Appendix C

CORE CIRCULATION STUDY

Recognizing that a large share of San Francisco’s future growth is planned for the city core (downtown, South of Market, and Mission Bay Neighborhoods), we undertook a study of current and projected circulation patterns in the core as part of SFTP development. The study resulted in a paper accepted for publication at the Transportation Research Board 2014 annual conference (attached). Study findings informed the SFTP Investment Plans and policy recommendations.
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ABSTRACT

Several land use and transportation plans propose changes that would affect the “Core” of San Francisco. The Core encompasses the greater Downtown area, including the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. SoMa is currently comprised of a predominantly one-way street grid with long blocks of multi-lane arterial streets designed to carry traffic from Downtown to the city’s major regional freeway access points. With at least 48,000 housing units and 122,000 more jobs expected in this area, San Francisco has developed plans to aggressively reduce number of general purpose travel lanes on many streets to improve livability and better balance travel options amongst modes. This paper presents analysis and findings of an effort to use quantitative analysis to identify the cumulative transportation performance effects of these proposed changes. The paper presents a combination of activity-based travel demand model, traffic microsimulation, and off-model analysis to describe one of the key problems identified – that plans for the Core could lead to a “carmaggedon” scenario (i.e. perpetual gridlock) where the forecast level of auto demand “breaks” the Core network—a particular problem because of the negative impact perpetual gridlock would have for transit operating at-grade. A range of strategies to reduce auto demand are evaluated for their effectiveness, finding that demand management and mobility improvement strategies are essential. The paper closes with two key discussion areas: 1) opportunities and challenges to making transit, walking, and cycling function effectively in extremely congested conditions; 2) a need for the city evolve from the typical forecasting/analysis approaches to long-range transportation planning to solve tomorrow’s transport challenges.
INTRODUCTION

To see an example of how traffic congestion impacts other modes of transportation today, you only need to stand for a moment on a street in Downtown, San Francisco during rush hour. You will likely see private autos illegally trespassing in unprotected bus lanes. You will see 50+ passengers on a bus waiting for a single motorist to make a right turn through a pedestrian-filled intersection. You will see frustrated motorists block intersections because they have already waited too long to cross. You will see cyclists risking their lives navigating the slim and unpredictable gaps between vehicles. This problem—of congestion, and its negative travel time, reliability, and safety impacts to all modes of transportation—has been of particular interest to San Francisco given plans underway to rapidly intensify land uses while reducing the number of general purpose travel lanes on many streets to increase livability. Given this context, the City has struggled with questions such as: how much can auto congestion’s impacts on other modes be mitigated by simple low-cost solutions or are major capital investments needed? Can we, and/or should we strive to mitigate congestion? What level of intervention is needed to maintain a safe, habitable urban environment while providing sufficient mobility to maintain the City’s economic competitiveness? This paper explores these challenging questions and analyzes potential solutions.

BACKGROUND

San Francisco is a city recognized for its leadership in planning for transit-oriented growth. The City’s Charter even has a Transit First policy that states that, "decisions regarding the use of limited public street and sidewalk space shall encourage the use of public rights of way by pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit."(1) The City’s currently adopted or underway land use plans call for a significant increase of 48,000 housing units and 122,000 jobs within the city’s Core (2). The city has made planning for this growth a policy priority. In addition, the Bay Area region (population of approximately 7 million) looks to San Francisco, as well as the other core cities of the region (Oakland and San Jose) as the most important locations to focus most growth due to the existing infrastructure and density within these locations. In fact, in the recently adopted Plan Bay Area long-range land use and transportation plan, San Francisco is expected to take on approximately 92,000 housing units and 190,000 jobs to help achieve the region’s greenhouse gas reduction goals (3). Citywide, this expected growth represents approximately a 25% increase in housing and a 34% increase in jobs, relative to today’s levels citywide.

Within this context, San Francisco has placed emphasis on planning for growth within the “Core” of the city, generally those areas adjacent to the Downtown/Civic Center job centers. Combined, approximately 60% of growth in housing units and 85% growth in jobs has been planned to be accommodated in the Core, with a lot of it focused in the neighborhoods directly south of Downtown: the South of Market (SoMa) and Mission Bay neighborhoods (4). SoMa is known for its multi-lane one-way arterial streets that provide access between Downtown and the regional freeway network. As a result of the needs of existing SoMa residents, as well as in response to growth planned, there have been significant efforts to develop and implement plans to increase the neighborhood’s livability by re-purposing right-of-way of general purpose lanes to provide safer, more attractive non-motorized facilities and faster, more reliable transit. Mission Bay, just south of SoMa is a redevelopment area with a research and heath-care oriented master plan in the process of building out, and separated from SoMa by a channel to the Bay, with only two streets connecting north-south to SoMa (see Figure 1).

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) undertook a focused study of the Core to inform the 2013 update to the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP), San Francisco’s long-range, countywide transportation plan that prioritizes transportation investments and recommends policies to support the city’s transportation goals. The purpose of this analysis, known as the Core Network Circulation Study (Study) was to analyze the cumulative impact of growth and

FIGURE 1 Core Study Area
changes to the transportation network; identify transportation performance problems; and propose recommendations.

The analysis revealed three key problems: 1) the forecast increase in auto trip-making caused by the intensifying land use would result in more auto demand than could be served, in particular given concurrent projects to promote livability through reducing private vehicle capacity—in other words, if the demand for vehicle travel forecast were realized, a perpetual gridlock or “carmageddon” scenario was expected given current plans; 2) even if auto demand was to be substantially reduced, significant transit performance challenges remained; and 3) the overall increase in trips of all modes would exacerbate multi-modal conflicts endangering the safety of pedestrian and cyclists. The purpose of this paper is to describe the methodology, findings, policy implications, limitations, and conclusions related to the first problem (the problem of “carmageddon”).

METHODOLOGY/ANALYSIS APPROACH

The Study’s approach to identifying problems relied on an evaluation framework that included metrics related to performance of each mode of transportation, including transit, walking, cycling, and private vehicle travel. The analysis proceeded in three phases: first, a baseline travel market analysis was conducted to understand who is traveling in the Core, in particular which high auto trip markets affected the Core; next, transportation performance was assessed and problems identified, including the problem that is the focus of this paper, forecast perpetual gridlock congestion during peak hours; finally, effectiveness of strategies to respond to problem areas were identified and evaluated.

Two main scenarios were considered to inform the analysis: a “Base” year, representing current conditions, and a “Planned Future” horizon, that included all land use and transportation network changes planned for in the 2035-2040 timeframe. The study team chose the PM peak hour as representative of a typical daily “worst case” scenario.

A variety of analysis tools were used including:

- The Authority’s activity-based travel demand model, the San Francisco Chained Activity Modeling Process (SF-CHAMP) (5). SF-CHAMP incorporates a state-of-the-art approach to forecasting travel demand, sensitive to a broad array of conditions that influence travelers’ choices. It incorporates the most recent 2010 Census household travel data, along with calibration to observed data including traffic volumes and transit ridership.
- Micro-simulation traffic analysis software, SimTraffic, which was used to determine how the level of auto trip-making demand forecast in SF-CHAMP would affect on-the-ground performance during PM peak hour conditions. As compared to SF-CHAMP, SimTraffic better accounts for delays under congested conditions and represents more detailed network characteristics such as traffic signal phasing, coordination, turn lanes, and the effects of queuing between intersections.
- Off-model techniques customized to understand the effectiveness of strategies that are not currently represented in SF-CHAMP or SimTraffic. These methodologies are summarized in the following section alongside descriptions of the strategies considered. More detailed documentation is available as a technical appendix (6).

FINDINGS

This section presents findings from each of the three phases of the analysis: travel markets, transportation performance problems, and effectiveness of strategies.

1. Travel Markets

The Travel Market analysis investigates the purpose and characteristics of travel in the Core during PM peak hours including: travel mode, common origins and destinations, and breakdown between trips passing through versus originating or destined to the Core. This was a focus, as understanding the major and changing travel markets would inform which strategies would most effectively respond to problems identified.

Figure 2 summarizes overall trip-making levels in Downtown and SoMa/Mission Bay today and in the Planned Future using SF-CHAMP model output for each scenario. SoMa/Mission Bay is responsible for most of the growth in trip-making—about twice as many in the

FIGURE 2 Trips to/from/within Downtown and SoMa/Mission Bay: Base vs. Planned Future, pm peak
Source: SF-CHAMP 4.3, Focused Growth
Planned Future than today. However, Downtown still attracts the most total trips. As shown in Figure 3, nearly all the new auto trips to or from the Core in the future are generated by SoMa/Mission Bay.

Figures 2 and 3 show travel occurring to, from, or within the Core, but many other trips pass through the Core without starting or ending there. Figure 4 includes this larger universe of trips and breaks down trips between those that start or end somewhere else within San Francisco (i.e. local), versus those that are regional and have their other end in another Bay Area county. Viewing trip ends and through trips together indicates that over half of the vehicles traveling on the SoMa street network are not going to a destination in SoMa; and, of the trips which pass through, half are local to San Francisco and half have regional destinations. Figure 4 also shows that the share of trips destined to or from this part of the City is increasing, while the share of trips passing through this area is decreasing, potentially indicating that as this part of the city densifies, the local streets are used by more core-related traffic, crowding out vehicles destined to other parts of the City.

The Study team executed additional analysis focused on short auto trips, due to their greater potential to shift to walk and bicycle trips. Figure 5 shows “sub-areas” that were the focus of the analysis, as well as the number of short auto trips under 2 miles and under 0.5 miles in the Planned Future and the change relative to today.

In the aggregate, PM peak auto trips less than two miles more than double (233% increase) from today to
the Planned Future. The auto mode share of trips less than two miles actually decreases (20% to 17%), yet the share of auto traffic in SoMa/Mission Bay that is completing a trip less than two miles increases (18% to 20%). In the context of an overall increase in trip-making, this means a lower percentage of people are choosing to drive for short trips, yet, more vehicles on the network are completing short trips due to changes in land use and density. Many of these short auto trips are likely a result of trip-chaining, which the Study team considered as it developed the strategy response (described in Part 3 of this section). The implication is that transportation demand management (TDM) strategies should be pursued to discourage people from arriving via automobile in the first place, allowing these short auto trips to more easily be shifted to walking and bicycling trips. By encouraging transit, shuttle use, ridesharing, parking policy, and other TDM measures people will be less likely to drive to these districts in the first place, and thus decreasing the possibility of short auto trips. Shifting to walking and cycling is a particular opportunity not only for short vehicle trips but also for short transit trips, which would free up room on overcrowded buses and trains for longer transit commutes.

2. Transportation Performance: Congestion Reduction to Avoid Gridlock

The study team analyzed the auto and transit performance impacts of the forecast increase in net auto travel in the Planned Future. The Study team prepared a SimTraffic microsimulation analysis, assuming the transportation network proposals (i.e. reduction in general purpose travel lanes) were in place, for a subset of SoMa that experiences some of the greatest levels of congestion today. The purpose of this analysis was to determine how much auto demand reduction would be necessary to prevent vehicle queues from spilling into upstream intersections and maintain a saturated, but flowing network. Results determined that an approximate 26% reduction of auto volumes during the PM peak period relative to Planned Future SF-CHAMP forecasted levels of demand was needed to reach an operational point at which traffic could flow (see Figure 6). In other words, the Core San Francisco road network can only accommodate about half of the forecasted auto demand increase before creating a perpetual gridlock condition.

3. Congestion Reduction Strategy Effectiveness

The final aspect of the analysis was to assess the effectiveness of a range of strategies in contributing to achieving the 26% reduction in PM peak VMT needed. Informed by the trip analysis findings, a set of potential strategies were identified for analysis.

Generally, strategies were identified in line with those that responded to a larger needs analysis conducted for the SFTP. In particular, there was a focus on newer and innovative demand management strategies that have
recently come into practice or are under consideration in San Francisco.

Figure 7 summarizes the range of potential impacts of selected strategies to further reduce core VMT from the Planned Future (each strategy listed could individually provide the level of reduction—e.g. congestion pricing and slow growth could each provide a 10-15% reduction in PM peak SoMa VMT). Results found that no single strategy alone could achieve the level of reduction needed, and even all strategies combined may not be able to. The rest of this section contains definitions of each strategy represented as well as the methodological approach to quantify the benefit. It should be noted that the impacts of these strategies are not additive: each strategy is evaluated assuming that no other strategies are implemented. Overlap is likely although in some cases synergies between strategies are also possible.

10% - 15% VMT Reduction

**Congestion Pricing:** The reduction estimate for congestion pricing is based on travel forecasts conducted as a part of the Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study that explored the feasibility of implementing congestion pricing in Downtown San Francisco (7). The 10-15% reduction represents the AM/PM Northeast Cordon scenario, where motorists would be charged a $3 per crossing fee for crossing into or out of the area bounded by Laguna Street, Guerrero Street, 18th Street, and the waterfront during peak periods with net revenue reinvested in multi-modal mobility improvement. Such a policy is still under consideration for San Francisco, and has recently come back into policy and media attention in context of major growth planned in the Core and the resurgence of San Francisco’s economy after the recession.

**Slow Growth Scenario Test:** This scenario test was intended to be a point-of-information were San Francisco’s growth to happen at a slower pace, akin to the level of growth forecast for 2020. Under this slower growth scenario, PM peak VMT would need to be reduced by 11%. Of course, growth would continue towards 2040 projections and further reduction strategies would ultimately be needed to avoid perpetual gridlock.

3% - 5% VMT Reduction

**Central Corridor Residential Parking Supply Restrictions:** This strategy describes results of a model scenario in SF-CHAMP representing the effect of a set of policies that would aggressively limit the growth of parking supply in a part of SoMa known as the Central Corridor (bounded by 2nd, 6th, Mission, and Townsend Streets). The Central Corridor is currently undergoing a planning process to upzone the area as it is adjacent to the route of a major transportation investment (the Central Subway that will connect Southeast San Francisco, SoMa, Union Square, and Chinatown). This policy scenario was specified for the Central Corridor area because the opportunity to regulate parking more aggressively (relative to previous area plans) may be an option, since this area is in the process of being re-zoned.

**Carsharing Expansion:** This strategy estimates the impacts of an aggressive expansion of carsharing consistent with analysis done by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) as a part of Plan Bay Area (8). Such an expansion would be achieved by policies that increase set-aside for off-street parking for car-sharing (current San Francisco policy is one car-share space for every 50 housing units in new developments (9)) or expansion of on-street carshare parking spaces as is currently in its nascency (10). Additionally, MTC proposes subsidizing new start-up carshare offices throughout the region. This assumes that 15% of the “eligible population” (defined as adults 20-64) will be become carsharing members by 2040.

1% - 3% VMT Reduction

**Dynamic Ridesharing:** Dynamic ridesharing explores the potential of heavily investing in outreach and technology to match current single occupant vehicle (SOV) trip-makers to share rides with those having similar trip origins and destinations. In the Planned Future, 59,000 PM peak VMT (60%) are from SOVs. The analysis assumes the market for dynamic ridesharing to be 5% of those who currently drive alone, based on survey results of City and County of San Francisco employees (11) and the market research potential of dynamic ridesharing from UC Berkeley (12) and MIT (13).

**Shuttles:** Employer-provided shuttles have emerged as a major new sector within San Francisco’s transportation system recently, in particular for workers in certain employment sectors such as technology. According to a survey conducted for San Francisco’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Partnership Project, regional shuttles represent at least 6,600 daily boardings, while intra-city shuttles account for at least 28,700 boardings (14). The analysis assumes the market is projected to grow by approximately 40% for regional providers and 39% for intra-
city providers based on forecast increase in employment in these categories. Using TDM Partnership Project survey results as to what mode would serve the trip if the shuttle was not an option, a Planned Future PM peak VMT reduction was calculated based on the share of shuttles that serve SoMa (27%). This strategy is intended to represent partnering with employers to enable the shuttle system to grow as it has been trending without interfering with public transportation, such as through the city’s recent efforts to regulate use of bus stops for shuttles (15).

0.5% - 1% VMT Reduction

Vanpool: The Vanpool strategy applies the MTC Plan Bay Area (16) methodology of a strategy that would provide a $400/month/van subsidy to encourage ridesharing growth in the region. In SoMa, this translates to 1,800 new vanpool riders and 700 fewer vehicles in SoMa.

< 0.5% VMT Reduction

Bicycle and Pedestrian Program: This strategy represents major investments to the city’s bike and pedestrian networks including building more than 100 miles of upgraded protected bike lanes or cycletracks, and improving pedestrian conditions through safer, redesigned streets and shorter crossing distances. Savings from the Bicycle and Pedestrian program were calculated using SF-CHAMP, which has recently been upgraded to better represent pedestrian (17) and cycling (18) trip-making behavior. The savings were calculated by comparing the Planned Future to a model scenario that represents upgraded cycletrack-level bike lanes city-wide, as well as representing improved pedestrian conditions through increasing the pedestrian environment factor and reducing facility type to represent slower streets. The resulting change in evening peak VMT in the core as a result of this strategy is forecast to be modest, which was initially surprising to some of the team members. Additional discussion to interpret this result included determining that many new bicycle riders and pedestrians in the modeling exercise were former transit riders, or those drivers who shifted to non-motorized modes, then freed up space for additional drivers, increasing the overall number of trips and biking and walking trips, rather than reducing SoMa VMT. Another point of information that was used to consider the potential effectiveness of this strategy was the short-trips analysis described in Part 1 of this section that found that in whole, removing all auto trips under a half-mile in SoMa/Mission Bay represents 7% of this desired reduction while trips under two miles (including under half-mile) represent 34%.

Safe Routes to School: This strategy models the effect of continuing and expanding the city’s Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program. The San Francisco United School District (SFUSD) launched SR2S to increase the attractiveness and safety of walking or cycling to school beginning in the 2009-2010 school year with three schools and currently has 15 schools participating. Based on empirical evidence from the program and experience from SR2S programs in Marin and Alameda counties, an average family vehicle trip reduction of 14% is assumed to result from the program. Applying this to the 15 schools currently enrolled in the program results in 900 fewer daily vehicle trips in San Francisco. When extrapolated to all SFUSD schools plus private schools, 10,000 fewer daily vehicle trips are projected. The 2012-2013 program currently includes one school in SoMa. Therefore, the SoMa share of the current program translates to 100 fewer 2040 PM peak VMT. Accounting for expansion of the program plus private schools results in an additional 160 VMT decrease, or a total of less than 0.5% VMT decrease.

Bikeshare: This strategy represents the benefits from both a pilot program (500 bikes) that launched in San Francisco in August 2013 as well as a Phase 2 (2,750 bikes) that would launch at a later date (after this analysis was completed, the pilot program has sense been reduced to 350 bikes in San Francisco). The pilot project would have placed 360 bikes in SoMa while Phase 2 would place 538 bikes in SoMa. Using a methodology based on trips generated per bike observed in four cities (19) and modal diversions of those trips observed in six cities (20), ~40 VMT in the 2040 PM peak are expected to be saved as a result of the pilot and ~60 VMT are expected to be saved from Phase 2. This translates to <0.5% VMT reduction from bikeshare alone. However, one would expect bikeshare to be an integral part of an overall coordinated TDM strategy in SoMa and its value may extend far beyond its independent VMT reduction contribution.

Transit: Several transit-related strategies considered showed no notable change in VMT on SoMa streets. Two scenarios were analyzed using the SF-CHAMP model: 1) a second underground rail tube under the San Francisco Bay for the regional heavy-rail system BART that would run from the East Bay, through SoMa under Mission Street and continue under the Geary corridor to the Richmond; 2) a “capacity unconstrained” scenario, where there would be enough room on local San Francisco buses to accommodate everyone who desired to ride transit (SF-CHAMP was recently upgraded to represent transit crowding (21), and essentially this “knob” was turned off in this scenario).
In both scenarios, change in PM peak period VMT on SoMa streets was flat. This is not to say that improved transit is not imperative to the functioning of the Core, but rather than on its own, will not result in a notable reduction in SoMa VMT. This finding highlights likely latent demand for driving in this part of the city. Road space given up by those who shift to improved transit service will be replaced by new drivers “filling in” newly available capacity.

**Potentially Effective Strategies Not Analyzed**

“Fix the Grid”: This strategy represents an idea to “fix the grid” by reconnecting streets that do not currently connect well. SoMa/Mission Bay is ground zero for several street grids that interface in awkward ways where they meet including between Downtown and SoMa, between Downtown and Market/Octavia, between SoMa and Mission Bay, and between Mission Bay and Potrero Hill/the Mission District. Several opportunities to make these upgrades have been identified. Although analysis was not undertaken, the team expects such a strategy could contribute modest positive benefits towards SoMa congestion reduction by removing bottlenecks in the network.

**Auto Trip Cap:** Recently, San Francisco planners have discussed the idea of a private vehicle “trip cap” as a potential next-generation TDM strategy. The idea of such a strategy would be to set an allowance for a maximum number of auto trips that allow the network to continue to function, while charging a fee to trip generators who exceed their trip allowance, similar to a cap-and-trade scheme. While this strategy was not analyzed and would require more detailed specification, it may represent a similar magnitude of potential trip shifts as parking supply restrictions or congestion pricing strategies.

**Convert Freeway Lanes and Ramps from General Purpose to Transit/Carpool** Because SoMa is home to a series of on- and off-ramps to three major highways of I-80, US 101, and I-280, traffic associated with motorists trying to access those ramps is a notable contributor to PM peak congestion on SoMa streets as shown in Figure 4. A strategy that would close or re-purpose some ramps or travel lanes for use only by transit- or carpool-only may both increase the competitiveness of non-SOV modes, and improve the throughput of those facilities that may be degraded by closely spaced interchanges (0.5-0.7 miles apart through SoMa). Several potential options to operationalize this strategy were developed, but the team did not believe the VMT reduction benefits could appropriately be analyzed within the resources and analysis tools available for the current Study (future work is expected to analyze this strategy in a broader planning context).

**DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The team struggled with how to interpret the result that the level of reduction in demand for auto travel would be challenging to achieve, concluding that in areas of above a certain threshold of high land use intensity, demand for auto travel at levels higher than available supply will always be present and can only be managed through strong demand management strategies that increase price or restrict vehicle access. In order to maintain mobility and economic vitality concurrently, demand management strategies must be paired with improvements in safety, capacity, and performance of other modes of transportation. Given that reality, there are two challenges and policy implications to discuss: 1) what the city can do to ensure effectiveness of other modes in a congested future; 2) how to evolve from typical forecasting/analysis approaches to long-range transportation planning while still having a rational basis for proposing transportation interventions.

**Increasing the effectiveness of non-auto modes of transport in a congested future.**

In the San Francisco policy context of a city that has made Transit First an official policy, pure auto congestion is not considered a problem in and of itself if it does not interfere with the ability to accommodate mobility for other modes of transportation, as well as if it allows for the city to maintain its economic competitiveness. But, on-the-ground conditions today are such that during peak commute periods auto congestion does interfere with other modes. While some of this interference can be addressed by strategies not yet in place such as greater protection for transit and cycling facilities, the team concluded that in a destination like the Core, that is highly attractive due to the concentration of residential, employment, and visitor uses, increasing intensification would require a transition to more active management of transportation conditions such as deploying resources in real-time based on on-the ground conditions and active enforcement of “don’t block the box” (i.e., enforcement/ticketing of cars that remain in an intersection on a red light). Such an approach is already utilized effectively in special cases such as during major sports or cultural events. For example, a recent confluence of major events resulted in one million people converging on San Francisco (the so-called “event-mageddon” of America’s Cup/Fleet Week, the Castro Street Fair, the Italian Heritage Parade, Giants and 49ers games, the Hardly Strictly Bluegrass Festival and the Double Ten Parade) on the weekend of October 6, 2012 (22).
However, the team also posited maintaining transit speed and reliability would be increasingly challenging
to do so at-grade as congestion and overall trip-making grows. While upgrading streets to provide protected transit
facilities is important, challenges such as the need to accommodate access to curb space for goods movement
loading and disabled persons and the need to allow private vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists to cross transit lanes, all
create negative speed and reliability impacts. As a result, transit may only be truly effective as grade-separated after
a certain intensity of trip-making. San Francisco already has underground transit including the regional BART heavy
rail system and portions of the Muni Metro system that serves some parts of the city. In addition, the newly planned
Central Subway under SoMa, Union Square, and Chinatown, and eventually the planned extension of the Caltrain
regional commuter system to Downtown as a part of the California High-Speed Rail project will also contribute to
addressing this need. Yet, other parts of San Francisco do not currently have fast or reliable access to any below
grade opportunity and some below grade facilities are not providing the level of speed or reliability needed to attract
or maintain riders. Of course, this problem is particularly challenging to address given the lack of funding for major
capital investments relative to past decades. How to respond to these needs are one focus of the SFTP.

Evolving from typical forecasting/analysis approaches to long-range transportation planning

Historical and to some extent state of the practice approaches to travel forecasting and transportation
project evaluation have led to problem-solution framing where an input of more people and more jobs indicate an
output of demand for auto trip-making that can only be solved by adding roadway capacity. San Francisco has for
some time used a more nuanced approach guided by the city’s Transit First policy and prioritized improvements to
transit, walking, cycling, and reduction in auto lanes. San Francisco’s travel demand model, SF-CHAMP, has been
created and upgraded to be sensitive to a broader array of multi-modal interventions. But, the finding about the
excess of vehicle demand relative to supply indicates a condition that is not physically possible. While there is
widespread recognition that the “solutions” of past--increasing vehicle capacity—are wrong, the now well-
recognized candidate solutions related to demand management and multi-modal improvements, are not found to do
enough to address the problem when applying empirical evidence about their effectiveness from other cities to San
Francisco conditions (of course more stringent representation of strategies could be quantifiably demonstrated to be
more effective such as a much higher congestion toll or extreme restriction of parking supply, but were not elected
to be studied here).

As the team concluded this particular effort, there was a recognition that the analytic work needed to plan
to meet transportation needs in San Francisco’s core must evolve to utilize different problem-solution framings.
Recent ideas about how else to frame long range planning analysis are to focus on quantifying the expected increase
in trip-making from new growth, then planning to accommodate those trips based on policy-driven modal split, and
planning for the characteristics (performance, safety, capacity) of transit, cycling, and walking networks that are
known to be important factors in travel behavior decision-making in favor of those modes. Approaches such as these
are sure to be tested in emerging transport planning work in San Francisco.

LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations to the paper’s technical analysis (all of which support the second discussion
point regarding evolving from typical forecasting/analysis approaches):

- The paper suggests a particular level of auto traffic reduction needed to avoid perpetual gridlock. This
  level is based on a methodology of inputting auto traffic demand forecast by a travel demand model into
  microsimulation software. What is implied by the microsimulation finding is that the travel demand
  model is forecasting more demand than can be accommodated. Ultimately, the 26% VMT reduction
  should be interpreted to reflect that there would be that much demand for peak hour auto travel even in
  congested conditions, but in reality some of those trips would change their time of day, route, mode, or
  not make the trip at all. Given that SF-CHAMP also represents transit crowding, the level of transit
  demand would likely also not be able to be accommodated with the existing transit supply.

- The strategies specified could have been specified to be a stronger representation: for example, a
  congestion pricing policy with a higher priced toll would be expected to increase the VMT reduction of
  that strategy; similarly a higher number of bikes in a bikeshare program could also be more effective.
  However, the study aimed to represent strategies based on the current or proposed definitions.

- The strategies do not take into account unprecedented cultural shifts. For example, younger generations
  are not driving as much as past generations, and bicycling has become rapidly more popular. These
  trends may indicate a greater impact of some strategies than what is quantified here.

- The relative effectiveness of strategies analyzed via the model versus via off-model may not be
  perfectly comparable and may overestimate the benefit of off-model strategies. Modeled strategies
show the induced demand of new vehicle trips “filling in” freed up capacity, while off-model strategies do not.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper finds that in areas of high land use intensity, demand for auto travel at levels higher than available supply will always be present and can only be managed through strong demand management strategies that increase price or restrict vehicle access. In order to maintain mobility, such strategies must be paired with improvements in safety, capacity, and performance of other modes of transportation. In the near-term, San Francisco can reduce traffic congestion’s impacts on other modes of transport through more regular active management of the transport network and continuing to re-purpose auto lanes for walking, cycling, and transit space. In the longer term, the city will continue to strategically consider additional below-grade/subway additions and upgrades to the local and regional transit network. Finally, future long-range transport analysis should explore new analytical frameworks for long-range transport planning that may be more apt to solve tomorrow’s transport challenges.
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