown and to travel within downtown. The vision is exciting but, in a way, seems static; it needs more sense of dynamic change as people learn how non-car mobility works in a pedestrian system and shifts the system away from private cars, reinforcing over time the non-auto mode system to grow even more. The common knowledge now is that a sustainable life style is possible in a few dense cities, but won't work in suburbia. In fact, it is a flexible system that can work in densifying centers and corridors and achieving mode shift in suburban areas. LWC is good at painting verbal pictures; I'd like to see one with people living an upbeat lifestyle with full mobility and better off without the expense and burden of a private car, healthier from walking, saving money and using public cars when needed. Your vision page 30 is good for what we want to see, as a place. I could not find a good place to put a vision about how it feels to live it.

1.3 Key Challenges and Recent Investments – good except on 238

Diagram of the Route 238 Bypass Alternative needs more detail and sharpness.

References to the "Route 238 Bypass Alternative" (p. 16 etc.) need some fixing.

"In the early 1960s, the Foothill Freeway, also known as the Bypass Alternative..." (p. 20) The Foothill Freeway was ended in 1979 and was never known as the Bypass Alternative. The Bypass, 1979 onwards, was never known as the Bypass Alternative; it was the Hayward Bypass.

"The project ran directly through Downtown..." The freeway/Bypass never ran through downtown; part of it ran along Fourth Street from north of A St. to south of E Street on the east side of downtown. It was called the Bypass because it bypassed downtown.

“...was highly controversial as it destroyed historic buildings and disconnected the area.” “Disconnect the area” has no meaning. The projects were not particularly controversial because of destruction of historic buildings.

The projects were controversial for many reasons over decades because they would destroy peoples’ homes, aggravated a housing shortage, condemned homes without housing replacement or relocation benefits thus violating a federal Housing Act, violated NEPA due to lack of an EIS, violated CEQA because of lack of an EIR, violated the 4(f) section of a federal Transportation Act by crossing a public park without adequate search for alternatives, violated the federal Endangered Species Act because of a lack of review of whipsnake impact south of Harder, destroyed open space, had not been reviewed for conformity under the federal Clean Air Act, were denied for state and local funding by MTC, used a sales tax to pay for what a gas tax should pay for, would divide the whole city over a distance of five miles, lacked logical termini, attempted to use funds voters had approved for another project on the Bypass alignment, and was not needed in the first place. I can supply documentation.

“...was proposed to connect I-580 and I-680...” That was true of the Foothill Freeway from 1963 to 1979, but never of the Bypass which stopped at Industrial.

“The Bypass Alternative returns to two-way traffic” (p. 47). This is an error. You mean “The Loop returns to two-way traffic...”

“...rather than a bypass for motorists passing through.” (p. 59) Your meaning is clear but the term bypass is incorrect because nothing is bypassed. Consider: “...rather than as a high-speed route for commuter traffic” or something similar that would be accurate.

“The Bypass Alternative serves considerable regional pass-through traffic...such as commuters between the Tri-Valley and the San Francisco Peninsula or the South Bay.” (p. 61) This is not true. The Usage Study quantified that about 90 percent of the traffic on Foothill downtown was Hayward-based regional traffic, that is, one end in Hayward and the other outside. If Kittleson has, in fact, run the mid-county model with screenlines on Mission below Tamarac and on Foothill above Apple with results that show differently, I would really like to see the model outputs. Your statement reflects the uniformed conventional wisdom.

1.5 Public Participation

Public participation was good except there was no way for participants to choose among major alternatives, which were also excluded from the Plan, resulting in a take-it-or-leave it Plan.

Extensive analyses and reports submitted by the Hayward Area Planning Association, mainly “Ideas for Downtown Hayward” and “Competing Visions for Downtown Hayward” were not referenced, only governmental documents. I submit them again with these comments for reference, for the record but not as a comment, along with my email list appended at the end of these comments. We are glad to see the Plan incorporates so many of the ideas we have long advocated.

2.3 Downtown Land Use Plan

MIXED-USE GATEWAY

Some planner jargon abuses of the English language are worse than others. Seven story buildings cannot be “nestled” against San Lorenzo Creek (p. 36).

Five to seven stories (p. 38) will be very dense for Hayward, are not a short-term prospect, and are even less likely in this location so far from BART. They are probably not needed to reach the 50 person per neighborhood acre threshold needed for major mode

shift. (See Lewis, Sherman. 2017. Neighborhood density and travel mode: new survey findings for high densities. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology* 25:2, 152-165, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2017.1321052> and Lewis, Sherman and Emilio Grande del Valle. 2018a. San Francisco's Neighborhoods; and Auto Dependency. *Cities* 86(2019) 11-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.12.017>.)

"Slip lanes" (p. 38, 39), tuck-under parking and hidden parking garages reveal an auto-centric wolf under the pedestrian clothing.

DOWNTOWN CORE

Two way on the Loop will make getting around easier; two way on B and C probably will not. An operations analysis should look at Loop reform first and then see if B and C going to two way improves things, being sure to consider observed blockage on B St. by parking in the travel lane. Friction on B St. may already slow it to the design speed. Without some evidence to the contrary, B St. and C St. should remain a one-way pair. True, "the inherent design of one-way streets tends to encourage higher vehicular speeds..." (p. 61), but only "tends." Other factors can make a particular street as slow as two-way: narrowness and vehicles parked in the travel lane. To repeat my point, LWC needs to observe parking in the travel lane and actual speeds, because if actual speeds are the desired design speeds, two-way is not needed.

URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS

"The Bypass Alternative returns to two-way traffic" (p. 47) is incorrect; the Plan means "the Plan returns the Loop to two-way traffic."

STATION PLAZA

Good, even great, concepts; some flawed implementation.

BART Station Access should delete the first two bullet points. (p. 73). These proposals go contrary to Plan Vision.

Wiping out BART access (p. 50, 51, 73) on the east side is nonsense; the bus intermodal, passenger lane, and handicapped access must remain and the taxi stand needs to be moved close the station exit. Policy M-7.13 should specify relocating the taxi stand to the station exit. The Plan should reference broader taxi deregulation to allow fair competition with eail ride sharing and use of eail technology, already approved by the State.

There is no need to change the bus intermodal "...to avoid the delays and congestion of using a bus intermodal..." (p. 73, program C 10). I have observed this intermodal since it was built and have never observed any delays or congestion. It is well-designed and serves its purpose. The relocation of the intermodal to the west side makes transit access far more inconvenient and slower than the existing system, and would move a large pedestrian flow away from accessing downtown. The buildings proposed for the east side can work as well on the west side. The "bus stops on existing streets adjacent to the station" are not identified so it is not clear what might be relocated. What does "Integrating bus stops on existing streets adjacent to the station" mean, specifically?

Changes in bus stop location cannot be ruled out but they have to save travel time. A bus stop on the west side for buses west bound on A St. could have a bus travel time savings greater than the extra walk time to get there.

How many stories are probably needed for a hotel on the BART lot? The large lot size could be big enough for a small conventional hotel. A big one is not only unlikely for Hayward but actually undesirable; it would be out-of-scale for this town. Such a hotel would do more

for Hayward than an office building, if feasible. The City needs to confer with BART Real Estate. The Plan should discuss these issues.

Policy M-7.4, M-7.5 and M-7.11 are so similar they should be combined into one.

Policy M-7.2 should specify Greyhound. Policy M-2.4 (p. 74) should include Greyhound, to replace its miserable little building with a place with windows and seating out of the weather.

Reducing BART parking must be done in tandem with growth in non-parking access, which the Plan does not cover and should. BART parking charges are already an incentive for riders to use transit to reach the station, but the needed park-and-ride lots and rapid bus are not in the Plan.

BART would need to agree to how much replacement access is needed to allow building, and initial building should be the northwest lot (p. 50: 5 and 6). Building there will be vastly easier due to the small number of spaces compared to the parking structure. The Plan should have these ideas, both building first where it is easiest, and working with BART on an explicit swap of access that has a trigger for building.

Eleven stories (p. 39) is not only unrealistic but unnecessary for growth and has much less sustainability and higher costs than three to seven stories. "Up to eleven stories" should be deleted from the Plan unless LWC has data showing it is viable. The Plan is deficient in discussing the sustainability, seismic, aesthetic, access and economic disamenities of high-rise buildings, as well as the fact that they are unnecessary for growth and out of character with Hayward. Three to seven story buildings will do the job.

While some smaller activities are desirable for the BART plaza area, it is too small for the farmers market, which is already planned for a much bigger and better space in Heritage Park.

DOWNTOWN SOUTHERN GATEWAY

The oval roundabout (p. 53) is an expensive, dysfunctional, and unnecessary way to achieve the goals of Heritage Park, which is better located for park purposes. Heritage Park does not require crossing heavy traffic to get there, is more centrally located, and already exists. The big investment in Heritage Park should be honored, not ignored.

The drawing has a clerical error lower right; "Foothill Blvd" is actually building frontage for the St. Regis. The label needs to be moved up to either side of the oval or to the top. Mission Blvd. southbound goes out of the frame at the bottom and lacks a label.

The Plan does not explain how the traffic will flow around the oval (p. 53, 54) and looking at its movements indicates less functionality and a higher cost than a circle or signals at Jackson Mission Foothill. The oval has little effect on Jackson-Foothill traffic and some other movements, but Mission traffic is detoured. Eastbound D Street, which now flows across Foothill, would be blocked so badly it would lead to rat-runs similar to the Loop A Street problem. That traffic will likely go to Francisco St., a narrow street. If that is your intent, the Plan needs to explain it, or what LWC predicts will happen.

The oval is too expensive, dysfunctional, and unnecessary to achieve Loop reform, comparable to the Loop in the magnitude of bungling. Frankly, the imaginations of the designers got way ahead of their common sense.

Signals and two-way streets on the Loop are the best short-term, low-cost solution to Loop problems.

Longer term, a circle is intriguing, and could be a circle similar to 4 in the drawing (p. 53). E St. would be extended to connect the circle to Second St. A circle has advantages over lights for handling five access roads and numerous left turns. Also, Foothill could be realigned towards Main St. to intersect Mission more squarely and head into Jackson more directly, freeing up enough land for building on the west side, probably creating more land for building than the existing split oval layout. All this can be done at a fraction of the cost and time for building the oval.

If this oval remains in play, planning should not proceed without an operations analysis. An ordinary traffic study will not be sensitive to the operational issues. Even better would be to use some common sense on the three options. Just looking at the oval shows that it will increase VMT and point to point travel times.

3.2 Mobility Vision

I believe Loop reform is **urgent**. The Plan is deficient in discussing Loop problems, such as how point to point traffic has become slower, one-way speeds have increased, reverse direction speeds have slowed, and vmt has increased. I incorporate here by reference HAPA's in-depth analysis. They are not for comment in the Final EIR as they are too long and many parts are out of date. The essential points are made here.

The short-term improvement should be converting the Loop to two-way with signaled intersections using AB 1386 funds. Improvements 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 (p. 65) on Foothill and Mission should not be done and then have to be redone later. I don't think we should wait til 2034 or later to fix the Loop. (p. 64)

How does the Program CD 17 linear park (p. 19, 124) relate to the oval?

Appendix C makes no reference to the oval roundabout. Why?

Appendix C Program C 13 (p. 375) does not include making Foothill two-way. Why?

Why does program C 13 start in 8 years while 3.2.1 (p. 64) it starts in 15 years?

3.2.3 Transit Network

The City's shuttle feasibility study and the Plan have not considered a downtown smart shuttle. The City is studying, instead, shuttles that resemble AC Transit service with slow, long, infrequent runs and low ridership. Smart shuttles use smart bus technologies, short corridors, and fast/free/frequent service.

They need direct routes, high speeds, and short distances to support low cost. In downtown, assuming Loop reform and a central block busway, one bus would be needed for a BART to Lincoln Landing shuttle. To achieve speed, a smart shuttle uses bus-only lanes, a smaller (p. 20-30 passenger) bus, and guiding docking for no-step entry with no fare collection. They need right-of-way that facilitates speed. Right-of-way improvements include right lane queue jumping, signal preemption, and elevated sidewalk stops at bus floor level for no-step entry. They have very short dwell times. They can use a hybrid diesel electric motor or comparable for torque, regenerative braking, and low carbon energy.

Smart shuttles compete with established personal travel time budgets existing in the corridor; that is, they have to be as fast as existing modes, e.g., cars. Travel time has to consider all modes on a point-to-point trip, such as, from Lincoln Landing, walk/wait/in vehicle/walk to BART, in competition with walk to car/drive out of home parking structure/drive on street/hunt/park/walk to BART.

Shuttles pay for themselves with land-based finance, some of which is possible for Maple Main and Lincoln Landing, which include developer capital contribution for equipment and way upgrades and rents or HOA dues for operating.

Smart shuttles have to be understood within a larger system, not as an add-on that works on its own. They need high densities and incentives to reduce car use such as smart meters and unbundling. Smart shuttles achieve high ridership; they are not per se a social service for people with low incomes. The Plan needs to study such a system and its ridership.

3.3 Proposed Street Design and Appendix B

Some cross sections (pp. 355-368) show no street parking while claiming “maintain curb parking.” Generally, the potential for more diagonal parking is ignored in favor parallel parking with more space for other uses that seem unlikely to get used enough to justify the loss of parking. The amount of bike lanes is not related to behavioral analysis as to whether they will be used, or whether light traffic obviates the need for a bike lane. The Plan is excellent for design in support of bikes but lacks information on probable bike use, resulting in empty bike lanes and lost parking. I don’t know how to estimate bike use, but some effort needs to be made to optimize between bike lanes and parking.

We need performance criteria or warrants for bike lanes and parking. In time, we can hope increased biking and decreased car use can be the basis for shifting the balance.

Separate buffers should not reduce parking; parking itself is a good buffer.

The oval roundabout needs analysis; it is a concept in need of operations modeling in comparison to a traffic circle at Mission Foothill Jackson and to a regular intersection. Network modeling will not be sensitive to the problem. Any analysis must look at VMT and point to point travel times, not just speeds. The right-of-way takes and large size make the oval much more expensive than a regular intersection.

The Foothill cross-section (p. 368) does seems too wide. The thru lanes are designed for speed when the Plan calls for slowing cars down. The extra-wide widths preclude diagonal parking, which is easier and allows more spaces. The Plan needs to estimate the width of the “J” cross section and reduce other uses to get diagonal parking, as illustrated in detailed drawings that HAPA has previously submitted to the City.

Comment on 3.3.1: Amen.

3.4 Parking and Transportation Demand Management

Overview

The problem is that the transportation environmental assessment does not meet CEQA requirements for evaluation of impacts. Kittleson assumes that use of the BAAQMD protocol based on CARB’s CalEEMod (Draft EIR p. 4.2-27) is enough, but it is not. These comments and submissions by HAPA establish an administrative record for challenging the adequacy of the EIR. “The Plan” refers to the Plan as such and to the Draft EIR. SB 471 makes VMT an important impact to be evaluated because it is reduced by smart growth. SB 471 excludes LOS because it precludes smart growth and congestion is a factor supporting non-auto modes. The Plan does not evaluate the impact of Plan policies on VMT.

The Draft EIR

Appendix C is a technical document produced by Kittleson and not intended to be understood by the public. The opening table shows zero operational percent reduction with 12 columns for pollutants and 9 categories of sources, with all cells reporting 0.00%. The next table has operational mobile mitigation with many categories and policies, among which are

four parking policy pricing policies, all reporting 0.00% reduction. The rest of the document of 314 pages has text reporting the policies without providing any quantitative data on their impact on air quality. Similar reporting without supporting data is found for a number of other policies which would reduce air pollution from vehicles.

Appendix E is a technical document of 341 pages produced by Kittleson listing 30 roadway mitigation measures and no other policies in the Plan which are expected to reduce traffic. It reports build-out totals for dwelling units, office square feet, “777,485 of retail uses” (presumably square feet), and “1,506,095 of other non-residential uses” (presumably square feet). We used numerous search terms looking for the effect of Plan policies on LOS and VMT without results. The rest of the document does not report on any of the numerous measures in the Plan that will affect traffic. The document reports numerous VMT and LOS results with no quantification of the many Plan policies that would affect them.

The traffic volume forecasting approach (p. 67-68) states that the Alameda CTC countywide model is used and no adjustments for the results of plan policies are mentioned. Appendix 6 of Appendix E has travel demand model data that list only taz land uses and nothing on the many policies that affect vehicle trips.

Appendix 7 on Project Alternatives is blank.

There is no report of the effect of unbundling, cash-out, parking supply, or parking charges. There is no information about how much parking would increase, how much it costs, or mode split.

The Hayward Downtown Specific Plan and Associated Zoning Code Update Draft EIR depends on data flowing up from the technical air quality and transportation studies. The Draft EIR lists all plan policies but has no data on their effect on LOS or VMT.

Demand for parking

The need for parking in the Plan is culturally assumed, not analytically demonstrated. The amount of parking, pricing of parking, alternative modes, and mode split needs more attention and quantification. Alternative modes get a lot design discussion, but no analysis of how much they will actually be used, leaving no bases for knowing how much parking there should be and what it costs society and the user. The Plan needs to state how much parking is planned, why it is justified, and what are the environmental results.

Market price, monetary cost, and economic cost

Market price is what a driver will pay to park at an average of 85% occupancy of parking spaces, and is determined by the value of the destination and the number of spaces. It is based on the willingness to pay. Higher value and more fewer spaces drive up cost; alternative modes meeting travel time budget lower costs.

Monetary cost is the value of the land, cost of construction, and cost of operation. Market price may be higher or lower; if market price is lower than monetary cost, the difference is a subsidy, which subsidizes more car travel and reduces use of alternative modes.

Economic cost is monetary cost plus important non-monetary costs that have economic value, typically external costs of traffic, congestion, GHG, air and other pollution, health and safety costs, disamenity costs to pedestrians, costs to other modes, and reduction in total social welfare due to distorted prices. Monetary costs fail to measure value; economic costs require estimating approximations of value in money terms to reach total. Monetary costs are extremely inaccurate by omitting too much of value; economic costs are not precise but are at least more accurate.

Surface vs structured parking

The monetary costs of surface vs. structured parking are quite different, while the market cost and economic cost above the monetary component are similar or the same. From a driver's point of view, it does not matter if a space is surface or structured; only the charge matters. For non-monetized values, a trip is a trip regardless of where the car is parked. Surface parking is so inexpensive that moderate demand can cover the monetary cost while structured parking usually cannot.

Structured parking has a time cost of driving up and down ramps and circling that surface parking does not have. It has much higher construction costs due to the expense of holding very heavy objects up in the air safely. Also, the space taken up by ramps and travel lanes reduces the number of spaces on upper levels. A number of spaces at ground level are also lost to support columns, travel lanes, and ramps. The cost per space needs to be assigned to the upper spaces and compared to surface parking with more spaces on the same footprint.

The downtown parking structure (p. 42) is unacceptable and unnecessary. It goes against Plan policies for non-auto modes and subsidizes traffic and greenhouse gases. It is anti-walkable. It preempts a travel lane needed by the most feasible rapid shuttle route or a housing site. Screening parking from street view does nothing to mitigate the adverse effects of more auto-dependency and the reduced the functionality and attractiveness of this central area.

The Plan needs to estimate if the market charge for the upper spaces would cover the monetary costs and, if not, how much the subsidy would be.

Silence on the economics may hide the City's intent to subsidize parking, as has happened already with the other two city parking structures. A monetary parking charge would probably be so high that few people would park there. The Plan does not discuss a monetary charge or subsidies.

The monetary cost of structured parking is likely to be far higher than the market price, resulting in a subsidy which causes adverse external costs. People are unlikely to pay monetary cost because alternatives work better for them. The EIR must evaluate these issues.

Auto vs. non-auto modes

The Plan needs to consider the mode split all policies considered together with particular attention to the role of subsidy. The Plan does not calculate the mode split of the Plan. The Plan has many features reducing auto use: density, mixed use, unbundling, cash-out, market parking charges/smart meters, pedestrian amenity, bicycle amenity, slower vehicle travel speeds, public cars, rapid bus, and transit. These policies can support competitive non-auto travel times in personal travel time budgets. They will reduce auto-ownership and VMT.

Unbundling, parking ratios, and minimum parking requirements

The Plan calls for unbundling but fails to analyze its results. It calls for eliminating parking requirements but fails to estimate the results. The Plan fails to discuss how an unbundled parking rent below the monetary cost of providing the parking is a subsidy to parking, in this case from higher housing rents to pay for below-cost parking rents. A developer will build all housing with no parking if 1) the increase in units made possible by less parking, 2) the lower cost per unit from having no parking costs, and 3) non-auto modes meet travel needs all combine to be profitable. The Green Shutter did it.

Parking spaces

The Plan calls for "Reuse of underutilized surface parking lots as public plazas provides additional civic gathering space" based on CDM Smith occupancy analysis for peak hour

parking. The Plan calls for increase parking in structures and on streets. The Plan has to estimate how many spaces are involved and the policies that would increase and decrease the number needed. What ratio does the Plan expect of housing units to parking spaces?

The Plan has no estimates of losses in surface parking on B and C due to medians, buffers, travel lanes, and bike lanes and going from diagonal to parallel parking. There are no estimates of increased surface parking with Loop reform. The claim (p. 43, “provide opportunities for on-street parking”) that the Plan would increase on-street parking is not quantified; sidewalks, bike lanes, medians, and travel lanes reduce parking.

I incorporate by reference Todd Litman, Parking Management at www.vtpi.org/park_man_comp.pdf and Transportation Cost and Benefit Analysis at www.vtpi.org/tca/

Public cars

I did not find a discussion of how public cars are the final component needed to reduce car ownership by supporting those few trips that are best made by car. I did not find a discussion of public cars as a concept combining car share, car rental, taxi, and ride hail. I think some, maybe all of the idea is embodied in “shared rides,” but I could not find a definition.

Carshare needs a description. You do a great job on unbundling; a paragraph on car share using street parking, web location, and card swipe operation would inform those unfamiliar with it. I found no reference to car rental. Please think twice about car share pods; I don’t think they are the most competitive system. It should not just be part of an employer policy or new project; carshare can be done now dispersed now on the streets based on demand.

You have a lot of pieces but are a bit short of the puzzle. You need to add to your streets policies the need for curb space needed by public cars, provided by them paying the rate or by reservation.

Curb Parking; Smart meters

The Plan is good but weak on market-based pricing and smart meters for street parking, which it calls performance-based parking for curb parking (p. 84). The Plan needs more detail. It does not explain smart meters and easy pay systems. The Plan must discuss a smart meter program like SFPark and compare it to time limits for efficiency in parking turnover and the benefits to merchants and drivers from the point of view of each. You get part way there but don’t make the sale, unlike unbundling, with a detailed explanation.

Does “set” performance-based pricing for curb parking mean “implement”?

The Plan calls for implementation “long-term” (p. 77), which overlooks the need for implementation now in places that already are over-parked. It is not a problem that will develop “overtime” (p. 84) problem; it is a problem now. Nobody can park on B St. because it is always parked up.

The Plan should recommend short term implementation involving public education, a pilot program that includes easy pay and business participation in use of funds for local improvements, and gradual implementation. Part 5.1 Implementation is too disjointed to be a clear presentation. You need to talk about a pilot program and explain the benefit of surplus funds for downtown improvement. People need to know there will be free parking nearby if they don’t want to pay. You should mention the features that make Pasadena Old Town so successful.

You need to propose how to make the sale. You should describe what the staff did in Berkeley that persuaded Shattuck merchants to support charges. Planning needs to discuss how people can be persuaded to support small steps that go against their initial prejudices.

The popular perception of parking availability is that *sometimes parking is really hard to find and we need more*. That is the political reality Council lives with. The last proposal for parking meters was rejected by Council, which panicked when a few merchants showed up fearful of losing customers and not understanding the opposite would occur. The Plan needs to include public education and gradual implementation to overcome popular prejudice. Planning should not succeed at design and fail at psychology.

Minimum Parking Standards

Update Minimum Parking Standards (p. 78) is internally inconsistent: Plan Discussion: "Once these two key policies (market pricing street parking and residential permits) have been implemented, imposing minimum parking requirements becomes unnecessary." I agree. Plan Recommendation: "reduce minimum parking requirements for projects in areas with high transit accessibility..." I disagree. The recommendation is inconsistent with the discussion and parking requirements should be eliminated. Council won't do it for political reasons, but that is another problem. For every one person that advocates for no parking requirements, there are a few hundred who don't want to have a parking problem. You quote Shoup and have a good discussion, (p. 78); so, follow through.

4.1 Infrastructure and Services Introduction

4.2 Infrastructure Capacity and Improvements

4.2.5 Stormwater

Watersheds (p. 96- 101) has some of the best work I've seen on local watersheds, superior to AC Flood Control new watershed map on downtown area detail, and comparable to Google Earth Pro. Let's hope for progress on daylighting. I would like to see it covered earlier, possibly p. 100, ahead of the C.3 issues. The topic is not reached til 150 and then buried in the middle of a paragraph. It pops up on 344 with no discussion, no suggestions of where it might work. The water now flows long parts of Second, Foothill, B, C, Jackson, etc. It should be mentioned in Vision and in 2.2.2 Public Realm. A possible project should be added to the bottom of 102.

It's Sulphur, not Sulfur (p. 97, also 100), on Google Maps, the nature center, AC Flood Control map, and even in the blue heading above the problem.

Upper Sulphur Creek gets no respect. AC Flood Control put it into the San Lorenzo Creek watershed and does not identify it, but it should be identified.

Either "Floods Zibes" (p. 98) is a new concept or a great typo.

5.2 Potential Funding Sources

In addition to sources cited by LWC, The LATIP AB 1386 Account managed by Caltrans in 2018 had about \$44 million in unprogrammed funds applicable to street projects downtown.

Submitted by

Sherman Lewis, President,
Hayward Area Planning Association
2787 Hillcrest Ave., Hayward CA 94542
sherman@csu Hayward.us
510-538-3692

List of emails sent to City on downtown specific plan (much repetition among them)

Subject	From	Recipient	Date	Size	Locat...
Re: Downtown Specifi Plan	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	3/16/2015, 9:28 PM	1.3 MB	Down...
➡ Downtown SP Scope of Work	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics, Fred Kelley	3/23/2015, 1:48 PM	1.5 KB	Down...
Re: Downtown SP Scope of Work	Fred Kelley	Sherman, Damon Golubics	3/27/2015, 9:30 AM	18.6 KB	Down...
Re: Downtown SP Scope of Work	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	3/27/2015, 10:17 AM	7.0 KB	Down...
➡ Downtown Specific Plan Task F...	Damon Golubics	Sherman (sherman@csuha...	5/19/2015, 9:57 AM	43.9 KB	Down...
Re: Downtown Specific Plan Tas...	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	5/19/2015, 10:57 AM	4.5 KB	Down...
Re: Downtown Specific Plan Tas...	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	5/19/2015, 1:50 PM	4.6 KB	Down...
Re: Downtown Specific Plan Tas...	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	5/19/2015, 5:06 PM	965 KB	Down...
Go Berkeley and the MTC parkin...	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	6/3/2015, 8:58 PM	2.3 KB	Down...
Re: Go Berkeley and the MTC pa...	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	6/4/2015, 7:41 AM	6.5 KB	Down...
Re: Please forward attached rep...	Sherman Lewis	Miriam Lens, Lory and Dan...	2/17/2016, 10:25 AM	3.5 KB	Down...
➡ Neighborhood parking permits	Sherman	diane.vargas@haywrd-ca.g...	9/1/2016, 2:15 PM	33.3 KB	Down...
Re: Neighborhood parking per...	Damon Golubics	Sherman	9/6/2016, 11:18 AM	5.8 KB	Down...
Downtown Specific Plan - Curre...	Damon Golubics	Sherman (sherman@csuha...	11/15/2016, 11:09 AM	790 KB	Down...
Re: FW: Downtown Specific Plan...	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	11/15/2016, 6:16 PM	28.4 KB	Down...
Re: Smart Growth Parking empt...	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	2/2/2017, 1:11 PM	6.9 KB	Down...
➡ Re: Downtown charrettes	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	3/6/2017, 2:55 PM	8.8 KB	Down...
➡ Re: Hayward charrettes	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	3/6/2017, 3:46 PM	1.8 MB	Down...
➡ Re: Downtown charrettes	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	3/6/2017, 10:12 PM	3.1 KB	Down...
Re: Hayward charrettes	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	3/6/2017, 10:20 PM	3.3 KB	Down...
Downtown charrettes	Sherman	Damon Golubics	3/12/2017, 9:36 PM	3.1 KB	Down...
➡ Re: Downtown charrettes	Damon Golubics	Sherman	3/13/2017, 7:27 AM	9.5 KB	Down...
Re: Downtown charrettes	Damon Golubics	Sherman	3/15/2017, 8:20 AM	7.6 KB	Down...
Re: Charrette input	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	3/17/2017, 9:07 AM	11.7 KB	Down...
Comments for LWC	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	3/28/2017, 4:40 PM	1.1 MB	Down...
Re: Comments for LWC	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	3/28/2017, 4:53 PM	6.2 KB	Down...
downtown plan	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	5/5/2017, 7:27 AM	1.2 KB	Down...
Downtown Plan	Sherman Lewis	David Rizk, Sara Buizer	5/15/2017, 8:27 AM	1.5 KB	Down...
Downtown Plan	Sherman	David Rizk, Sara Buizer, Da...	5/15/2017, 8:52 AM	2.5 KB	Down...
Re: Downtown Plan	Damon Golubics	Sherman	5/15/2017, 9:20 AM	10.4 KB	Down...
Draft Comments on Vision	Sherman Lewis	List-Mayor-Council@hayw...	7/10/2017, 6:10 AM	802 KB	Down...
Re: DTSP presentation today Jan...	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	1/22/2018, 10:17 AM	305 KB	Down...
Hayward Downtown Specific Pl...	Caitlyn Murray	Dave Campbell, Derinda , F...	2/23/2018, 2:19 PM	2.2 MB	Down...
Re: Downtown SP	Damon Golubics	Sherman	2/27/2018, 8:14 AM	9.9 KB	Down...
V	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	3/24/2018, 5:16 PM	1.6 MB	Down...
Re: V	Damon Golubics	Sherman Lewis	3/26/2018, 7:59 AM	9.4 KB	Down...
Council Infrastructure Committ...	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics, Laura Si...	10/23/2018, 9:33 PM	3.9 KB	Down...
Re: Council Infrastructure Com...	Sherman Lewis	Damon Golubics	10/24/2018, 8:42 AM	20.2 KB	Down...