

1858 **4. ACCESS**

1859 **STRATEGIC STATEMENT**

1860 Access to Downtown Berkeley takes many forms, and its transportation system is the armature for
1861 supporting Downtown's many activities. For its continued success as a thriving and livable place,
1862 Downtown's transportation system must serve Downtown's three principal roles: as a livable district,
1863 a vibrant city center, and as a regional destination for housing, employment, education, community
1864 life, culture and the arts.

1865 Downtown is an urban center that requires interdependent and complementary transportation
1866 management strategies that focus on three central themes.

- 1867 – Emphasize and enhance Downtown as a destination.
- 1868 – Give priority to transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists, while reducing automobile use, especially
1869 by commuters.
- 1870 – Improve connectivity between Downtown and Berkeley neighborhoods, and between
1871 Downtown and the Bay Area.

1872 **PRIORITIZE PEDESTRIANS**

1873 Downtown should be first and foremost oriented for the comfort, enjoyment and safety of pedestrians
1874 of all ages and abilities. A positive experience for pedestrians is the foundation for attaining many
1875 Downtown goals. A pedestrian-oriented environment serves the needs of Downtown residents, who
1876 can meet most daily needs on foot and for whom Downtown's streets are at their front door. Safe,
1877 comfortable, interesting, walkable environments also serve daytime denizens: the employees,
1878 shoppers, visitors, University students, faculty, and staff -- who walk through and into Downtown.

1879 Downtown already has a lot of pedestrians. The segment of Center Street between BART and the
1880 UC campus has the most foot traffic of any street in the East Bay. Seventy percent of Berkeley
1881 residents say that they sometimes walk to shop or run errands (2001 City of Berkeley General Plan).
1882 The 2000 Census shows that about 15 percent of Berkeley residents walk to work, five times the rate
1883 for Alameda County as a whole. The highest walk-to-work rates are found in the census tracts that
1884 include the Downtown Area.

1885 Maintaining and improving Downtown's pedestrian environments is especially critical to Berkeley's
1886 increasingly aging population, for whom Downtown offers car-free housing options. Twenty one
1887 percent of Americans aged 65 and older do not drive (STPP Aging Americans: Stranded without
1888 Options: April, 2004). Downtown Berkeley is an ideal for aging baby-boomers interested in active
1889 lives near the many attractions that Downtown has to offer. A pedestrian-friendly Downtown is also
1890 an important resource for people with physical disabilities who are “. . . poorly served by development
1891 patterns that do not provide access to transit and safe, accessible pedestrian facilities . . . [and
1892 whose] specific needs . . . are often not met in car-oriented environments.” (LEED-ND, USGBC,
1893 Public Health and the Built Environment, May 2006 p.114).

1894 A Downtown with exceptional, inviting pedestrian places is much more likely to attract retail patrons,
1895 businesses, cultural uses, visitors and new residents. High quality pedestrian environments are
1896 critical to Downtown's competitiveness with other regional destinations.

1897 The previous Downtown Plan (1990) strongly supported a pedestrian-oriented Downtown. Despite
1898 that Plan, the quality of Downtown's walking environments is mixed. Relatively few places provide
1899 high-quality walking environments that are lined by active uses, sheltered by street trees and
1900 awnings, and are human in scale. The southern sidewalk on Center Street between Shattuck and
1901 Oxford is a model of such a high-quality pedestrian environment, as are the Addison Street "Poetry
1902 Walk" and parts of Shattuck Square. Other streets offer little more than narrow sidewalks, and many
1903 places that could be successful pedestrian places because of the presence of active uses, trees and
1904 furnishings, are dominated by cars.

1905 Another important element of the pedestrian environment are mid-block walkways that offer
1906 pedestrians "shortcuts" that are free from vehicles and sometimes accompanied by outdoor dining.
1907 New mid-block walkways have been created over the past 20 years, and others are possible.

1908 The comfort and safety of pedestrians is often compromised by fast-moving traffic and by street
1909 design and operations decisions that favor cars and trucks. Transportation engineering decisions
1910 traditionally focus on vehicle flow and minimizing vehicular conflicts, and less on the needs of
1911 pedestrians and bicycles. While Downtown streets already contain features that help protect
1912 pedestrians and cause drivers to slow (such as curb extensions at some crosswalks and parallel on-
1913 street parking), more can be accomplished if design options that favor pedestrians are employed. For
1914 example, travel lane widths might be reduced for pedestrian safety, as the average speed of a car
1915 slows as much as 3 mph per foot in lane reduction (Parsons Transportation Group). Transportation
1916 modeling has also confirmed that several street segments with four travel lanes (two in each
1917 direction) can, in fact, be reduced to two lanes (one in each direction) with no significant traffic
1918 impacts. Reducing the width of travel lanes, or eliminating them altogether, offers major opportunities
1919 for expanding sidewalks, increased landscaping and bicycles (see chapter on Streets & Open
1920 Space).

1921 Cars can be managed in other ways to enhance pedestrian environments. Shifting people out of cars
1922 and into alternative modes benefit pedestrians by reducing and calming traffic. Conflicts between
1923 cars and pedestrians decrease along sidewalks when parking on private parcels and driveways are
1924 reduced. And while efficient transit is important, transit improvements must be thoughtfully designed
1925 and respect that Downtown is, foremost, a pedestrian-oriented place.

1926 **BICYCLING**

1927 Only a portion of the people who visit Downtown can do so on foot. For many Berkeleyans, bicycling
1928 offers an excellent way to get there. Over 3,000 people, 5.6 percent of Berkeley residents, bike to
1929 work in Berkeley every day (2000 United States Census). This is over four times the Alameda
1930 County rate of 1.2 percent. In addition, about 4,200 individuals bike to work or study at UC Berkeley
1931 each day, with 21 percent of bike trips originating within Berkeley (UC Berkeley Bike Plan, 2006).
1932 Students in other schools in Berkeley, including Downtown's high school and Berkeley City College,
1933 also use bicycles as their primary means of transportation.

1934 Downtown is served by a variety of bicycle routes, “bicycle boulevards”, and other bicycle-oriented
1935 facilities. Milvia was Berkeley’s first “Bicycle Boulevard” and offers a protected route for bicyclists
1936 traveling from the north or south, although the segment between University Avenue and Allston might
1937 be improved. Most people bicycling to the University pass through Downtown. Oxford Street carries
1938 over 1,400 peak hour bicyclists (UC Berkeley Bike Plan, 2006). Bicyclists from the west use other
1939 routes as well, such as Channing Way, which is also a Bicycle Boulevard, and Allston Way, which is a
1940 “Bicycle Route” because of slower traffic speeds and the traffic light at Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK)
1941 Way.

1942 Center Street offers a two-block segment with bicycle lanes, however it does not connect farther west
1943 than MLK Way and most bicyclists actually use Allston Way significantly more than Center (144
1944 versus 95 per hour eastbound, staff 2009 count), when moving through this portion of Downtown.
1945 This is significant because proposed plaza improvements on Center Street (between Shattuck and
1946 Oxford) would make bike lanes difficult. Furthermore, the important pedestrian connection between
1947 BART and Civic Center Park would benefit greatly if large landscape strips with abundant trees
1948 replaced these poorly used bike lanes. with.

1949 Bicycle parking facilities are in high demand, and new parking was introduced in recent years.
1950 Bicycle parking is provided on-street and in covered locations, such as City garages and the BART
1951 station’s mezzanine. More bicycle parking is needed, however, especially near major destinations,
1952 such as the YMCA and BART. While Downtown BART recently upgraded bike parking, a recent
1953 study considered ways to expand this facility or relocate covered and secured parking elsewhere in
1954 Downtown (Downtown Berkeley Association). Early consideration is also being given to bicycle rental
1955 programs that are inexpensive, convenient and located near transit.

1956 **TRANSIT**

1957 Downtown Berkeley has some of the best transit access in the Bay Area, and it is the second largest
1958 transit hub in the East Bay. Downtown has a BART Station and is the point of convergence for
1959 thirteen AC Transit bus lines (2008). Low-cost shuttles for the University and LBNL also serve
1960 Downtown, as well as private commuter shuttles. In 2008, the City began to explore the possibility of
1961 shuttle service between Downtown BART and major employers in West Berkeley.

1962 Transit is a key alternative mode to the automobile, and is essential to persons who do not or cannot
1963 drive. A 2000 survey of AC Transit riders showed that 61% of adult riders were transit-dependent.
1964 (AC Transit 2002 On-Board Passenger Survey-System-Wide Results). Presentations for the Urban
1965 Habitat to the Transportation and Land Use Coalition indicate that, in 2002 and in the Bay Area, 26%
1966 of low-income households and 35% of poor single-parent families did not have access to a car. In
1967 addition, many disabled and elderly individuals are unable to drive.

1968 Transit also plays a vital role in minimizing impacts associated with the University of California’s
1969 growth. UC’s 2020 Long Range Development Plan requires that all new University housing be
1970 accessible within 20 minutes, either on foot (i.e., a one mile radius) or by transit (i.e., along major
1971 transit corridors).

1972 For those people who have a choice of modes, key determinants in choosing between transit and the
1973 automobile are reliability and time. If buses come on time and get you there quickly, they better

1974 compete better with the automobile. AC Transit has introduced enhanced "Rapid Bus" service that
1975 connects Downtown to Telegraph Avenue and downtown Oakland. Rapid Bus improves travel
1976 speeds and makes schedules more reliable by giving buses priority at traffic lights and by having
1977 fewer stops. Additional Rapid Bus improvements might include raised platforms and pre-paying (to
1978 speed boarding), real-time information on arrival times, and other amenities.

1979 Another way to enhance bus service is through Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). BRT uses dedicated travel
1980 lanes to further improve speed and reliability. In urban areas, bus schedules can be difficult to
1981 maintain because of congestion. Traffic projections predict that congestion will choke Bay Area
1982 freeways and major roadways over the next 20 years (ACCMA). Diminished speed and predictability
1983 not only results frustrated riders, it also makes transferring between bus routes difficult and time
1984 consuming. Dedicated bus lanes would allow buses to bypass congestion, remain on schedule,
1985 improve timed transfers, and reduce travel times – possibly to the point where using transit becomes
1986 faster than driving.

1987 Transit options like Bus Rapid Transit must be carefully evaluated and planned to consider impacts
1988 on the livability of Downtown and adjacent neighborhoods, especially the quality of pedestrian
1989 environments. The City will need to take a leadership role so that local concerns can be addressed
1990 effectively.

1991 **REDUCING AUTO USE**

1992 The City of Berkeley has long sought to reduce vehicle use to reduce impacts on the community and
1993 the environment, however automobiles are likely to be the dominant transportation mode in the
1994 foreseeable future, and trucks are likely to deliver most goods. While Berkeley's population declined
1995 slightly from 1990 to 2000, traffic on Berkeley streets increased.

1996 This Plan seeks to balance a strong desire to minimize the use of autos, while also accommodating
1997 them to the degree necessary and in the least obtrusive way possible. Accommodation of cars must
1998 be consistent with the City's priorities for pedestrians, bicycles and transit. To achieve this balance,
1999 multiple strategies are needed to promote alternative modes, manage parking and traffic more
2000 effectively, and make street- and parking-related improvements that support the Plan's goals.

2001 In considering strategies for managing the automobile, it is important to recognize that motorists are
2002 comprised of different user groups. To simultaneously reduce car use while making Downtown more
2003 attractive as a regional destination, each user group requires different transportation management
2004 strategies.

2005 **Commuters.** The first and best strategy to address commuting is to provide more housing near jobs
2006 in Berkeley and encourage people to walk or bicycle to work. Commuters are by far the most
2007 susceptible of the user groups to alternative modes because most do not need regular access to their
2008 automobiles during the day. Parking and other strategies that increase the cost of commuting (see
2009 further discussion on parking below), or decrease the cost of using transit (see Transit and
2010 Transportation Demand Management, below) can have a significant impact on commuting. Because
2011 Berkeley has some of the best transit access in the Bay Area, these options are more available for
2012 workers here than in most other communities. For commuters, having access to car-sharing vehicles
2013 can sometimes allay fears of the need to get somewhere in the event of emergencies. Long-

2014 standing City and the University policies discourage single-occupant commuter vehicles and to
2015 encourage the use of transit. As a result, Berkeley remains one of the top 25 cities in the country for
2016 the percentage of commuters using public transportation and other alternative modes
2017 (www.bikesatwork.com)

2018 **Shoppers and Other Short-Term Visitors.** People who come Downtown to shop or other short-
2019 term business are less likely to use of alternative modes, even though such modes deserve
2020 emphasis. Short-term visitors are less likely to travel on a regular schedule and more likely to value
2021 convenience. At the same time, the access by shoppers and other short-term visitors is vital to
2022 Downtown's economic health and attractiveness as a destination. To maintain a thriving shopping
2023 district, Downtown must rely on people from outside of the area, and not solely on people who live,
2024 work or learn in the area. Because retailers must compete with other shopping districts in Berkeley
2025 and regionally, and Downtown's competitiveness depends on reasonably convenient access. For
2026 retail, the availability of short-term parking – especially convenient parking on the street -- plays a
2027 critical role (see parking below). Once visitors have parked, an enjoyable and safe pedestrian
2028 environment will encourage them to walk to multiple destinations -- instead of driving. Convenient
2029 parking is also important to families, especially those with small children.

2030 **Residents.** The average resident in Downtown Berkeley today is much less likely to own an
2031 automobile than residents in other parts of Berkeley or the region. But many residents own a vehicle
2032 because of occasional need or simply to have options. As more housing is built Downtown, including
2033 more affluent housing, some accommodation of cars will be needed. However, because of excellent
2034 transit and walking access to most services -- and because carsharing opportunities are available
2035 throughout Downtown -- many residents will not need or want their own car.

2036 **Global Climate Change.** The use of cars is a major contributor to global climate change. In 2005,
2037 gasoline and diesel consumption in automobiles accounted for 47 percent of Berkeley's total
2038 greenhouse gas emissions, and almost 293,000 tons of greenhouse gases. Automobile emissions
2039 also contribute to air pollution and disease (City of Berkeley June 2007 Climate Action Framework).
2040 While there is some hope that in the timeframe of the Downtown Area Plan (roughly 2009 – 2029),
2041 non-polluting vehicles could become more readily available, autos and trucks will still have impacts on
2042 the character of the City, of Downtown and its surrounding neighborhoods, including noise, conflicts
2043 with other modes, and the use of significant amount of space for parking and streets. Reducing car
2044 use can best be achieved by increasing the numbers of people living near good public transit, and at
2045 intensities that support shops and services within walking distance

2046 **TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM)**

2047 TDM is a range of strategies to discourage commuting at peak times, and encourage alternative
2048 modes, such as transit, bicycling, ridesharing, or walking. TDM is generally implemented by
2049 employers, who encourage their employees to reduce car use through incentives and disincentives.
2050 While TDM strategies most efficiently applied by larger employers, government can sometimes help
2051 to make it workable for smaller employers. TDM strategies can include a variety of tools, including:

- 2052 – cash equivalent to the cost of parking for those who do not drive alone;
- 2053 – free or low-cost transit passes;

- 2054 – car-/van-pool coordination and free car-/van-pool parking;
- 2055 – showers for bicyclists and vouchers for bike repairs;
- 2056 – car-sharing opportunities for those who do not drive; and
- 2057 – a “free-ride-home” when people who do not own a car are faced with emergencies.

2058 To be effective, TDM strategies must consider more than the dollar cost of driving. A UC survey
 2059 determined that "convenience" (at 37%) and "travel time" (at 30%) were most often cited as reasons
 2060 why faculty and staff drive rather than use transit or other alternate modes. As congestion increases,
 2061 the amount of time and money that is needed to drive will also increase, and public transit and other
 2062 TDM options will become even more attractive.

2063 **PARKING**

2064 Parking strategies should meet needs of the various “auto-user” groups, and address seemingly
 2065 competing objectives for discouraging parking (for commuters) while simultaneously making it
 2066 convenient (for short-term use).

2067 **Commuter Parking.** It has been long-standing City policy to discourage long-term commuter
 2068 parking in Downtown. Despite that policy, about half of all parking spaces in Downtown garages were
 2069 occupied daylong by single-occupant vehicles, as observed in a DATE student-conducted research
 2070 project guided by U.C. Professor Elizabeth Deakin [CITE STUDY]. The City needs to work with
 2071 private lot owners (and employers in regard to TDM Strategies) to help reduce this proportion.
 2072 Commuter behavior can be altered by reducing the number of employers who offer free parking as an
 2073 employee benefit or offer equal benefits to uses of alternative modes. Parking can also be priced to
 2074 become increasingly expensive the longer that you park, which discourages long-term parking but
 2075 also increases revenues from the relatively few people willing to pay the premium. Commuter-
 2076 focused strategies need to be accompanied by enforcing parking restrictions in surrounding
 2077 residential areas and by citing people who feed on-street meters to get a lower short-term parking
 2078 rate. Another Deakin study showed that one-quarter of all on-street meters are occupied by all-day
 2079 commuters, depriving retailers of these much needed spaces.

2080 **Parking for Restaurants and Shops.** The availability of convenient and readily available parking is
 2081 critical for shops and restaurants Downtown. Because it is visible and often most readily accessible
 2082 to businesses, on-street parking is more highly valued than off-street garage parking. Since
 2083 convenience is a critical dimension of retail competitiveness, Downtown’s on-street parking needs to
 2084 be priced to discourage long-term use and to encourage use of lower-priced parking garages for
 2085 those who are willing to walk farther.

2086 In his book, *The High Price of Free Parking*, Donald Shoup who is a professor at UCLA observes that
 2087 the price of parking is a minor factor for retail competition, and that the convenience plays a major
 2088 role. Consequently, parking ordinances that Shoup has implemented price on-street parking so that
 2089 there is nearly always at least one parking space available on each block face (a vacancy rate of
 2090 about 15%). Since demand for parking can vary by time of day or location, prices can be adjusted
 2091 accordingly to attain this preferred vacancy rate.

2092 Retailers, who typically object to increasing the price of parking, have been found to be accepting of
2093 higher on-street parking prices if the increased revenue from parking is invested in things that benefit
2094 the retail district, such as street and open space improvements and improved cleaning and
2095 maintenance.

2096 **Evening Entertainment.** Evening entertainment venues can also benefit from price-based supply-
2097 and-demand strategies. Entertainment patrons often drive because of more limited evening transit
2098 service, concerns about safety, and higher vehicle occupancy. Yet, a 2006 study on Downtown found
2099 that, in the evening on-street parking “had an overall higher occupancy when compared to the midday
2100 period [and] revealed that parking on select blocks was fully occupied” near Downtown’s cinemas and
2101 live theaters. And yet, on-street parking is free after 6 pm, suggesting that assigning a cost to on-
2102 street parking could greatly improve its availability and increase utilization of off-street parking
2103 garages. (2006 MTC Downtown Berkeley Parking Study, <http://tinyurl.com/2yput7>).

2104 **Information on Parking Availability.** While perceptions prevail that parking is not available in
2105 Downtown, surveys indicate that roughly 20% of public parking garages are vacant during the early
2106 afternoon when demand peaks. In addition to making parking more available on the street (as has
2107 been previously discussed), parking demand can also be addressed by using “real-time” signage. If
2108 driving to Downtown on any major street, signs would direct you to major publicly accessible parking
2109 garages and would also indicate how many parking spaces are available at each. A recent study
2110 analyzed how a system of information signage might help motorists find parking space in Downtown
2111 but was not implemented due to insufficient funding. Increasing parking revenues might help pay for
2112 such a system in the future.

2113 **Residential Projects.** To promote Downtown’s revitalization, the City of Berkeley already has some
2114 of the lowest required parking requirements in the Bay Area outside of San Francisco: one space for
2115 every four dwelling units. Actual demand corresponds closely with this requirement, testifying to the
2116 reduced driving rates Downtown residents presently enjoy (Wilbur Smith Associates).

2117 Current zoning provisions require on-site parking for each project. An option might be offered that
2118 would allow developers to pay an “in lieu fee” for the construction of publicly accessible parking off-
2119 site but nearby. Because of the dimensions necessary for parking and the costs involved, an in lieu
2120 arrangement would help make adaptive re-use of existing buildings and new development on smaller
2121 sites more feasible. Such an arrangement would require coordination to orchestrate the collection of
2122 fees, the location of parking garages, and funding for their construction.

2123 **Consolidated Parking Strategy.** A “consolidated” parking strategy would help the City address all of
2124 the parking issues previously noted. The strategy could determine the needs of the various user
2125 groups, consider various parking pricing and management policies, and then arrive at
2126 recommendations that meet parking needs while also discouraging car use and commuter parking. A
2127 consolidated parking strategy could better utilize the parking that is available. It can also help assure
2128 that the amount of new parking does not exceed what is needed after car-reducing TDM strategies
2129 are aggressively applied. The program of fees in lieu of on-site parking, and an associated program
2130 for constructing new parking, would also be part consolidated parking strategy. An MTC-ABAG grant
2131 for pursuing a consolidated parking strategy was received in 2008.

2132 **UC Parking.** The University has its own parking management program that addresses its needs and
2133 is structured, in part, to meet TDM goals. To meet needs identified in its LRDP and acknowledged by
2134 the UC-COB Settlement Agreement, the University may add over one thousand additional parking
2135 spaces in Downtown to address its growth needs. University parking built in Downtown would be
2136 shared with non-UC users. As became the case in 2007, University parking is generally available to
2137 the public during off-peak hours and weekends, although use by the public has been relatively low
2138 and might be increased by providing better information. UC parking might be shared in other ways as
2139 well, a topic that can be pursued mutually as part of the consolidated parking strategy described
2140 above.

2141 **Car Sharing.** Car-sharing strategies (i.e., programs for affordable short-term car rentals) already
2142 exist and can play a critical role in reducing the demand for auto-ownership in Downtown. Car-
2143 sharing also makes it possible for commuters, who bike or use transit, to have access to a car during
2144 the day. While Downtown has several car-share vehicles, additional locations would encourage
2145 participation.

2146 **Residential Neighborhoods.** The demand for parking Downtown will spillover into abutting
2147 neighborhoods unless the present “Residential Permit Program” (RPP) is continued and enforced. In
2148 some other cities like Cambridge, Massachusetts, variants on Berkeley’s program protect residents
2149 while also raising new revenues for neighborhood improvements.

2150 **EMERGENCY ACCESS**

2151 Emergency access and egress is a critical need and must be provided. Except for portions of Milvia
2152 and Fulton Streets, all Downtown streets are designated by the General Plan as “Emergency Access
2153 & Evacuation Routes.” As a consequence, “full traffic diverters” and “speed humps” are not currently
2154 permitted unless it is determined by the Fire and Police Departments that the installation will not
2155 significantly reduce emergency access or evacuation speeds. The General Plan also calls for the
2156 Fire and Police Departments to review proposed traffic calming measures. This review process is
2157 intended to ensure that proposed traffic calming devices on streets identified on the General Plan’s
2158 Emergency Access and Evacuation Network map will not significantly increase emergency response
2159 times or hinder evacuation of adjacent neighborhoods. Such review is an essential component during
2160 the design of future street improvements.

2161 **GOALS, POLICIES & ACTIONS**

2162 Note: While policies under this goal focus on multimodal approaches to strengthening Downtown as a
2163 destination (i.e., a place for people to enjoy), policies related to walking , transit, and bicycling are
2164 found in Goals AC-2, AC-4 and AC-5, respectively.

2165 **GOAL AC-1: IMPROVE OPTIONS THAT INCREASE ACCESS TO DOWNTOWN ON FOOT, BY** 2166 **BICYCLE, AND VIA TRANSIT.**

2167 **Policy AC-1.1: Street Modifications.** Modify Downtown’s streets and street network to better serve
2168 the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit. While recognizing that automobiles will be an
2169 important transportation mode for the foreseeable future, reduce and avoid negative impacts from the

- 2170 private automobile upon pedestrians, transit, and bicycles (see Goals AC-2, AC-4 and AC-5,
2171 respectively).
- 2172 a) Encourage potential motorists to access Downtown using other modes (as described in multiple
2173 policies below).
- 2174 b) Modify streets to slow automobile traffic to speeds appropriate to the function and character of
2175 each street, and emphasize the needs and comfort of pedestrians, transit and bicycles.
- 2176 – Modifications should encourage traffic to flow at speeds under 25 miles per hour.
- 2177 – Monitor traffic volumes and speeds on residential streets in and near Downtown using
2178 established standards, and continue to improve traffic calming and enforcement until General
2179 Plan targets are attained.
- 2180 c) Identify and implement street modifications to improve pedestrian safety and comfort, such as:
2181 sidewalk bulb-outs, traffic circles, textured concrete, suitable travel lane widths, etc.
- 2182 d) Evaluate proposed street network changes from the perspective of the needs, safety and comfort
2183 of bicyclists and pedestrians, including changes to lanes and turning movements. Where
2184 accommodations for private automobiles and accommodations for pedestrians are in conflict,
2185 decisions should reflect the priority of the pedestrian. Accept that improvements may result in
2186 slowing down vehicular traffic.
- 2187 e) Give specific consideration to street and open space improvements identified as “Street and
2188 Open Space” Opportunities” (Figure OS-##). Add Policy OS 1.2 (Traffic Modeling has...)
- 2189 – **Center Street Plaza.** Create a pedestrian-oriented urban space and prioritize pedestrian
2190 access on Center Street between Shattuck Avenue and Oxford, the primary pedestrian
2191 connection between BART and the UC campus. Creation of the Plaza is of critical
2192 importance. Consider phasing and design options that minimize negative impacts on Center
2193 Street merchants., and consider design options that address impacts. Phase construction of
2194 the new Center Street Plaza and utility improvements, so that segments become operational
2195 at the same time as the development on the north side of Center Street occurs. Consider
2196 providing bicycle access through the pedestrian plaza to accommodate safe and direct
2197 access to the UC campus. Paths between uses on the north and south sides of the Plaza
2198 should be reasonably direct.
- 2199 – **Center Street Greenway and Civic Center Park.** Consider pedestrian enhancements to
2200 Center Street between Civic Center Park and Shattuck Avenue, which could result in
2201 narrowing of travel lanes -- and potential elimination of bike lanes and on-street parking.
2202 Removal of bicycle lanes and narrowing of travel lanes should be implemented only if an
2203 appropriate speed differential between bicyclists and motor vehicles can be attained.
- 2204 – **Oxford-Fulton.** Consider reducing travel lanes on-street parking on Oxford and Fulton, to
2205 allow for sidewalk widening, additional landscaping, and a better link between the UC
2206 Campus and Downtown, and extending Center Street Plaza.

- 2207 – **University Avenue Gateway.** Consider removing two travel lanes on University Avenue
2208 between Shattuck Square and Oxford, so that the dimension that has been used for these
2209 lanes can be devoted to sidewalk widening and landscaping.
- 2210 – **Shattuck Avenue as a Boulevard** (from Durant to Center Street). Consider creating a
2211 pedestrian-oriented and attractive "boulevard" or "grand avenue" on Shattuck Avenue by
2212 redesigning and rebuilding the Shattuck right-of-way to facilitate pedestrian crossing,
2213 accommodate transit, and increase landscaping. To increase pedestrian-supportive features
2214 and landscaping, consider narrowing and/or reducing travel lanes, and converting diagonal
2215 parking to parallel parking (see AC-4.9).
- 2216 – **Shattuck Square** (from Center to University). Consider two-way through traffic on the west
2217 side of Shattuck Square, and designating the east side of Shattuck Square as a slow street
2218 that provides a high level of pedestrian amenity.
- 2219 – **Shattuck Avenue "Park Blocks"** (Dwight to Durant). Consider converting excessive travel
2220 ways and parking areas into a linear park, by eliminating diagonal parking and minimizing the
2221 width of travel lanes.
- 2222 – **Ohlone Greenway Extension.** Consider modifying Hearst Street between Milvia and Oxford
2223 Street in order to extend the Ohlone Greenway from its current eastern terminus to the UC
2224 Campus. Potential modifications include reducing the number of traffic lanes on Hearst to
2225 accommodate continuous bicycle lanes and enhance landscaping, closing the northern end
2226 of Henry Street, considering a pathway in the design of development on the DHS site, and
2227 other options that would allow the Greenway's grade-separated character to continue to
2228 campus.
- 2229 – **Harold Way (from Allston to Kittredge).** Within the Harold Way right-of-way, consider
2230 widening sidewalks and introducing pedestrian amenities. Consider closing Harold to traffic, if
2231 vehicle circulation needs allow. Consider moving parking spaces on Kittredge that are
2232 immediately adjacent to the Library Gardens' sculptural gate, to allow an unobstructed view
2233 of the gate from Harold Way.
- 2234 f) Once the design of specific improvements is conceptually approved, private and public
2235 developers adjacent to designed improvements should implement them as part of the
2236 development project, whenever feasible and as described in Policies (see LU-8.1, OS-3.1 and
2237 OS-3.3).
- 2238 g) Encourage potential private motorists to access Downtown using other modes, as described in
2239 multiple policies below.
- 2240 h) Engage merchants, property owners, transit agencies, the University and other stakeholders
2241 during the design and implementation process, to emphasize Downtown as a shared destination.
2242 Specifically work with AC Transit and other transit agencies to evaluate the impact of proposed
2243 street and street network changes on transit vehicle operations, and to identify suitable bus stop
2244 and layover locations (such as to replace those displaced by a new Center Street Plaza). Bus
2245 stops and layover locations should not degrade transit service, and should not negatively impact
2246 pedestrian environments.

2247 **Policy AC-1.2: Single-Occupant Vehicles.** Discourage the use of single-occupant vehicles (SOVs)
2248 by commuters to Downtown and encourage commuting with transit, ridesharing, bicycles, and on foot.

2249 a) Encourage ridesharing throughout Downtown by requiring larger development projects to provide
2250 ridesharing parking and support on-going ridesharing operations. Assess whether Downtown has
2251 subareas where ridesharing locations are not convenient, and serve these areas by identifying
2252 on-street ridesharing locations and working with ridesharing providers.

2253 b) Support ridesharing to and from Downtown by employers and institutions. In public parking
2254 garages, continue to discount parking prices for organized ridesharing, and provide preferential
2255 parking locations. Encourage private parking garages to make similar accommodations.

2256 c) Strengthen parking policies that discourage all-day SOV parking (see AC-3.1).

2257 d) Consistent with the Urban Environmental Accords endorsed by the City of Berkeley, set a goal of
2258 reducing the percentage of commute trips by single occupancy vehicles (SOVs) to Downtown by
2259 10% by 2012 through the implementation of transportation demand management and other
2260 measures. Seek to reduce SOVs to no more than 40% of all commute trips by 2020. Monitor
2261 peak period trips and adjust measures to meet these targets.

2262 **Policy AC-1.3: Transit Incentives by Business.** Encourage Downtown businesses to reward
2263 customers and employees who arrive by transit, by bicycle, or on foot, or who use off-street parking.

2264 a) Work with the Downtown Business Association to develop merchant-based incentives for using
2265 transit, bicycling or walking to Downtown.

2266 b) Encourage merchant programs (such as validation programs) to promote the use of parking
2267 structures, public transit, bicycling, and walking.

2268 c) Encourage Downtown businesses to provide subsidies for bicycling, walking and public transit for
2269 their employees.

2270 **Policy AC-1.4: Transportation Demand Management.** Promote and, when feasible, require the
2271 use of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) by private and public sector entities to discourage
2272 single occupant vehicles from commuting to and through Downtown.

2273 a) Establish coordinated UC/City TDM programs, including: organized ride share programs, sharing
2274 fleet vehicles, guaranteed ride home, coordinated employee transit subsidies, etc.

2275 b) Require that development projects of more than 20,000 square feet develop and implement a
2276 TDM plan for how residents/workers will employ transportation strategies to limit auto use. The
2277 City should develop and provide a "toolbox" for the development of project-specific TDM plans
2278 including bus passes for new residents or new office workers, secure and convenient bicycle
2279 parking, and encouraging carsharing.

2280 **GOAL AC-2: GIVE PEDESTRIANS PRIORITY IN DOWNTOWN, AND MAKE WALKING**
2281 **DOWNTOWN SAFE, ATTRACTIVE, EASY AND CONVENIENT FOR PEOPLE OF ALL AGES AND**
2282 **ABILITIES.**

2283 **Policy AC-2.1: Pedestrian Safety and Convenience.** Improve the safety, attractiveness and
2284 convenience of pedestrian routes within Downtown -- and to and from surrounding areas.

2285 a) Provide adequate sidewalk width, pedestrian crossing time, “count-down” signals, and universal
2286 access signal features at all signalized crosswalks.

2287 b) Evaluate the need for new mid-block pedestrian crosswalks where there are high volumes of
2288 pedestrians and a long distance between intersections.

2289 c) Regularly evaluate indicators of pedestrian safety, and adjust implementation priorities to improve
2290 pedestrian safety.

2291 d) Design and implement pedestrian enhancements through the development of a Streets & Open
2292 Space Improvements Plan (see OS-1.1 and OS-1.2).

2293 e) To reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflicts, minimize driveway curbcuts to the extent feasible, and
2294 where they must occur: avoid making driveways too wide and uneven surfaces where driveways
2295 cross sidewalks.

2296 f) Maintain sidewalks, crosswalks, plazas, and other pedestrian environments to be safe, clean and
2297 in good repair (see OS-1.3).

2298 **Policy AC-2.2: Pedestrian Amenities.** Encourage a wide range of conveniences and destinations
2299 within the Downtown Area to meet the needs and interests of those who live and work in and near
2300 Downtown (see Land Use chapter).

2301 **Policy AC-2.3: Universal Access.** Provide safe access to all Downtown streets and pathways for
2302 people of all abilities.

2303 a) Use regulation and incentives to require and/or encourage universal accessibility upgrades for
2304 private businesses when significant modifications to structures are made.

2305 b) Consider grants, low-cost loans, technical assistance and/or other incentives for businesses to
2306 correct unacceptable conditions, where significant modifications to existing buildings are not
2307 expected.

2308 **GOAL AC-3: PROVIDE PARKING TO MEET THE NEEDS OF DOWNTOWN, WHILE**
2309 **DISCOURAGING COMMUTER PARKING AND ENCOURAGING MOTORISTS TO PARK THEIR**
2310 **CARS AND EXPERIENCE DOWNTOWN AS A PEDESTRIAN.**

2311 **Policy AC-3.1: Effective Parking.** Manage parking more effectively to promote Downtown economic
2312 vitality and minimize the amount of all-day parking,

- 2313 a) Employ parking information technologies, such as dynamic and static signage, to direct motorists
2314 to where off-street parking is available and to Downtown destinations. If feasible, provide real-
2315 time information on parking space availability and location.
- 2316 b) Work with UC and private owners of parking to make it available for public use. Where the public
2317 can use UC or private parking, use signage and other features to make its public use transparent
2318 and public patrons welcome.
- 2319 c) Employ parking pricing and demand management to encourage alternative means of access and
2320 discourage all-day SOV parking, while simultaneously accommodating short-term users (e.g., up
2321 to 4 hours) and evening users (such as cultural and entertainment patrons).
- 2322 d) Increase pricing at on-street meters throughout Downtown until an acceptable vacancy rate is
2323 attained. Through analysis, consider establishing a 15% vacancy rate or more appropriate target
2324 for on-street parking within Downtown subareas.
- 2325 e) Authorize the Transportation Division to adjust parking rates whenever necessary to reach and
2326 maintain the established vacancy-rate target.
- 2327 f) Employ pay-and-display meters and/or other technology to increase the City's ability to manage
2328 the demand for on-street parking spaces.
- 2329 g) For evenings and weekends, price public parking and encourage private parking vendors to make
2330 off-street parking more affordable and convenient relative to on-street parking.
- 2331 h) Discourage all-day SOV parking and, when it does occur, encourage it off-street by making
2332 parking prices lower in parking garages than on streets. Also:
- 2333 i) Encourage employers who provide free parking as an employee benefit to offer cash instead.
2334 (Larger employers are required to do this by State law.)
- 2335 j) Phase out monthly garage spaces in City-owned Downtown parking facilities.
- 2336 k) Encourage the City Manager to phase out parking assigned to City staff for their privately-owned
2337 vehicles
- 2338 l) Encourage the City Manager to park City-owned vehicles outside of the Downtown Area, on City
2339 property, and/or on the upper floors of off-street facilities.
- 2340 m) Discourage all-day SOV parking through pricing, consistent with measure c) (above).
- 2341 n) Encourage privately owned garages to reduce or eliminate monthly parking, and to set rates that
2342 favor short-term over all day parking.
- 2343 o) Continue and expand flat prepaid rates (i.e., paid upon entrance) to prevent long queues upon
2344 exiting public and private parking garages after evening performances.

2345 **Policy AC-3.2: Equitable Access.** Develop mechanisms to support low-income Berkeleyans for
2346 whom Downtown transportation measures (such as to raise the price of parking) would make access
2347 to Downtown difficult.

2348 a) Consider provision of transit passes, bicycles, and subsidized carsharing to low-income residents
2349 as an affordable alternative to driving to Downtown.

2350 b) To better accommodate low income Berkeley households and individuals who are accessing
2351 social and health services, consider transit or parking vouchers for off-street public parking
2352 facilities.

2353 **Policy AC-3.3: Residential Parking.** In neighborhoods near Downtown where parking demand by
2354 non-residents is high, offer residents options for managing the supply of on-street parking and
2355 mitigating the impacts of parking by non-residents.

2356 a) Evaluate alternatives for managing demand by non-residents, such as installation of metered
2357 parking and the use of residential parking permits.

2358 b) Consider earmarking a portion of new revenues from parking meters and/or parking permits for
2359 improvements in these neighborhoods.

2360 **Policy AC-3.4: University Cooperation.** Encourage the University to review existing parking
2361 programs, and work with the University in developing comprehensive parking strategies (see AC-3.6).

2362 a) Work with the University to coordinate optimum parking rates and locations, and possible
2363 development of shared facilities at: the DHS site, the UC Art Museum site, the Tang site,
2364 University property west of University Hall, and the site at the corner of Oxford and University.

2365 b) Encourage underground parking in all locations considered by UC, to maximize use of above-
2366 ground space for other uses.

2367 c) Encourage the University to locate replacement parking for parking lost on campus to a
2368 Downtown site where parking can be shared and is often more accessible, but not in excess of
2369 what is called for under UC's Long Range Development Plan.

2370 **Policy AC-3.5: Parking Revenues.** Devote a significant portion of the additional revenue from
2371 Downtown Area parking (i.e., meters, publicly-owned garages, and parking taxes) to visible
2372 Downtown Area improvements, maintenance, and services – as an important vehicle for Downtown's
2373 revitalization and to increase merchant and public support for parking price increases. The increased
2374 parking revenue increment might be used for: street improvements, public open spaces, public
2375 conveniences (such as bathrooms), street and open space maintenance, transit services, transit
2376 subsidies (e.g., EcoPass) transit facilities, and/or traffic calming improvements in residential
2377 neighborhoods that abut the Downtown Area.

2378 a) Develop a Finance Plan to evaluate the potential increased parking revenue increment -- and
2379 other potential sources of revenue -- and compares the financial capacity of these potential
2380 revenues with the costs of Downtown improvements, maintenance and services. The Finance

2381 Plan should use this analysis to set near-term priorities for improvements -- based on public input
2382 and other considerations (see LU-8.1).

2383 **Policy AC-3.6: New Parking.** Provide for sufficient parking for expected growth by considering
2384 future parking in a comprehensive way.

2385 a) Consolidate parking to the extent possible and discourage on-site parking to optimize retail and
2386 other uses, minimize curb cuts for driveways (which creates a better pedestrian environment),
2387 and encourage walking between Downtown establishments, thereby enlivening the sidewalks and
2388 promoting drop-in shopping.

2389 b) A consolidated parking strategy should guide decisions about future parking needs, replacement
2390 of removed on-street parking, and funding for parking. Potential sites for future parking garages
2391 should be identified and evaluated against preferred characteristics, such as proximity to
2392 destinations, ease of access (such as locations peripheral to Downtown's Core Area), and ability
2393 to transfer to transit and/or shuttles. (see AC-3.4)

2394 c) Evaluate ways that private development can fund alternative travel modes, consolidated publicly
2395 accessible parking facilities, and transportation demand management (TDM) programs, such as
2396 through the use of fees in lieu of on-site parking, transportation service fees, and/or benefit
2397 district(s) (see AC-1-4).

2398 d) Allow fees to be paid in lieu of on-site parking, and apply these revenues toward off-site
2399 consolidated parking, TDM programs, and pedestrian, bicycle and transit infrastructure
2400 improvements, and evaluate other ways of funding such improvements and programs
2401 Encourage developers to pay fees in lieu of on-site parking, especially commercial projects that
2402 will bring large numbers of new commuters Downtown.

2403 e) Consider revisions to parking standards and programs to better accomplish policies of the DAP,
2404 and specifically: as part of the analysis for a consolidated parking strategy, and to reduce
2405 impediments to the preservation and the adaptive reuse of historic buildings.

2406 f) Prohibit new driveways on Shattuck and University Avenues in Downtown except when it can be
2407 demonstrated that no other site-access options exist or that other alternatives would have greater
2408 negative impacts than the proposed driveway.

2409 g) Monitor the amount of on-site parking that new development includes and, if excessive, develop
2410 standards for maximum allowable on-site parking. Require parking for carshare vehicles in new
2411 projects that opt to provide on-site parking.

2412 h) Expand electric car and hybrid plug-in location through standards and guidelines, and encourage
2413 their connection to local renewable energy sources.

2414 **Policy AC-3.7: Pedestrian Impacts.** Locate and design new parking to minimize negative impacts
2415 upon the pedestrian quality of Downtown (see HD-4.1 and ED-1.2).

- 2416 a) Consolidate parking available to minimize visual and other negative impacts from parking.
 2417 Enlarge the capacity of existing parking garages as feasible, through management practices
 2418 and/or physical improvements.
- 2419 b) Place Parking below grade when feasible. When below-grade parking is deemed infeasible,
 2420 above-grade parking structures should face streets and public open spaces in ways that support
 2421 pedestrian safety and activity. Surface parking should be prohibited along streets.
- 2422 c) Locate, design, and size entrances and exits to parking to minimize impact on the pedestrian
 2423 realm, such as through traffic management, exit mirrors, warning lights.
- 2424 d) Discourage use of more than 25% of a building's street-level area for parking).
- 2425 **GOAL AC-4: PROMOTE TRANSIT AS AN EFFICIENT, ATTRACTIVE CHOICE AND AS A**
 2426 **PRIMARY MODE OF MOTOR-VEHICLE TRAVEL.**
- 2427 **Policy AC-4.1: Commute Priority.** Promote transit as the primary mode for commuting to and from
 2428 Downtown.
- 2429 a) Work collaboratively with Downtown employers, institutions, and organizations (including major
 2430 employers such as the City of Berkeley, UC Berkeley, Berkeley Unified School District, Berkeley
 2431 City College, Berkeley Unified School District, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and Alta
 2432 Bates Medical Center) to adopt aggressive Transportation Demand Management programs and
 2433 facilities to reduce automobile use by staff, faculty and students, such as through education
 2434 transit subsidy programs (such as the EcoPass program for City staff), and other incentives for
 2435 walking, bicycling, carpooling and transit use.
- 2436 b) Consider requiring an employee transit subsidy in lieu of providing parking for new buildings that
 2437 can serve more than 20 employees. Consider incentives for other businesses to provide
 2438 employee transit subsidies and participate in pre-tax transit-support programs.
- 2439 c) Work with businesses to expand fare subsidies and guaranteed-ride-home programs for
 2440 employees who use transit.
- 2441 **Policy AC-4.2: Promote Transit.** Encourage retail, restaurant, theater, cinema, and art patrons to
 2442 use transit.
- 2443 a) Work with commercial and cultural venues to promote transit use among patrons.
- 2444 b) Examine examples of transit validation programs for these uses, and consider implementation of
 2445 similar programs Downtown.
- 2446 c) Encourage AC Transit, BART, and other transit providers to increase evening service to
 2447 Downtown.
- 2448 d) Work with these providers to review night-time conditions near transit stops that might affect
 2449 safety, such as lighting and poor visual access.

2450 **Policy AC-4.3: Events.** Promote transit to reduce acute short-term traffic congestion that occurs
2451 around Cal football games, Berkeley High School morning drop-off, and arts and theater events in the
2452 Downtown Arts District.

2453 a) Work with AC Transit and other transit operators to consider how transit operations, measures,
2454 and programs might be refined to reduce acute short-term traffic congestion.

2455 b) Pursue joint marketing campaigns with transit agencies and event sponsors promoting alternative
2456 ways to get to city events in Downtown.

2457 **Policy AC-4.4: Attractive Transit.** Make transit an efficient, attractive choice, and give it priority
2458 over personal vehicles.

2459 a) Encourage AC Transit, BART, and other transit providers to improve transit reliability and shorten
2460 travel times and headways (i.e., the time between buses and trains).

2461 b) Encourage transit reliability by giving consideration to transit-supportive street and facility
2462 improvements in the Downtown Area, by considering in collaboration with AC Transit and other
2463 transit providers:

2464 – the location and design of bus stops/stations, including the use of raised platforms;

2465 – the location and design of turn-around and layover areas;

2466 – possible integration of bus facilities within City, University and/or private projects;

2467 – how Rapid Bus and other enhanced bus service can be extended west on University Avenue
2468 and/or north on Shattuck Avenue, and avoiding improvements that might preclude such
2469 options; and

2470 – where dedicated bus-only lanes might significantly improve reliability.

2471 c) Minimize potential negative impacts from transit facility improvements, and maximize potential
2472 positive impacts to pedestrians, retail establishments, street trees, landscaping, neighboring
2473 residential areas, and others. Specifically,

2474 – engage community stakeholders, especially those representing Downtown interests;

2475 – give careful consideration to trade-offs between facilitating bus turning movements and other
2476 operations versus reductions in on-street parking supply, landscaping, and sidewalks;

2477 – do not interrupt pedestrian movement or block clear views of public sidewalks, plazas or
2478 storefronts;

2479 – promote public safety; and

2480 – replace trees and landscaping that are removed with a greater number of trees and improved
2481 and expanded landscaping and, with the City, jointly determine the type of trees and
2482 landscaping to be planted.

2483 d) Encourage AC Transit and BART efforts to maintain transit affordability, and consider ways that
2484 lower fares can be offered.

- 2485 e) Support AC Transit and BART service their efforts to receive increased federal and state funding.
- 2486 f) Encourage BART to improve the frequency of weekend service to and from Downtown.
- 2487 g) Encourage AC Transit to implement a pre-pay fare system to improve efficiency.
- 2488 h) Work with transit providers to improve access to Downtown from eastern Alameda and Contra
- 2489 Costa Counties, and other locations where large numbers of Downtown-bound vehicle trips
- 2490 originate. Encourage AC Transit to consider park-and-ride facilities in locations that will
- 2491 encourage people who start their trip by car to transfer to transit before reaching Downtown.
- 2492 i) Consider the possibility of a transit fare-free zone in Downtown or a larger area, potentially
- 2493 funded through a local tax measure.
- 2494 j) Improve signage to orient visitors to public transit (see ED-1.10 and ED-1.11), and create
- 2495 information centers and kiosks, near BART and other gateway locations, to provide transit and
- 2496 visitor information.
- 2497 k) Consider ways to make transit trip planning and ticket purchases easier, and promote alternative
- 2498 transportation programs, such as Eco Pass.
- 2499 l) Consult with AC Transit about Downtown circulation proposals to avoid changes that could slow
- 2500 down or otherwise degrade transit service.

2501 **Policy AC-4.5: Local Connections.** Improve transit connections among Downtown, University

2502 destinations and Berkeley neighborhoods, especially areas with significant numbers of potential but

2503 poorly served riders, neighborhood commercial areas, facilities for transit-dependent residents, and

2504 where high numbers of single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips are concentrated.

- 2505 a) Encourage AC Transit to improve service to these areas.
- 2506 b) Work with UC and other shuttle providers to evaluate the potential for creating shuttle service to
- 2507 better serve these areas.
- 2508 c) Work with major employers and community service providers (such as UC, LBNL, COB, BUSD,
- 2509 the YMCA, the Library) to identify facilities for transit-dependent residents, and areas where
- 2510 sources of single-occupancy vehicle trips are concentrated.
- 2511 d) Encourage AC Transit to establish a low-fare or fare free zone within the Downtown Area and
- 2512 connecting to upper Telegraph Avenue.

2513 **Policy AC-4.6: Shuttle Service.** Consider ways to provide frequent and low-cost local shuttle

2514 services that connect multiple destinations within Downtown, as well as connections with the

2515 University and Berkeley neighborhoods.

- 2516 a) Work with AC Transit, UC Berkeley, LBNL, Alta Bates, and lifeline service to improve shuttle
- 2517 service and consider ways that it can:

- 2518 – attract users now driving regularly to the UC campus and/or Downtown thereby reducing
 - 2519 parking demand;
 - 2520 – connect multiple points Downtown with each other and with other local destinations, including
 - 2521 Telegraph retail, north Shattuck retail, and University destinations;
 - 2522 – build upon existing shuttle systems so that an expanded shuttle service can be attained
 - 2523 sooner;
 - 2524 – undertake an effective public information campaign to advertise new service as it is made
 - 2525 available; and
 - 2526 – schedule shuttles on regular routes and/or make them demand-responsive, depending on the
 - 2527 needs of users.
- 2528 m) Develop a shuttle funding and operations strategy in association with the University. Funding
- 2529 sources might include:
- 2530 – replacement/reassignment of some existing services;
 - 2531 – mitigation funds from new development;
 - 2532 – assessments in lieu of new parking;
 - 2533 – a surcharge on fees for off-street parking; a charge for multiple car ownership;
 - 2534 – capital grants for carbon neutral vehicles;
 - 2535 – employment/jobs or work/study program funding for drivers' salaries;
 - 2536 – passes/fares prepaid by institutions/employers; and/or
 - 2537 – a parking benefits district.
- 2538 n) To the extent feasible, use low-carbon fuels and promote shuttles as a way for people to reduce
- 2539 their carbon footprint and meet the City's Measure G goals (see LU-3.1).
- 2540 **Policy AC-4.7: Bus Stops.** Maintain safe, attractive and weather-protected bus stops.
- 2541 a) Encourage frequent maintenance, graffiti abatement, and the elimination of unsafe conditions by
 - 2542 working with bus service providers to maintain high standards and alerting responsible agencies
 - 2543 when bus stop improvements are unsafe or unsightly.
- 2544 **Policy AC-4.8: Paratransit.** Accommodate taxi service and on-demand transport service providers
- 2545 in Downtown.
- 2546 a) Incorporate a location for taxis when making improvements near BART.
 - 2547 b) Consult with on-demand transport service providers, such as public transit agencies, community
 - 2548 groups, hospitals, and businesses, especially those serving Berkeley's disabled community, to
 - 2549 see how their needs can be better met.
- 2550 **Policy AC-4.9: Transit Center.** Improve access to BART and enhance the Downtown BART Station
- 2551 as a transportation hub for other transit providers.

- 2552 a) Enhance access to BART on foot and by bike (see AC-1.1 and AC-5.2
- 2553 b) Study and, if feasible, support creating a new entrance to BART on the east side of Shattuck at
2554 Center to provide immediate and uninterrupted pedestrian access to the planned Center Street
2555 Plaza.
- 2556 c) Improve the BART Plaza's (aka Constitution Square's) function as a transit hub by implementing
2557 improvements that make it more pedestrian-friendly (see OS-1.2).
- 2558 d) Continue to seek ways to better integrate the transit modes serving Downtown with the BART
2559 Station, including taxis, shuttles and buses.
- 2560 **Policy AC-4.10: Transit and Bikes.** Encourage bicycle access to Downtown for local and regional
2561 transit trips.
- 2562 a) Near the Downtown Berkeley BART and other major transit stops (including any future transit
2563 stops), increase high-capacity bicycle parking (see AC-5.2). Support the expansion of the
2564 Downtown Berkeley bicycle station and additional high-quality bike storage at other major transit
2565 stops. Promote bicycle parking and service in a storefront adjacent to BART. .
- 2566 b) Encourage transit providers to expand bicycle access to transit vehicles, including increased
2567 storage on trains and buses.
- 2568 **Policy AC-4.11: Transit-Supportive Uses.** Concentrate housing, jobs, and cultural destinations in
2569 Downtown to be near transit, shops and amenities, while simultaneously enhancing its character and
2570 livability (see Goal LU-3.1).
- 2571 **GOAL AC-5: MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE SAFE, ATTRACTIVE AND CONVENIENT BICYCLE**
2572 **CIRCULATION WITHIN DOWNTOWN, AND TO AND FROM SURROUNDING AREAS, FOR**
2573 **PEOPLE OF ALL AGES AND ABILITIES. PROMOTE BICYCLING DOWNTOWN**
- 2574 **Policy AC-5.1: Bikeways and Bike Lanes.** Give bicycles priority over personal vehicles on many
2575 streets Downtown, by providing bikeways on low-speed low-traffic streets, and bike lanes where
2576 appropriate.
- 2577 a) Consider extending the bicycle route designation (i.e., a "Class 3" bicycle facility) on Allston Way
2578 from Milvia to Oxford Street, as an alternative to the existing bike lanes on Center Street, so as to
2579 make Allston Way the primary east-west bikeway through Downtown's Core Area to recognize
2580 that: bike lanes cannot be accommodated easily within a pedestrian-focused Center Street
2581 Plaza, and the the existing crosstown bike route on Allston extends west from Milvia, with the
2582 result that many bicyclists use Allston between Milvia and Oxford, in spite of the current
2583 availability of bike lanes on Center. Making Allston Way the primary bikeway through Downtown's
2584 Core Area should be contingent upon maintaining Allston as a low-traffic-speed roadway that
2585 facilitates bicycling. If extended, the Bicycle Route on Allston should be accompanied by a bike-
2586 and pedestrian-activated traffic light at Oxford.

- 2587 b) Consider locations in Downtown where bike-activated traffic lights would improve safety and
2588 convenience along streets with higher levels of bicycle use.
- 2589 c) Create continuous Class 2 bicycle lanes and/or separated Class 1 bicycle paths along Hearst
2590 Avenue from the Ohlone Greenway to the UC Berkeley campus (see AC-1.1 and OS 1.2).
- 2591 d) Seek to improve the Milvia Bicycle Boulevard by evaluating the feasibility of extending bike lanes
2592 where they are missing (i.e., between University Avenue and Allston Way), and establishing bike
2593 lanes if feasible.
- 2594 e) Enhance the Milvia Bicycle Boulevard by providing special treatments to calm traffic and improve
2595 safety. Specifically, consider ways to divert and/or discourage through traffic on Milvia through
2596 Downtown.
- 2597 f) Consider how to connect the bicycle route on Fulton Street (south of Dwight) to the bike lanes on
2598 Fulton-Oxford (north of Bancroft). Examine how to provide a more convenient route for
2599 northbound bicyclists.
- 2600 **Policy AC-5.2: Bicycle Parking.** Increase the supply of convenient, secure and attractive short-term
2601 and long-term bicycle parking throughout the mixed-use portions of the Downtown Area.
- 2602 a) Increase the availability of secured bicycle parking throughout Downtown, particularly in areas of
2603 high use, including bicycle parking options that are sheltered and/or attended.
- 2604 b) Increase the availability of bicycle racks throughout Downtown, especially where parking meter
2605 poles are removed.
- 2606 c) Provide bicycle parking facilities near transit centers and major destinations (see AC-4.10).
- 2607 d) Promote the creation of an at-grade attended or automated bicycle-parking service. Work with
2608 BART to consider replacing the existing bicycle station with a joint City/BART above-ground
2609 facility, perhaps in a storefront on Shattuck Avenue.
- 2610 e) Require the provision of secure bicycle parking facilities by new development projects (and major
2611 renovations), both public and private.
- 2612 **Policy AC-5.3: Bike Sharing.** Encourage the creation of "bike sharing" (i.e., convenient bike rental)
2613 programs Downtown, and their use by employees, residents, and visitors, especially near BART.
- 2614 a) Identify criteria for the design, program, and location of bike sharing facilities, by examining
2615 existing programs in North American and Europe. Solicit proposals from bike share providers for
2616 facilities consistent with these criteria. Give special consideration to locations near BART.
- 2617 **Policy AC-5.4: Business/Institutional Support.** Make it easier for Downtown employees to use
2618 bicycles, especially employees of the City, University, and BUSD.

- 2619 a) Require new office and retail construction and renovations (over a specified size) to provide
2620 showers and lockers for employees, so that bicyclists can change into work clothes at their
2621 destinations.
- 2622 b) Study the feasibility of subsidizing the cost of bicycles for Downtown employees. Work with
2623 Downtown employers and bicycle merchants to explore the potential for discounts for the
2624 purchase of bicycles.
- 2625 c) If bike sharing is established, consider reducing the cost of bike sharing for Downtown employees
2626 and others (see AC-5.3).
- 2627 d) Enhance the City's own bicycle program for City employees.