Long Range Development Plan (LRDP): Proposed Physical Plan for Parnassus Heights

UCSF Community Advisory Group
January 15, 2013
Agenda

1. Feedback from Community Workshop #1
2. LRDP Building Recommendations and Effects on Space Ceiling, Population and Traffic
3. Parnassus Avenue Streetscape and Transportation Plan
4. LRDP Parking and Loading Recommendations
5. Shuttle Operations
FEEDBACK FROM PARNASSUS
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1
Community Workshop Major Themes

- Support reusing UC Hall. Housing seen as good use.
- Address traffic, loading and other impacts that have resulted from UCSF’s growth in space and population—a quality of life issue.
- Continue to move toward space ceiling compliance.
- Promote shuttle system to increase ridership and reduce auto trips. Work to optimize operations and minimize impacts on neighbors.
- Support Moffitt Hospital replacement. Design new hospital with respect for Parnassus Avenue.
- Support UCSF’s research, clinical and teaching activities.

(Detailed feedback contained in full meeting summary)
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS
Chancellor’s Executive Cabinet Direction on UC Hall

RECOMMENDATION

• Renovate UC Hall with 3 floors of housing, 2 floors of offices and 1 floor of education space by 2018-2019
• Convert 2 floors of office to housing at a later date
• If office and educational space demand fails to materialize in the next few years while Clinical Sciences Building is being renovated, consider renovating UC Hall with all housing

RENOVATE BECAUSE

• UC Hall could help meet office demand (through 2030), education space and/or housing need
• Preserves historic building
• If renovated for housing (which does not count against space ceiling), Moffitt Hospital replacement can be constructed and still reduce space ceiling overage to approximately 5%
LRDP Proposals at Parnassus

- Moffitt Hospital Replacement to meet SB 1953
- Demolition of small buildings
- Reprogram and reuse of existing buildings
- Reduced space ceiling overage
- Additional housing
- Improvements to transit, pedestrian and bicycle experience and service
- Coordinated traffic, parking and loading strategy
- Phased improvements to public spaces and connections
- Quality of life improvements
Key Elements

• Demolition of LPPI to allow for Moffitt Replacement Hospital

• Demolition of Radiobiology, MRIV, EH&S, Surge, Woods, Proctor, 374/735 Parnassus Avenue, and Koret

• Conversion to housing through reuse and new construction

• Critical testing for feasibility and phasing

• Improved circulation and access – including reduction of clinic traffic at 5th & Kirkham due to relocations of ophthalmology & UC Hall uses

• LRDP actions to reflect community feedback
Space Ceiling Overage through LRDP Horizon – Current UC Hall Proposal
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## Average Daily Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,200-8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,500-18,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Average Daily Population calculation methodology does not include residential population.
2. Projected range of faculty and staff in 2035 depends on assumptions for LPPI, Ophthalmology and Proctor.

While the space ceiling overage would decrease from 8.2% to 5% by 2035, average daily population would increase from 17,900 persons to 18,900 persons (up to a 5% increase)
The range in projected campus growth would increase peak hour vehicle trips 3 - 7% by 2035.
The City forecasts that traffic levels will increase approximately 5-10% from 2012 to 2035 regardless of UCSF’s anticipated growth in population
PARNASSUS AVENUE STREETSCAPE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN
Parnassus Avenue Streetscape Plan

Background

- **2007 Parnassus Avenue Campus Core Concept**
  1. Create an attractive outdoor setting at the “crossroads” of the campus for different types of activities
  2. Establish a special zone in the street to improve pedestrian safety
  3. Community support but concerns about neighboring streets

- Concept carried forward into *Parnassus Heights Preliminary Design Goals and Guidelines*

- Initial consultation with City but changes not implemented – higher priorities and lack of funding

- City’s 2011 *Better Streets Plan* provides new guidance for streetscape improvements

- Concept being refined and considered for funding

- Would likely be implemented in phases if funding is approved
Create a Framework for the Parnassus Avenue Streetscape Plan:

1. Proud Signature
2. Welcomes Community
3. Improves all Modes
4. Seeks Clarity, Comfort and Safety
5. Can be Phased
6. Efficient and Cost Effective
7. Beautiful
City of San Francisco Better Streets Plan Goals

- Create a Distinctive and Unified Streetscape
- Enhance Space for Public Life
- Improve Street Ecology
- Improve Pedestrian Safety
- Accommodate Universal Design
- Integrate Pedestrians with Transit
- Accommodate Bicycle Transportation
- Creatively Use Parking Lanes as Useable Outdoor Space and Amenities
- Renovate Existing Planting Areas and Tree Canopy
PROPOSED TYPICAL SECTION

- Amenity Zone
- Pedestrian Zone
- Parking Zone
- Shared Auto/Bike Lane - Westbound
- Shared Auto/Bike Lane - Eastbound
- Parking Zone
- Pedestrian Zone
- Amenity Zone

Curb / Planting Zone / Stormwater Management

Curb / Planting Zone / Stormwater Management
PROPOSED CORE CROSSWALKS

Campus Core Crossings
Proposed Sidewalk Widening
EXISTING TREES: SITE PHOTOS

POOR QUALITY

DAMAGE

HAZARDOUS

OVER GROWN
Methods
- Community Focus Group and Parnassus Design Guidelines Committee (2005)
- Professional Tree Inventory and Survey
- Tree by Tree Assessment by UCSF Campus Planning Staff
- Informed by San Francisco Better Streets Plan
- Visual Assessment and Recommendations by Licensed Landscape Architect
Parnassus LRDP Vanpool, Contractor Parking, and Loading Goals

• Reduce congestion and loading on Parnassus Avenue and provide for streetscape improvements

• Redistribute some loading from Parnassus Avenue to off-street areas around the campus while minimizing the potential impact on neighbors, particularly those on 5th Avenue

• Accommodate future loading demand off-street

• Offset the loss of parking spaces from when the Kirkham child care center was developed while preserving space for the center’s outdoor play yard, which is currently undersized

• Provide lower turnover spaces along Koret Way (i.e., vanpool and contractor) to reduce in/out traffic throughout the day
Existing Vanpool, Contractor Parking, & Loading

Note: Excludes contractor parking at Kesar Lot.
### Parking/Loading Recommendations – 2015-2020
(CSB/UCH Renovations; Parnassus Ave Phase 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 - 2020</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10-20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15-30 contractor, 5-10 general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A portion of the MRIV Footprint may be reserved for expansion of the Child Care outdoor play area.

---

[Image of map with markers for Vanpool, Contractor, Parcel, Loading Dock, General]
Parking/Loading Recommendations – 2020-2025
(Phase 2 Parnassus Streetscape Improvements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020-2025</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10-20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15-30 contractor, 5-10 general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A**: Vanpool
- **B**: Contractor
- **C**: Parcel
- **D**: Loading Dock
- **E**: General

[Map of Parnassus Avenue with various parking and loading zones marked]
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Parking/Loading Recommendations – 2025-2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10-20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15-30 contractor, 5-10 general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus Boundary

Legend:
- Vanpool
- Contractor
- Parcel
- Loading Dock
- General
Parking/Loading Recommendations – post-2030
(Moffitt Replacement, Koret Demolition, Parnassus Ave Phase 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10-20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Up to 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15-30 contractor, 5-10 general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Up to 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus Boundary
Parking/Loading Recommendations – post-2030 (overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck/Parcel</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net New Spaces** +13-87

Note 1: Excludes contractor parking at Kezar Lot.

Note 2: A portion of the MRIV Footprint may be reserved for expansion of the Child Care outdoor play area.
5th Avenue Traffic Effects

Through 2030

• +2-4% Increase in Daily Volume
  – Daily: ~+60-120 trips including ~15-40 Truck Trips
  – PM Peak Hour: ~+10-20 trips including ~0-4 Truck Trips

Post 2030

• 30 Vanpool or Contractor Spaces Relocated to Koret
• Vision Clinics Relocated
5th/Kirkham Planned Improvements

- Planted Median: Low Plantings and Tree
- Existing Low Pressure Fire Hydrant
- 5th Avenue
- Kirkham Street
- Stop Signs
- Dimensions: 36' x 6'
SHUTTLE OPERATIONS
COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS
Community Survey Results

- Most respondents (57%) have no current or past affiliation with the University
- Most (71%) want the University to prioritize higher levels of shuttle service as opposed to lower levels (29%)
- Most (82%) prefer smaller shuttle vehicles
- Responses were split among prioritizing commercial streets for shuttle use (54%), or distributing service more evenly (46%)
- Most (64%) indicated they would like UCSF to maintain current levels of shuttle service throughout the day, though some (36%) would like to see reduced off-peak frequencies
Community Survey Results

Additional Comments:

- Need for safer shuttle driving habits (speeds, adherence to traffic laws, etc.)
- Dislike noise associated with shuttles, particularly on hills
- Shuttles should be on commercial streets only
- Hybrid vehicles/quieter shuttles desirable
- Some routes near capacity at peak times, have excess capacity during off-peak – seek opportunity to reduce frequency/shuttle size during off-peak
- Coordination with SFMTA to improve transit routes
- Shuttles lessen University’s impact on neighborhood parking
DRIVER SURVEY RESULTS
Driver Survey Results

- The highest portion of respondents (48%) have worked for UCSF for 5-9 years
- Most (53%) drive 22 passenger vehicles as opposed to 30 (24%) and 33 (24%) passenger vehicles
- 11% of respondents think vehicle size is not adequate for the line they drive
  - 2 lines – vehicles too small
  - 2 lines – vehicles too large
- Most (60%) believe smaller shuttles/increased frequencies would address neighborhood concerns, while 20% believe larger shuttles would be best. Others suggested quieter vehicles.
Driver Survey Results

Additional Comments:

- Desire for route flexibility at driver’s discretion
- Preference for wider streets
- Desire for additional time to complete routes, particularly during rush hour
- Increase frequency of shuttles during peak times
- Adverse effects of congestion
- Squeaky brakes reported
- Need for better schedule information for riders and vehicle signage
RIDERSHIP ANALYSIS
Ridership Analysis

Current shuttle service eliminates:

- 2,706 daily car trips citywide
- 687 daily car trips to Parnassus Heights Campus
- Parking demand citywide
Ridership Analysis

Potential need for increased peak service?

Potential for reduced service?
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS: 
CHANGES TO CURRENT OPERATIONS
Preliminary Recommendations

ISSUE

Low evening shuttle occupancies on 3 lines accessing Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Move evening (after 6PM) runs to 7th Avenue to address resident concerns
- Appropriate reduction in frequency impractical due to operational specifics (number of shuttles in service)
Preliminary Recommendations

ISSUE

Parnassus-Mission Bay line could benefit from more AM peak service and less midday service

RECOMMENDATIONS

– Introduce additional AM peak 22-passenger vehicle
– Utilize backup 22-passenger vehicles during non-peak times (11 AM – 3 PM)
– Continue to use 33-passenger vehicles during all other times
Preliminary Recommendations

ISSUE

Parnassus-Mission Center line under-capacity at all times of day

RECOMMENDATION

– Utilize 22-passenger vehicles in lieu of current 30-passenger vehicles

No changes recommended for lines accessing Kezar, the VA, Aldea, and 3360 Geary Medical Center
Preliminary Recommendations

ISSUE
Potential policy change to disallow standees system wide

RECOMMENDATIONS (if implemented)

– Additional AM & PM peak-hour shuttles on 3 lines accessing Mt. Zion and Laurel Heights
– Additional PM peak-hour shuttles on 1 line accessing Mt. Zion & Laurel Heights and Parnassus-Mission Center line
Preliminary Recommendations

• Parnassus Heights Campus Routing:
  – July 2011 re-routing significantly reduced impacts on neighborhood streets around Parnassus campus.
  – Shift evening runs from 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> on 3 lines accessing Mt. Zion & Laurel Heights to 7<sup>th</sup>, reducing evening impacts
    • Resident desires to shift remaining runs off of 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenues and onto 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
    • Roughly 10% average reduction in frequency caused by increased run time
Preliminary Recommendations

Use of Muni

– If the UCSF shuttle system were not available, many current shuttle riders would use Muni
  • 39% report they would use transit to make their trip, while 32% report that they would drive
– Planned transit investments (Geary BRT, Central Subway, 22-Fillmore extension to MB) will improve Muni connectivity between UCSF campuses, but shuttles will still provide the most direct connection.
– New express Muni routes between UCSF campuses may reduce neighborhood impacts, but will not operate as efficiently as the UCSF shuttle system.
  • $90 (UCSF) operating cost per hour vs. $207 (Muni)
  • 83X (Twitter Shuttle) sets poor precedent
Preliminary Recommendations

Connections to Regional Rail

– Main UCSF campuses have existing high quality Muni connections to BART and Caltrain
  • N Judah, 38 Geary, T Third
– Planned improvements will only strengthen these existing connections
  • Geary BRT, Central Subway, 22-Fillmore extension to Mission Bay
– Any potential shuttle or new Muni connection would not be competitive with existing/planned service. For example:
  • N-Judah to BART: 15 minute ride
  • Potential shuttle connection: > 20 minute trip
Alternative Shuttle Technology

- **Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)**
  - Marginally fewer emissions
  - Roughly 1.5x cost of diesel shuttle + expensive new fueling stations
- **Hybrid-Electric**
  - 40% fuel economy improvement;
    30% reduction in emissions
  - Roughly 2x cost of diesel shuttle
- **Battery-Electric**
  - No tailpipe emissions
  - Challenges with battery life and maintenance result in lower ranges
Alternative Shuttle Technology

• Items for consideration
  – Requires commitment to technology ("pilot-projects" typically fail)
  – Maintenance costs very high if multiple technologies exist in fleet
  – Environmental and noise benefits

• Recommendations
  – Continue to maintain current fleet
  – Monitor new shuttle technology as it becomes available
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
2015 OPERATIONS
Preliminary Recommendations – 2015

- 120 new daily shuttle trips over 3 Parnassus shuttle lines
- 2-5% increase in ridership per line
- No additional shuttle capacity needed
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS: 2035 OPERATIONS
Preliminary Recommendations – 2035

• **Increase in ridership accessing Parnassus**
  – ~33% on 4 lines
  – 3-6% on 3 lines

• **Keeping current shuttle service levels**
  – Results in 175 daily trips shifted to automobiles around Parnassus

• **To facilitate no new net growth in car trips**
  – Increased frequency and/or larger vehicles on 5 routes
Preliminary Recommendations – Future Conditions

Clear need for increased peak service and/or shuttle size
Preliminary Recommendations – Future Conditions

• Parnassus-Mission Bay line needs additional AM and PM peak service
  – 3 additional AM vehicles, 2 additional PM vehicles
  – Utilize 33-passenger vehicles during all times

• 2 lines accessing Mt. Zion & Laurel Heights:
  – Switch from 22- to 30-passenger vehicles
  – 1 additional vehicle in peak hours
  – 1 fewer vehicle in off-peak hours

• 1 line accessing Mt. Zion & Laurel Heights:
  – Switch 1 vehicle to 30-passengers in peak hours

• 1 line accessing Mt. Zion & Laurel Heights:
  – Add additional PM vehicle or increase size of vehicle