

This document contains questions and comments received regarding the Hayes Valley Parking and Curb Management Plan via an online feedback form and emails received by Raynell Cooper from April 13, 2021 to April 29, 2021, the day of the Public Hearing and Community Meeting. It also includes questions received in the Q & A at that meeting. **The responses to this document reflect the plan as it stood on April 29 and does not include any subsequent changes to the plan.** Addresses and names have been redacted. Where questions are asked or clarifying comments are needed, SFMTA has provided a response. The ID column connects feedback form responses across multiple questions.

Question: Do you have any feedback on the new RPP area, including its extent or the one car per household limit?

ID	Comment	SFMTA response
2	Many households depend on more than one car. Unless we had convenient and fast public transportation I don't think we can penalize households who rely on cars go go places, be it work, doctors or errands. I am against this drastic measure to reduce allowed permits from 4 to 1.	
5	I vehemently do NOT want to join the HVP RPP area and want to stay as part of the S RPP area. I live in the buffer zone on the north side of the 300 block of Hermann Street and never find myself visiting Hayes Valley. My principle shopping areas are the Castro and Mission districts. Duboce Triangle is NOT Hayes Valley and the streets touching Duboce Park should NOT be included in this plan. I know that I live at the dividing line between supervisor districts, as a resident of the north side of Hermann Street, but taking away my S parking pass would prevent me from visiting loved ones and my community, in favor of a parking pass that has no value to me. I am not part of the Hayes Valley neighborhood, I am part of Duboce Triangle! Leave the north side of the 300 block of Hermann Street out of this proposal! In addition, I oppose the one car per household limit.	The boundary used to create the HV RPP area is based on that of our community partner, the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association. Additionally, the 300 block of Hermann would still be part of Area S under this plan; the street itself is part of the buffer zone allowing both Area S and Area HV parkers to park on the street but residents would be eligible for just Area S.
6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I live with a roommate. This significantly impacts my ability to get a roommate in the future, as I require a car for work and would be unable to offer the ability to get a parking spot to a future roommate. I would probably have to move if this plan went ahead. 2. Webster St, especially south of Haight street (where I live), feels culturally a part of the Lower Haight/Duboce Triangle area. When I can't find parking within a block of my house, that's usually where I look to park. It should remain in the Area S RPP zone. 	

7	<p>Everything looks good except the Lower Haight area of the planned RPP area. It is decidedly a different neighborhood from Hayes Valley. I think the HV RPP area is fine and good, but I believe the buffer blocks that HV permits can be used should be expanded further into the S zone near Duboce Park, the Lower Haight, and generally west and east further. Parking currently is fine with the S zone near Fillmore, and I think you should either cut the zone off at Buchanan and west OR extend the buffer zone further between S and the proposed HV.</p>	
8	<p>My opinion is that this new RPP and one car per household is AWFUL!!! My wife and I have had two permits for almost 20 years, we are both native San Franciscans and find this proposed new limit punitive.</p>	
9	<p>Do not change anything with the RPP current area. It works fine the way it is. Reducing down to one car per household is too extreme. If you have a working family that needs their car to commute how do you expect them to get around? Public transportation isn't working at full capacity and not everyone works within the city.</p>	<p>The one permit per household limit would not take effect until the 2024 permit year.</p>
10	<p>The new RPP area does not make sense to me, it includes areas that are far from Hayes Valley, such as the block bordered by Webster and Fillmore on Hermann street and Waller street.</p> <p>I believe that the new RPP area will have an extremely negative impact on my quality of life and those of my neighbors. Additionally, I am against the 1 car per household policy. It is impractical given that many of us live with roommates or other persons with whom we cannot share a car. This means that the greatest burden of this new rule will be born by those with the lowest incomes, who cannot afford to pay for a garage or their own single family residence.</p>	

11	<p>1) It seems arbitrary to add the 300 block of Waller St to the Hayes Valley area. 2) If I am forced to only have a HV RPP, I will be living on the edge of a neighborhood with high parking demand, and will be denied the option of parking opportunities in the nearby S area; a net loss to me. 3) As a neighborhood resident for 23 years, I have learned how to work around the hours when parking is in high demand. The new plan looks as though it may make parking more difficult, not easier. 4) I have a job which requires a lot of driving, and my employer provides me with a car for work use, but it is not available to me for personal use. I have my own vehicle for traveling and personal use outside the city. Both vehicles have S stickers. I am opposed to the one car limit.</p> <p>Let the neighborhood visitors use taxis, or ride apps to come visit, as I do when I travel to other city neighborhoods. Please don't make it more difficult for residents for the sake of those visiting from without.</p>	<p>The intent of the plan is to make parking easier for residents as paid parking is likely to be less appealing to non-residents than two-hour parking.</p>
12	<p>Please allow for 2 or more parking permits. People have differing vehicles like a car and motorcycle.</p>	<p>Under the current proposal, a household would be able to have one permit each for a car and a motorcycle if there are two drivers.</p>

Under the current proposal, the vast majority of the Lower Haight neighborhood would remain in the S zone, while a small segment would be reclassified into the Hayes Valley zone. As a long-time resident of the Lower Haight, I am deeply concerned with this plan. I feel strongly that such a change would be extremely unfair to Lower Haight residents and would create undue hardship by separating our small neighborhood into 2 different RPP zones. Please do not alleviate the Hayes Valley parking problem at the expense of Lower Haight residents.

The new RPP area would be particularly detrimental to Lower Haight residents (such as myself) who live within the 4 blocks bound by Haight to the North, Fillmore to the West, Hermann to the South and Buchanan to the East. These blocks are included in the proposed "Hayes Valley" RPP zone, but they are definitively within the Lower Haight neighborhood. I feel strongly that these 4 blocks – *especially* the 2 blocks South of Haight between Fillmore and Webster – should remain in the same RPP zone as the rest of the Lower Haight so that Lower Haight residents can park freely throughout our small neighborhood and not be relegated to parking in the RPP zone of a nearby neighborhood that is not our own.

13

—SOLUTION A:

From Haight Street and Southward, change the Western border of the HV zone to Buchanan, and add the following 2 buffer zones where both S and HV permits are valid: (1) Laussat between Webster and Buchanan, and (2) Waller between Webster and Buchanan.

—SOLUTION B:

If Solution A is not feasible, please consider changing the border of the HV zone to Webster from Haight Street and Southward, and adding the same 2 buffer zones noted above (Laussat between Webster and Buchanan, and Waller between Webster and Buchanan). This is a particularly practical solution since Webster is already the proposed Western border North of Haight.

—SOLUTION C:

If solutions A and B are not feasible, please consider including the *entire* Lower Haight – or maybe even the entire segment of the S zone that is North of Market St – in the newly-proposed zone.

In summary, please either make the *entire* Lower Haight part of the new zone, or make

	<p>*none* of it part of the new zone, but whatever you do, please do not split the Lower Haight into 2 different RPPs. Please do not cutoff a section of our already small neighborhood.</p> <p>CONCERN 2: The limit of only 1 permit is excessively limiting and would create undue hardship for people living in shared units with people not of the same family. San Francisco is an extremely expensive place to live, and many, many people live with roommates to find lower rent. These roommates have entirely separate lives, jobs, and schedules, and therefore require their own cars. Limiting permits to only 1 per address would cause major problems for people (such as myself) who live with roommates and who would require 3 permits in order to accommodate all roommates. The change from 4 to 1 is far too drastic, too limiting, and is completely unfair to people who live with roommates.</p> <p>—SOLUTION: A limit of 2, with a possible extension to 3 for an extra fee, is much more reasonable given the number of people in communal, roommate living situations.</p>	
14	I think it is absolutely wrong and unfair to limit permits to only one per household.	
16	No changes to house hold limits Allow new RPP to park in S and R	

17	<p>Please stop this zone at haight st. I live on Hermann st and rely on what would be a mix of the S and HV zones to park, and would have a very difficult time if some of the safest/nearest areas would be removed from my allotted parking zone.</p> <p>Also, the notice I received in the mail referenced a flier and a map as enclosed and neither of those were actually included. It is possible that your physical mail outreach is extremely flawed if this is the case with other residents.</p> <p>Please also be clear: is it one pass per residential building or per apartment in a residential building? The language may be clear to you, but as a layperson, it is foggy. One per multi-apartment building would be terrible. My ancient car makes my work possible, and as an impoverished person in a neighborhood that is growing more expensive, I don't know that I can stay if things get even more difficult with parking. I understand that this is meant to ease parking issues, but living on the edge of the new zone may very well make it worse.</p>	<p>The map is available at SFMTA.com/HayesValleyParking. The policy as currently proposed would be one permit per household, meaning each individual apartment in a multi-unit building, not the building as a whole.</p>
18	<p>I am worried that there will be less parking, parking will now be so intensely regulated that it will be hard for people to visit the area and the added paid parking will take away from residential parking. I live on the corner of Hayes and Laguna and I will have a constant revolving door of people parking and getting out throughout my work day. I think two cars per household makes sense. If people have kids and one parent has to go to work and one is on child duty, one car doesnt make sense.</p>	
19	<p>I love the idea of making Fell St and other streets in Hayes valley RPP. I live at 540 Fell St and I have seen so many cars that are not from the neighborhood park here. They leave their cars here for days. Cars like these also attract thieves and break-ins that create unsafe environment for the neighborhood. I welcome this change!!!</p>	
20	<p>I like the plan.</p>	
22	<p>I'm in favor of the new RPP area, and would like to see it expanded even more through Hayes Valley. I'm also in favor of household limits.</p>	
23	<p>I love this plan! I live on one of the blocks without an RPP right now and it is a mess. I'm surrounded by Area S and and can't get a permit. Some of my SF native friends and I literally joke about how Area S is the best RPP because you can go anywhere. It can be great if you're in it, but it's not fair that someone who lives in Noe Valley also gest priority parking in Hayes Valley. It's just to far.</p>	

24	<p>I would like to comment on the reduction from 4 permits per household all the way down to 1. I don't agree with that decision as there are many households in the area that I've seen have multiple cars per household (my household included due to commuting requirements pre- and post-Covid) and I think that only allowing 1 car per household, along with the increased coverage of areas previously not enforced for RPP, will put</p> <p>I agree with the idea of reducing the amount of permits per household, and would propose a limit of 2 per household like other RPP areas in the city (AA and EE).</p>	
25	<p>I am concerned about the one car per household limit because it drastically reduces the current limit from 4 to 1. I think a limit such as 2 is far more reasonable while still reducing the number of permits by 50%. Many people who live in Hayes Valley live in combined households where they are not living with members of our family and cannot use just one car.</p> <p>I think the new area is great, though, and will significantly help finding parking. As someone who lives on Hayes Street, at the edge of the S zone, parking has been a pain and I typically only find spots many blocks away from where I live because I cannot search in all directions from my home.</p>	
26	<p>Lowering the household limit from 4 cars is a great idea. It may make sense to provide more clarity for who will be eligible for a second permit, as the current proposal is ambiguous.</p> <p>While separating the area from the larger RPP areas makes sense, the new proposed zoning seems to have almost no RPP only parking, particularly the southern and eastern portions of the zone. It would be more fair to residents to make more RPP only and limit the amount of hybrid or pay only areas rather than the current proposal.</p>	<p>Under the proposal, a second permit would be available if the permit is for a motorcycle, if the permit is for an in-home medical care or childcare provider, or if an occupancy study shows that there is enough available parking on the street to allow for a second permit.</p>
27	<p>I have grave concerns about the proposed new RPP area. First, I live in a 24-unit apartment building at the corner of McAlister and Gough. How will multi-unit apartment buildings be handled? Are there limits on the number of permits available to residents of such buildings? Available materials don't address this. Already reducing to 1 permit for household seems like it will be a nightmare for many residents. Would they be expected to sell their vehicles? For example, I just moved from an apartment building on Oak and Laguna where I had the second vehicle of the household. I need my car to commute to work. Having to rely on an</p>	<p>The proposed permit limit is one per household, so each apartment in a multifamily building would be eligible for a permit. The one-block buffer is our standard policy for new areas and Golden Gate was outside of the project scope as originally defined.</p>

obscure waiver system to be able to legally park my car seems problematic. SFMTA I'm sure has the data on how many permits they plan to eliminate by moving to 1-permit per household. I'm sure there's also a plan for how many exceptions it will offer. What's the plan for larger apartment buildings. Can the public get more clarity on these areas?

Moving past that hypothetical, the proposed zone greatly limits where I would be able to park which makes me very nervous and concerned. It appears the proposed zone would be one of the smallest in the city. However, those that are smaller have unregulated parking nearby, which reduces the strain of limited zoned spaces. As a member of the R zone, currently, I have a range of nearby blocks where I can park (namely, up Laguna north of McAlister, and on Golden Gate, McAlister, or Fulton). However, the newly proposed zone would prohibit me from parking anywhere north of McAlister (save 2 small north-south curbs). Not only is the new zone objectively limiting geographically, it is severely limiting for someone like me, a resident in the northeastern quadrant of the proposed district. The vast majority of nearby curb spaces are already reserved for paid parking without exception. Further, parking on Gough is a bad proposition because it has street sweeping 3 days a week so even if you find a spot there you'll regularly need to move to a different spot elsewhere in the zone. This is important to highlight because the frequency of street sweeping practically limits how many available spaces are near me. At a minimum, it highlights the importance of flexibility in parking options. Even if I were to park on Gough, I need to be ready to move to elsewhere in the zone daily (e.g., park on Monday morning, move Tuesday for midnight street sweeping, re-park Wednesday). Obviously, I'd need somewhere to move my car to. Without having the option of Golden Gate or anything north of it, I anticipate I'll be circling the block looking for parking or end up parking half a mile from my home.

For residents like me and those that live near me, the flexibility of the R permit is a Godsend. At least with the way things are now, I know if I can't find a space near me there are other blocks north of me in the R zone that will have parking available. What makes the proposal so concerning is the plan recommends making McAlister between Laguna and Gough a buffer zone. As I said, north of McAlister the R zone already offers plenty of available parking. I'm concerned that this buffer zone won't be necessary for R zone holders but will further limit the likelihood that my neighbors and I will be able to park near our homes. Thinking about this northeastern quadrant of the proposed district, I worry this proposal would only promote the very thing you sought to eliminate—out-of-neighborhood

	<p>parkers. Why not offer buffer zones on Golden Gate Avenue for HV members instead? Why further limit spaces available to residents like me by making the one nearby, available block open to R zone permit holders as well? Not only would this plan be restricting where I can park near my residence (by eliminating Golden Gate options) but it would put me in competition with R residents too. At a bare minimum, please at least make the buffer zone reciprocal and allow HV residents to park on Golden Gate.</p>	
28	<p>Very happy to see this! I do think that each household should have at least 2 permits allowed. 4 is too many agreed but most may have more than 1 car.</p>	
29	<p>Yes, I do. I am absolutely outraged that this proposal includes a one car per household limit. This largely disadvantages residents of the community who cannot afford to commute without a car, given the costly alternatives (including time spent) of our public transportation options/ridesharing. Further, the jump from 4 to 1 is equally preposterous. I would love to learn more about the data that went into this decision. Forcing households to choose only one of their cars for the permit when there are undoubtedly several Hayes Valley households that don't have any cars is inequitable, and it will not stand.</p>	
30	<p>The one car per household limit is supported by an unfounded, entirely fabricated concept that Hayes Valley residents consist of exclusively families.</p>	
31	<p>Having just coming out of a pandemic, I feel this is not the right time to limit parking permits to one-per-household. Who needs a permit? Typically it's lower wage working people, many who work late night shifts in hospitals. Many students also need to drive to and from school, often living in flats with multiple people who also commute to work or school and also need a permit. I know this will take place in the future, but with the fraught state of public transportation in the Bay Area, and the fact that San Francisco is not great for commuting in general, I urge you to hold off on this proposal. Don't make it harder for those who live and pay taxes here, and are forced to drive to work or school.</p>	

32	<p>I strongly support the new RPP area. As a resident of the neighborhood who lives on an unregistered block, it has been incredibly difficult to find and maintain parking, as my household is ineligible at present for obtaining a zoned parking permit. I rearrange my schedule weekly to ensure I can find parking and limit the use of my car due to the added stress of being able to find parking on the few blocks I am able to park on at present.</p> <p>In regard to the one car per household limit, two permits per household may be more realistic, especially in households home to multiple young professionals who need to commute.</p>	
33	<p>I am opposed to the proposed new RPP area. The plan to extend this Hayes Valley initiative to the Lower Haight does not make sense. We have lived at Webster and Waller in the Lower Haight for 26 year, we own one car, do not have a garage and park on the street. We do not park our car down the hill in Hayes Valley. Per this plan less than 500 feet from our house at the end of the Webster Street (between Hermann and Duboce) or around the corner on Waller (across Fillmore) is out of our residential area, but Van Ness and McAllister would be included. The idea of a buffer zone around this new RRP area will not benefit those in the Lower Haight who have been arbitrarily lopped off from the neighborhood, but rather allow those who remain in the S permit area to continue to park where they always have without any impact.</p> <p>The one car per household limit is a blow to the working class, families and households with roommates. Imposing a one car per household limit is forcing lifestyle changes to households that have no option other than owning more than one car. Our neighborhood is filled with families that need two cars daily when family needs conflict with work needs. Also households with roommates, rather than families, would need to decide who gets to keep their car. The jump from four to one car is too drastic.</p>	
34	<p>I am a psychotherapist and work out of my office at 423 Gough St., Suite E. I have a a business parking permit. There are seven other psychotherapists, each an independent business, operating out of other suites at 423 Gough St. Some of those other therapists also have parking permits for their businesses. It is essential for my business that SFMTA continue to recognize that each suite at 423 Gough St. (suites A-H) is a separate business address and entitled to one parking permit.</p>	
35	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The "Buffer Area" should be extended to include Laussat and Waller from Webster to Buchanan. 2. The "Buffer Area" should include the southern portion of Buchanan as well as the 	

	<p>northern portion.</p> <p>This would help elderly people, like myself, who live at the current boundary of the "S" zone. With recent changes already made by your department, about 40 nearby parking spots have been restricted from me with my "S" sticker. The suggestions I am making here will allow me, as 70 year old man, to actually find parking within a few blocks of my home. Please consider and act on my request!!</p>	
36	<p>Yes!!! The proposed plan adversely affect homeowners with large families. I am a homeowner that has been a resident since June 1947. I have suffered many changes that were made under the guise of need and progress.</p> <p>The area in the plan extends farther than needed. That old-timers like me are suffering because our needs are not met. Due to technological changes the information highway has passed us by.</p>	
37	<p>I have lived on the Webster x Haight street for over 20 years and parking in the LOWER HAIGHT neighborhood has always been difficult. Notice I say LOWER HAIGHT and not Hayes Valley. I don't agree with that the changes proposed should be extended into our neighborhood as most people trying to go to the HV neighborhood don't park 5 blocks away. We have always had the RP here which is fine and doesn't need any changes in our neighborhood.</p> <p>There are many residents here who have families and seniors and these changes to the LH neighborhood would only make it extremely difficult for those that require a vehicle to get through life. I also do not believe it is acceptable to have 1 RP per household as many of our households need more than 1 vehicle.</p> <p>Finally instead of wasting time and money on new parking regulations start by cleaning up our streets. No one will want to even go to the neighborhoods to eat or shop if they are filthy from garbage, human waste and homeless.</p>	
38	<p>the number of allowed units per household should be increased. One per unit is not sufficient.</p>	
39	<p>I am very excited about and supportive of this change, and am excited to see the city start to widen the area of the city with paid parking. I hope efforts like this can be expanded to other neighborhoods! We are a one car household, but I do understand how the one car</p>	

	restriction could be a burden on households with children, disabled members, or elderly folks and think there should be some sort of application / exemption process	
42	I'm so happy to see this plan and can't wait for it's implementation. I lived in the S permit area for 5 years before moving to Hayes Valley and owned a car for 2 of those years (and still do). I share the hope & expectation that this will drastically improve the parking (and to an extent, congestion) situation in our neighborhood	

Question: Do you have any feedback on the new on-street parking regulations associated with this plan, such as Pay or Permit parking, streets receiving meters, and the standardization of hours of enforcement across the RPP area?

ID	Comment	SFMTA response
3	Keep the parking areas as is. It costs a lot of money to put up signs and enforce new areas. Lots of costs to plan and implement. Parking is already tough and permit parking zones don't seem to help. Don't add more paid permit parking. Stop trying to increase costs for residents. Waste of time and money	
5	I dislike this entire proposal.	
7	Looks great - only comment is on the actual boundaries of the zone incorporating the Lower Haight when it is not Hayes Valley. Please extend buffer blocks further into S areas OR keep blocks west of Buchanan as S.	
8	The ability to park at meters in the area without "paying" is a good idea. The hours are fine.	
9	Residential streets should not have parking meters. SFMTA will be outfitting meter maid vehicles with license plate scanners so the problem with chalking is not an issue. You guys keep trying to add more ways to tax the residents of the city and you never give anything back other than increasing fees and fines every single year. You guys need to stop with the non-sense	While SFMTA is indeed outfitting parking control vehicles with license plate recognition technology to increase the efficacy of time limit enforcement, vehicles still need to make multiple passes to enforce time

		limits while just needing to make one pass to enforce Pay or Permit parking.
11	If RPP permits will waive parking fees, and not reduce parking for residents, then I don't object.	
12	Very importantly, I have paid for an S zone 2022 RPP permit that will be changed to an HV permit in your 2021 plan. Will you permit us to exchange our S permit to an HV permit?	We will ensure the transition from Areas R and S to HV does not lead to permitholders paying more.
14	This is an outrageous overreach to extend permit permit times to Saturday and extending the hours. We should be eliminating all for pay meters as these are the public commons that we all own, but there should still be parking time time limits on those meters and a ticket, should you exceed the parking requirements.	
16	No new meter only areas, always pay or RPP	
17	I think this should be employed in the haight and north area if really needed. My few blocks near Hermann/Market/Church/Waller/Buchanan are probably not getting so much pressure.	
18	See above. We have enough metered parking on hayes st	
19	Perfect solution!!!! I am a nurse in the ICU at CPMC and I really appreciate you making exceptions for healthcare and childcare workers. Please make it happen. Thank you!	
20	I've felt for a long time that we needed to implement more S permit parking zones in the neighborhood particularly on Fell Street. We see many people from other areas of the city drive into Hayes just to park on Fell, then come move their cars once a week during street cleaning. Having the 2 hour parking zone might help free up those spots for residents of Hayes Valley.	
21	By extending the Pay Parking area, you are encouraging more outside driving into Hayes Valley, instead of trying to improve public transit. So much for Vision Zero and trying to reduce carbon emissions. Many of our streets have become so engulfed with traffic, now that the pandemic crisis is easing, to make for an unpleasant and dangerous environment for residents and visitor alike who prefer to walk or ride their bicycle. I would expect a bit more of a bold vision from the MTA. You are not moving in the right direction. Your priority should be for safer, less congested streets. Local residents have voiced their concerns for years (take Haight Street, for once), nothing serious has been done to this date.	Paid parking in San Francisco helps fund our transit system. Pay or Permit parking is not meant to induce car use from outside of the area but to better manage the demand that is already there on these blocks.
22	I'm in favor of Pay or Permit, it's a fair balance between residents and visitors.	

23	Pay or Permit sounds good. However, the map provided has so many colored and dashed lines that I can't tell what blocks are normal RPP and which are 'Pay or Permit'	The detailed proposal is available in the official legislation.
24	I am concerned that both the extension of paid parking areas, as well as the extended enforcement hours may negatively impact the employees who must commute into the area for work. The proposal mentions the benefits to the customers of these restaurants and businesses, but doesn't seem to take into account that the employees will now be required to pay more for parking than in the current system.	Employees who choose to drive to Hayes Valley would have to pay to park on the Pay or Permit blocks but would not have to move their car as often.
26	<p>This proposal to convert a number of blocks to "pay or permit" seems likely to encourage more traffic in the area and is unfair to residents who purchase a parking permit. The blocks between Octavia and Laguna (and extending to Buchanan on Haight) are almost exclusively residential, with many of these blocks containing primarily mutli-unit buildings that do not offer off-street parking. These blocks should be RPP only. It seems odd that the majority of the businesses in the area are on or near Hayes street, yet there are more RPP only zones on the streets near Hayes than in the southern portion of the zone.</p> <p>Adding more meters to the neighborhood would seem to encourage non-residents to drive and park in the area versus taking alternative transportation, and these spots would not be available for residents. It seems like the amount of meters being added to the neighborhood is being driven by a desire for the city to collect more revenue as opposed to actually making the neighborhood better for those that live here.</p>	Currently, upwards of 50% of cars parked on many blocks in the area, including many of the planned Pay or Permit blocks, are non-permitted vehicles, so the proposal is aimed at addressing the parking availability issues caused by out-of-area drivers by replacing free time-limited parking with paid parking for people without permits.
27	I understand the logic of adding more metered parking to generate more turnover. The plan brushes aside the fact that the con of this is charging visitors to park in what was previously free parking. I worry that will make Hayes Valley even less accessible for non-wealthy San Franciscans or visitors.	
28	Per the new map-the 600 block of Buchanan st which is all residential, would be pay parking only. Given this block is all residential would highly prefer permit only or at a minimum pay or permit similar to linden and fell blocks adjacent. The 700 block of Buchanan has no residential and is next to the community center and that could be pay only.	The 600 block of Buchanan, per the plan, would be traditional RPP with a two-hour limit for people without permits.
33	Establishing metered street parking into residential streets away from businesses only harms the residents. You are charging residents to have guests visit.	Visitor and guest permits will still be available.
36	The permanent residents need long-term parking spaces. My grandchildren live with me. They work during the day. They may or may not go somewhere on the weekend. SMTA TOOK AWAY FIFTEEN PARKING SPACES WITH THE NEW ENLARGED CIRCULAR CURBS	

	TRYING TO MAKE WALKERS THAT ARE NOT PAYING ATTENTION SAFE.	
38	the number of allowed units per household should be increased. One per unit is not sufficient.	
39	Very supportive!	
40	I oppose the plan to turn Linden into metered parking. As well as extending the metered times. Linden is one of only 2 streets without meters or Residential requirements on the eastern side. Including the only place for parking for many small apartments that border that street. I live at 350 Gough in a 20+ apartment building but was told my street was considered commercial and did not qualify. Either change that rule or keep the space we currently have.	
42	<p>I think the only downside to this whole program as it is, is that low-income neighbors/visitors/employees will be disproportionately affected. I know that's an extremely difficult reality to create policy around, but I think it's worth trying to find something. A credit-based program (where folks could get something like a prepaid card good for specifically parking using the pay program) is one idea that comes to mind.</p> <p>Similar to something mentioned in the April 29th community meeting about this, I'd love to see SFMTA (and the whole city) lobby the state to allow charging more for RPPs. I know it would be difficult given city policy on the profits of parking programs, but that is another way we might create a more equitable parking situation. Ultimately, I think, the goal should be to equally discourage all from using (private) cars when possible.</p>	

Question: Do you have any feedback on the proposal to extended meter hours until 10pm Monday-Saturday, and 12-6pm on Sundays?

ID	Comment	SFMTA response
2	I am against such proposal.	
3	Keep it the way it is and don't change it. It's already expensive enough	
5	I do not want meters to collect on Sundays or after 10pm on weekdays. I do not these want changes.	
6	This will make it very hard for bars in the area to operate.	
7	Great.	

8	I don't like having folks pay until 10pm, most businesses are not open that late. The hours should be no later than 6-7pm at the latest. Sundays should be/stay free.	
9	Businesses are not open until 10pm on Hayes street. Only a handful of businesses are and this plan is too extreme. Most businesses close at 9pm. And Sunday meter parking will drive away customers.	
10	These hours seem excessive. In particular inclusion of weekend permit requirements.	
11	If RPP permits will waive parking fees, and not reduce parking for residents, then I don't object.	RPP permit holders will be able to park for free in RPP and Pay or Permit spaces. They would still have to pay at the traditional metered spaces in the area.
12	I find this to be unacceptable. Please keep the times 12-6pm on all days. It's bad enough you have taken away our free parking moratorium on Sundays. Have a heart for the people you serve who deserve one free day of parking on Sundays.	
13	Meters should not require money on Sundays.	
14	Please stop this unnecessary harassment, we get home from work and need a place to park and now you want more money? These meters should be 6pm standardized and we've been through the Sunday meter game before and it was stopped. Give us a break for one day a week please!	
16	No Sunday meters No extended hours No new meters only streets	
17	No, I don't live or shop on Hayes. I don't have that kind of income.	
18	If I have a friend come from out of town I am confused as to where they will park in this situation. It makes it virtually impossible	Guest permits will still be available for longer-term visits, and increased meter hours will increase availability.
19	Perfect proposal!!!!	
20	I'm not sure why we need metered parking on Sundays. Seems a bit excessive to me.	
22	I'm in favor of extending meter hours as much as possible.	
23	Extended meters is fine. The RPP is just Monday to Friday though correct? The neighbors deserve an RPP zone, but it would not be fair to businesses if parking was also limited for customers on Saturdays.	This proposal would set uniform days and hours of enforcement for all traditional RPP and Pay or Permit blocks to Monday-Saturday, 9am-9pm

24	I am concerned that the extended enforcement hours may negatively impact the employees who must commute into the area for work. The proposal mentions the benefits to the customers of these restaurants and businesses, but doesn't seem to take into account that the employees will now be required to pay more for parking than in the current system.	
26	I do not think any meters should be added on the purely residential blocks as said in response to question 5. If you have evidence that meter hours discourages parking rather than encourages, then the extended timing is fine, but I do not think you should not be implementing measures likely to encourage non-residents to drive to the area.	
27	I'm not in favor of the Sunday meter extensions. Please leave that open as it currently is.	
28	Given most restaurants are not late night, not sure I see the need. As well for Sunday. But personally care much more about my block not being paid only given all residential here.	
36	12 to 6pm is reasonable to Sundays with special provisions or exceptions during church worship hours. Does it seem reasonable to you to have residents running out every two hours to feed a meter? 10pm may be ok for people who are shopping or people patronizing restaurants, etc., but it certainly will adversely affect those who are living above the businesses.	
37	I do not think meters should run until 10p as this seems to late maybe 8p.	
39	I think this is great!	
40	Oppose. As a resident that is unable to get a residential parking permit since the street I live on is considered 'commercial' - I only manage to keep my car by counting on the fact that I can still get parking in the evenings and weekend when I get home from work. This doesn't actually help residents find parking, it would just take more money from us that aren't allowed to get a residential parking permit.	
41	Strong support but having enough PCOs to enforce this is the key	
42	I think it's great. Given that the two hour base allowance shrinks the effective times of enforcement, this makes sense to me.	

Question: Do you have any feedback on the plans for additional passenger and commercial loading space along and around Hayes Street?

ID	Comment	SFMTA response
----	---------	----------------

5	No, I don't ever visit Hayes Street, as a resident of the north side of the 300 block of Hermann Street.	
7	Excellent.	
8	I don't believe there needs to be additional passenger zones. I think there is an abundance of space available for commercial parking at this time.	
9	Why are passenger zones needed if you are encouraging people to use other means of transportation?	Passenger and commercial loading zones make for a safer street environment for active transportation modes and faster service on transit.
11	If we ever get back to the level of ride app activity which we had before the pandemic, we will need this space, and its use should be enforced. Traffic and double parking caused by Uber and Lyft was rude, inconsiderate, and extensive.	
12	When you remove the restaurant parklets this will regain parking spaces again in this area.	The Shared Spaces program is outside of the scope of this project, but this proposal has been created with the assumption that most of the outdoor dining zones will remain.
14	You should follow the example of cities like New York and only allow deliveries in the morning hours in most cases unless those delivery zones end at like 1pm.	
17	No, I don't live or shop on Hayes. I don't have that kind of income.	
18	That will take away from more parking.	
20	If this would help keep cars and trucks from double parking on Hayes I'm all for it. But I'm not sure we could open up enough loading zones to actually cut down on the double parking.	
22	I'm favor of loading space over parking space. The need for loading space will only increase as people stop driving their own cars.	
23	GREAT IDEA.	
27	I understand the need to expand commercial loading space, particularly as outdoor dining (justifiably) eliminated a number of parking spaces. I would just raise the question that this entire plan seems to hinge on the erasure of many parking permits in order to be viable. Still, as I raised above, even that effort would not benefit residents in my corner of the proposed zone as few curb faces would actually be available to us to park. (Apologies for speaking about another matter here.)	

36	As soon as the pandemic is over, please remove the units in front of the restaurants that are blocking the sidewalks and taking up parking spaces. I object to reserving space for passenger and commercial loading space. You can not solve this parking problem during this day and time when Amazon, FedEx, Postal Services, etc. are constantly delivering packages and food.	
37	As long as they are being used as I see many loading zones that are not being utilized and vehicles are still double parking while the designated zone sits empty. So no until you can actively enforce this it just takes away more parking spaces.	
39	Would love to see the addition of passenger / commercial loading zones with dedicated curb space to reduce congestion and improve pedestrian & bike safety. Maybe Uber / Lyft / Doordash could pay to have access to the curb at peak hours?	
41	Loading zones is essential	
42	Just that I hope consideration is given to bike lanes and making all non-private-car forms of transportation safe & viable.	

Question: Do you have any other questions, comments, or feedback related to parking and curb management in Hayes Valley?

ID	Comment	SFMTA response
3	Do not make any changes. Stop wasting tax payer money	
4	My question is about the new zone, my residence 5[XX] Octavia St is not currently "zoned" for a parking permit because of the businesses even though there are more than 15 apartments at the address and multiple residents of my building cannot currently get parking permits. It looks like this entire block is included in the new zone, is there a way to find out if my residence will now be eligible for a permit with this new zoning?	Your residence will now be eligible for an area HV parking permit under this plan.
5	Duboce Triangle is NOT Hayes Valley. Leave the north side of the 300 block of Hermann Street out of this proposal!	
7	Please extend buffer zones further out, particularly the blocks in the Lower Haight to extend to Duboce Park and west a few blocks generally as HV/S zones.	
8	I think that most of these proposals are financially taxing on residents and visitors to the area. Please do not allow these the majority of these proposals to move forward. Thank you. A highly concerned second generation San Franciscan!!!!	

9	SFMTA wastes too much money on creating plans and the implementation is even worse. You guys are terrible. Stop wasting tax payer money and stealing from the people. You guys try to increase revenue year to pay your inflated salaries. With all these new strategies you guys think up you never ever reduce fines or parking fees. It's not fair.	
10	I understand that the goal of this project is to improve traffic and parking, however I think that many of the plans do not consider the negative impacts that will be felt most by those residents with the fewest resources.	
11	No on the one car per household limit!	
12	Taxation upon citizens is part and parcel for finding free subsidization for the city's municipal transportations lack of revenue. This is one way to manage the lack of funding needs for our enormous transportation systems. Since you have not provided people to park under the newly constructed housing projects this has forced more people to park on the streets. You have created this parking problem and are solving it by creating more paid parking zones. By doing this you are able to tax some citizens without taxing everyone. Where is the fairness to citizens when only a few are taxed for all citizens?	
13	Will people who live on a "buffer zone" street have the option to purchase either the HV permit OR the bordering permit? Can people who live on a "buffer zone" street purchase both permits?	Residents on buffer zone streets will only get to purchase the permits of the area that their address is part of. The buffer zones only affect the regulation of the street itself.
14	Please stop limiting gouging and taking away more and more parking, we have lost so much to the parklets and you should enforce and ticket the double parked delivery trucks for a change.	
15	Does these plans include the fact that probably year 2022 there will be a Trader Joe's grocery store at laguna & Fulton.	The Trader Joe's will open with customer parking. We will continue to monitor parking trends in the neighborhood throughout implementation, which will include the opening of the Trader Joe's
17	I'd prefer that my few blocks be removed from this project at this time. Being on the cusp of the new zone would really make parking difficult and I need my car for work. I can't afford to just park somewhere else (like a private garage spot if one were even available nearby) or join a car share program. Please trim back the zone to haight st and north if you really must change the zones. Please leave Hermann/Waller/Buchanan/church/market area out of it. Thank you for taking the time to read all of this.	

18	The real parking problem in hayes valley is all the construction that is going on. Can we please find a way for construction to not take up parking?	Construction permits are not under the purview of the Parking & Curb Management Team.
20	Is the Bus Zone at the corner of Fell and Laguna being enforced? Since COVID none of the companies have been using Buses so I assume that's not been enforced. But I'm curious to know for sure. And when will it be enforced in the future? Thank you.	Commuter shuttle enforcement is currently suspended. There has been no timetable for return announced.
22	Thanks for you work on this. Would love to see much more in this direction. Space is at an extreme premium in San Francisco, and Hayes Valley specifically. The cost to store a car in a parking space should be commensurate with the value of space and land in our neighborhood.	
23	I would like a clearer answer or diagram showing where is 'normal RPP' and where is 'Pay or Permit RPP.'	The detailed proposal is available in the official legislation.
25	Thank you for making changes!	
26	You should re-open street parking on Page street. With the safe streets seemingly becoming permanent and the lack of traffic due to closing highway access, the protected bike lane is no longer needed. Your own prior parking study showed that this was one of the most occupied parking blocks overnight, so you know that residents need, use, and want this parking.	That bike lane is part of the Page Street Bikeway Improvement Pilot, which will be brought back before the SFMTA board later this year. More information is available at the project website: https://www.sfmta.com/projects/page-street-bikeway-improvements-pilot
27	Is this plan an inevitability? Overall, I feel the newly proposed zone will be a major downgrade from my current experience. I understand many of the proposed changes. However, I'm very concerned about how much it will limit parking options for residents that live in my area of the proposed zone. Please pay attention to this dynamic you are creating.	The Parking and Curb Management Team will make decisions based on feedback from the public hearing process. The final version of the plan will then be presented to the SFMTA Board this summer.
28	With the board meeting this summer-if approved when would the new permits go into Effect and be available?	The changes would be rolled out in late 2021 and early 2022.
33	In the 26 years I have been a resident of the Lower Haight, I have never heard or seen any outreach from the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association. This plan does not appear to have the interest of my neighborhood and its residents in mind, but is designed only to support the Hayes Valley commercial businesses. It is another blow to an often overlooked, working class, family oriented residents of the Lower Haight in order to benefit the businesses in Hayes Valley.	

33	In the 26 years I have been a resident of the Lower Haight, I have never heard or seen any outreach from the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association. This plan does not appear to have the interest of my neighborhood and its residents in mind, but is designed only to support the Hayes Valley commercial businesses. It is another blow to an often overlooked, working class, family oriented residents of the Lower Haight in order to benefit the businesses in Hayes Valley.	
36	There is pro and cons to every plan you have presented. This neighborhood use to only serve families and children. Changes in our neighborhood has even forced Sacred Heart church, Sacred Heart School, the Nuns and the Priests out this neighborhood. The church on lower page was forced to move to Oakland. Many died and others moved to other cities and States. I'm still here and in behalf of other residents and myself and family, I plead my case. Many of the changes have been an injustice. What side of justice are you on???	
38	Will multi-unit homes be allowed one permit per the unit or one permit per home?	One per unit.
40	Please don't take away any currently open parking. Especially those that don't require residential parking permits given the limited number of streets with it currently and the fact that those that live in the area do not automatically get a residential parking permit to park in the other areas being created. Maybe try with a public parking lot and have pick up allowed in there. Lastly, will those that live in an apartment on a street that is currently deemed 'commercial' meaning we cannot get a RPP now be able to or does the same rule apply?	This plan includes an expansion of what buildings are eligible for RPP.
42	This overlaps directly with the BoS's authority over the shared spaces programs, but given recent accidents where cars ran into shared spaces in SF, I would love to see barriers/bollards or widened sidewalks to accommodate these (very much welcome) spaces. Finally, thank you so much for the time & energy you're putting into this!	

Emailed Questions and Comments:

Comment	SFMTA response
---------	----------------

I am a longtime residents of Hayes Valley since 1983. I've seen a lot of changes in the neighborhood since then. I'm writing regarding some of the concerns I have about some of the Hayes Valley Parking & Curb Management Plan.

I live within the Hayes Valley RPP Area(Area HV). Parking on the street has become more difficult over the past few years. Some of this is contributed to the additional housing that continues to be added into the neighborhood without any additional parking within those new buildings.

As an example is the Mercy housing at 455 Fell St. There are 72 new housing units with no contained parking for the building. Residence of 455 Fell Street use the neighborhood street parking and the added cars add more pressure for parking in the neighborhood. Underground parking should have been included in the plans for this building and should be included in all future building which may occur in the Hayes Valley.

When new construction is planned for Hayes Valley are there discussion with SFMTA about the impact of new additional parking to the neighborhood?

I myself have two trucks, one is a 1986 truck(my baby) which I paid resident parking for many years. I would like to be able to continue to purchase the two resident parking stickers for both of my trucks. I don't want to have to sell one of my trucks just because I can't get a parking permit for my own neighborhood.

I also think the enforcement of the for metered parking within the RPP and Parking metered area for Sunday's noon to 6pm is excessive. Paying for parking on Sunday was dropped throughout the entire City a few years ago. Citizens as well as visitors objected to it. Why should one neighborhood Hayes Valley be slotted out to return to paid parking on Sundays when other neighborhoods are excluded?

Also, do you have any influence and getting a stop sign at the corner of Octavia Boulevard and Linden Street on the west side of the park? This is within the RPP area. The direction of Linden Street was changed one way from west to east a few years ago and corner curve was added. I wrote Mark Dreger at SFMTA about this but no action has been taken. Many Hayes Valley residents and visitors walk along Octavia Street near the park and with their dogs. Many cars

With regards to the amount of off-street parking included with new developments, the Planning Department, not the SFMTA, sets those regulations. This plan is an attempt to address the increased on-street parking demand noted in this comment. In addition, the Market-Octavia Plan includes recommendations for how to manage the curb in light of new development, including a one-per-household limit for residential parking permits. With regards to Sunday metering, Hayes Valley is one of a number of neighborhoods that the Parking and Curb Management team is working with to explore evening and Sunday metering. The outreach process for those other neighborhoods is ongoing. We will forward the stop sign request to our traffic engineering section.

<p>travel too quickly down Linden alley and then turn right quickly onto Octavia straight without stopping; there is no stop sign there. Is SFMTA waiting for someone to get hurt or pets hurt Before putting a stop sign at the corner?</p> <p>Thank you Raynell for reviewing my concerns regarding the Hayes Valley Parking Curb Management Plan.</p> <p>I look forward to attending your meeting on April 29.</p>	
<p>I'd like to provide comments on the Hayes Valley RPP Area policy we received in the mail which proposed a limit to the number of parking permits to one per individual and no more than one per household. The limit on one per household is completely unreasonable based on current housing structure and cost of living here in San Francisco. We are 4 individuals living in a 4 bedroom apartment on Page St. Because the price of rent is so high, we have no choice but to live in a roommate situation. Our apartment does not have a purchasable option for a garage spot, in fact neither does any apartment in our 3 apartment building. Two of us need cars for our employment. If we were limited to only a single permit for the household, we would be forced to move from an apartment we've lived in for almost 5 years. A single permit per individual is a fair policy to meet in the middle, but limiting to a single permit per household would give us no other option than to move from an apartment and community we have called our own for many years. There are very few people who would be able to afford a \$7,000 rent per month on their own with only a single vehicle to do work. This policy furthers the gap of affordability in SF.</p>	
<p>I have a few comments/questions about the HV RPP project. For background: I live in a corner of the new proposed zone that has no buffer parking zones with another zone nor proposed RPP spots on my block (i.e. the 000 block of Page Street at Franklin). Meaning, I am almost guaranteed to park 2+ blocks, often more as is to park in either the S zone or this new zone. I am not asking for this project to be scrapped, but reconsidered on what the boundaries will be or which streets are purely meter streets vs hybrid. [original email contained a line break here that was not successfully copied over] The new RPP area looks to be one of the smaller RPP zones in the city, I have concerns this is not enough spots for the residents within the proposed RPP zone (existing or newly added to the zone), for example, almost all residents between Franklin and Gough have little to no parking spots on their block, forcing them westward (as there is no RPP buffer to the east/Civic Center area. Could there be additional blocks between Franklin and Gough added where it is the new proposed hybrid of meters and RPP (minus</p>	<p>Area HV will be smaller than some RPP areas but will very likely have more spaces than permits, as there are currently just under 1,000 RPP permitholders and approximately 1,500 spaces (though the number of permitholders would go up as more become eligible under this plan). Because most of the blocks between Franklin and Gough are predominantly commercial or other non-residential uses, those blocks will remain as paid parking. Construction permits are reviewed and approved by the Department of</p>

<p>school zones or other similar needs, of course)? [line break] Over the past few months or so, there has been a drastic number of new construction permits issued that blocks a ton of spaces for extended periods of time within this new zone, will the city further limit such permits, once this zone is implemented? I've specifically noticed the increase on Octavia, Laguna, and Buchanan streets. This has historically caused myself to park almost at the opposite side of the S RPP zone at times (i.e. Duboce Park, Castro, or even Noe Valley). Given the proposed limited area, I have big concerns there will be no spots at times within the zone. [line break] Was there a study to see if the parking limitations currently are caused by cars on the other side of the S RPP zone, or ones in the general area or buffer streets? This raises questions that while there is a claim this adds spots, it will only make the situation worse (as in reality it limits where those in the new zone can park). I am unable to attend the public meeting, but hopefully these can be answered in the meeting (if being recorded) or responded to in a public document later on, well before the proposal goes up for final approval by the SFMTA board.</p>	<p>Public Works, not the SFMTA. Current parking challenges are caused in part by cars that do not have permits: across studies conducted both before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, on the currently-RPP blocks that are proposed for to become Pay or Permit, less than half of the cars parked had permits.</p>
<p>I hope this email finds you happy and well. I am reaching out in regards to the proposed plan for Hayes Valley Parking & Curb Management. My husband and I have been residents of Hayes Valley for over 15 years and our family has been homeowners since 1979. We are in objection to the proposals below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limiting the number of RPP permits to no more than one per household. My husband and I both work and have 2 young children who are in daycare and need to be safely transported to and from. This requires us to have two (2) cars with two (2) car seats. This also requires us to hold two (2) residential permits. 2. Adding Pay parking to a primarily residential area. We can understand adding this to a block that has businesses nearby, however there are no businesses on our block or within multiple blocks. This will be extremely disruptive to the residents in the area. <p>Our home was built in the 1800's primarily as servants quarters on the Rose Street block, between Octavia and Laguna. Because of this, we do not have a parking garage, along with many other residents in our area. We rely strictly on residential street parking to conduct our daily lives. With the increased challenges to park near our home; slow streets, construction zones, and other proposed plans, this will cause further challenges to raise a family in San Francisco. If this plan is passed, we will seriously consider leaving the city.</p> <p>We thank you for your time and consideration to adjust this plan.</p>	
<p>I know you guys are going to do what you want regardless of the people that live here want. I'm totally against the proposal. After reading extending the hours of all regular meters in the</p>	

<p>Hayes Valley study area from 9am-10pm Monday through Saturday and 12pm-6pm on Sunday, all I can say is THIS IS CRAZY. Sundays are always free, and weekday meters only go until 6pm. I hate these regulations that is being proposed.</p> <p>Businesses have set up Parklets and reduced parking because of that. I am against these Parklets that take up parking spaces.</p> <p>You've made changes to Page street between Laguna and Octavia that I hate. I can't drive my car across Octavia at Page anymore to get to the other side of Octavia local lane. Horrible! I can't use Page street either except to go West on it. East bound traffic is not permitted between Laguna and Octavia and Gough.</p> <p>I'm not in favor of any of these changes. It's tough even having guests over as it is, and this makes it harder to have anybody over to stay with me. They are constantly worried about moving their cars.</p> <p>I am totally against all the proposals in this plan.</p> <p>This city has gone to bicyclists and there is areas you can't park in this city as it has bicycle paths created. So, I don't even shop at the stores here anymore. I use a barber and coffee shops outside of the city. Others do so also.</p> <p>Bottom line, I'm totally against the proposal being set forth and it should be scrapped totally.</p>	
<p>Hello, my family lives in Hayes Valley and we do not own a car. My priority is to ensure that parking is allocated to ride sharing alternatives like Getaround. We really appreciate the Getaround parking spot on Octavia and Fell.</p> <p>I've been told by neighbors that some sections of Fell Street recently lost its residential parking permit status. We also recently saw an increase in urban blight from the freeway traffic that offloads exclusively onto Fell Street. I would like an explanation for why Fell Street was singled out (yet again) for this treatment. What kind of advocacy would be necessary to protect people living on Fell Street from a constant reduction in city resources and quality of life?</p>	<p>This plan is intended to increase parking availability, which could down the road make it easier to add in other community assets like car share. We will work with our car share team to understand the best opportunities available. With regards to Fell Street: The current proposal will bring all of Fell west of Gough into the new RPP area. East of Gough, those buildings can petition to join the area.</p>
<p>I hope this email finds you well. My name is [redacted] and I am the Manager at [redacted] on Hayes Street. I am writing to make sure our opinion is included regarding extending the meter hours in Hayes Valley.</p>	<p>We will ensure that the transition between S and HV is such that current R and S permitholders will be able to get HV permits at their renewal time and that the</p>

<p>We are against the idea. This will discourage customers coming to Hayes Valley even more. Most businesses are closed after 6pm or 7pm. Leaving most spaces available for the restaurant customers. Parking is not usually a problem after 6/7pm. And Sundays are the only day people have a break from the meters. SFMTA should really be focusing on bringing back the 21 Line and other bus lines instead. This will help bring more people to Hayes Valley who want to come but can not due to how congested Hayes Valley has become from all the curbside, parklets and street closures. We urge to stop punishing customers who want to visit Hayes Valley by making them pay.</p> <p>And to add to the Parking Permits. As a business, we are allowed 1 parking permit, currently an S parking. What happens to our employee who has the S permit? Will we be offered a new permit for free(since we already paid for a full year). Or will our employee have to park blocks away which is not ideal.</p> <p>Thank you for your time to read this email.</p>	<p>implementation of HV is timed to align with the renewals of those zones.</p>
---	---

Questions received in the Q & A during the Community Meeting and Public Hearing

Comment	SFMTA Response
Will multi unit homes with a different tenant per unit be issued one permit per unit or one permit per home?	The proposal is one permit per address, so each unit in the building can get one permit
Do I have to be on the phone to comment?	You can also submit through the Q&A. We will try to answer all the questions we get through the Q&A, but even if we aren't able to get to every question tonight, we will publish all questions/comments and our responses (if appropriate) on the project webpage
Does this plan assume that Hayes Vally will continue to be a designated slow street even after shelter in place? Same question for Page Street.	This plan does assume that existing Slow Streets and Shared Spaces (dining zones/parklets) will continue after the emergency order is lifted

<p>Will apartment buildings be treated as single households? Or will each individual apartment be as I assume—its own household?</p>	<p>The proposal is one permit per address—so, for example, each unit in an apartment building would be eligible for one permit</p>
<p>Will you be highlighting what has changed since the last community meeting? Or is the plan largely the same?</p>	<p>We will highlight the updates, though the core of the plan is the same</p>
<p>Will RPP permit holders now be penalized and treated as visitors for parking in existing R, S and Q zones?</p>	<p>You'll see on later slides that we've added buffer zones of about two blocks around the edges of the new proposed RPP Area. Important to note that if someone is currently an Area R permit holder, per permit does not allow her to park all day in Area Q or Area S (and likewise for all the other Areas). This proposal focuses the new RPP Area to prevent people from commuting in from parts of Areas Q, R or S, parking, and walking to their jobs or hopping on the train downtown.</p>
<p>The reason there isn't onsite parking in many of these developments is because the city agreed to eliminate parking requirements in these buildings.</p>	<p>This is a good point, largely the result of the Market-Octavia plan led by the Planning Department. This proposal is an attempt to address the parking/curb demand that has resulted from all this development (and the growth of Hayes Valley as a destination).</p>
<p>What if 2 roommates need their cars for work, and neither is a caregiver, and no one is up for riding a motorcycle? What do we do with them?</p>	<p>As Kathie mentioned, if an occupancy survey shows that there's available parking, then a request for a second permit will be approved. But this is a good point: there may be household situations where only one driver can get a permit, and other drivers may need to find off-street parking for their cars.</p>
<p>I asked in the survey—but why is the 600 block of Buchanan pay only when the whole block is residential? Can we have it pay and permit?</p>	<p>600 block of Buchanan would be traditional RPP (it's a green dashed line on the map)</p>

<p>Will those that live in an apartment on a street that is currently deemed 'commerical' meaning we cannot get a RPP no wbe able to or does the same rule apply?</p>	
<p>Will those of us who just renewed our S permits be given new free permits if there are changes?</p>	
<p>Why just one permit per unit?</p>	<p>This is intended to address the fact that internal parking demand drives much of the challenge with finding parking. One permit per address encourages people to find off-street parking or take advantage of the transit and active transportation options in the area</p>
<p>How much would the RPP cost annually for one permit? And will it be the new version where it is stickerless?</p>	<p>The current rate for an annual RPP permit is \$152. The costs for the one permit allowed per address under this proposal would be the same. These permits would move to digital/virtual permits just like all other permits in the City, though not sure exactly when the new Area would be slated to make the move to virtual/digital.</p>
<p>Current parking is till 9:00pm, but if you take into account the 2 hour allowance, then parking is till 7:00pm. Not happy with the idea that people visiting in the evening will have to pay parking!</p>	
<p>What's the approval process ultimately like? (As in, what actually happens after this meeting? Is it put to a vote by some board? Will there be more meetings?)</p>	<p>We will talk about this later in the slides, but the next steps will be: we make adjustments based on the feedback we get in this meeting, then it goes to the SFMTA Board of Directors for consideration</p>
<p>Will those of us who just renewed our S permits be given new free permits if there are changes?</p>	<p>We will ensure that you get the full value of your permit and won't have to pay again before your current permit would have expired</p>
<p>So out of area folks with \$ will be able to stay in a spot all day long. Seems like this would be a reduction of spots for people in the area who benefit from the 2 hour time limit that force the cars to be moved.</p>	

<p>Will those that live in an apartment on a street that is currently deemed 'commercial' meaning we cannot get a RPP not be able to or does the same rule apply?</p>	<p>Everyone within the pink shaded zone shown on the "new RPP Area" slide will be eligible for RPP, even if they live on a street with traditional meters</p>
<p>I agree with the need of turnover, but then the apartments that are above the stores that currently are not allowed to get a RPP should be, is that being proposed?</p>	
<p>Forgive me, but what you are, at least implicitly, saying is that we should push residents out to make way for burgeoning businesses. And by pushing residents out I mean that with the recognition that the transportation system in this city is nowhere near efficient, and the ride-sharing system is nowhere near functional, affordable, or sustainable, and the housing prices are insane, you will turn our neighborhood into "meter or permit" and limit homes to one car per address, so people can no longer have roommates. Are you telling people who have been living in the neighborhood to leave? Don't you think 2 permits per household would be a bit less punitive?</p>	
<p>I live on a block with paid meter on all sides. Am I able to apply and acquire a parking permit?</p>	
<p>As someone who currently lives on a so-called unregulated street (and hence can't get a parking permit), these changes would be a lifesaver! I'm currently stuck moving my car every 2 hours most days; it's incredibly disruptive. On the rare occasion I do manage to find a spot on an unregulated street, I'm then scared to move my car for fear of having to go back to moving every 2 hours.</p>	
<p>Will those of us who just renewed our S permits be given new free permits if there are changes?</p>	<p>We will ensure that you get the full value of your permit and won't have to pay again before your current permit would have expired</p>
<p>Hayes Valley keeps being mentioned, but what about the residents Lower Haight. This will harm us and not benefit us. Why are we included in the new area and lopped off from our neighborhood? We do not park in Hayes Valley and hike our family up a hill to get home.</p>	
<p>Why was the 300 block of Gough left off? Specifically 350 Gough. It has a large apartment on the 2nd and 3rd floor. 1st floor is restaurants and stores. (Why is the 300 block left off? It has apartments as well.)</p>	

<p>Given board approval being needed, what is the earliest dates we could apply for a permit in this new area?</p>	
<p>So out of area folks with \$ will be able to stay in a spot all day long. Seems like this would be a reduction of spots for people in the area who benefit from the 2 hour time limit that force the cars to be moved.</p>	<p>We hope that the Pay or Permit will actually create more parking availability. Our data from paid parking shows that people tend to stay only as long as they need to—they usually don't stay all day even if there is not time limit. But not having a time limit allows folks who need to stay longer (eg the plumber, grandma who is visiting for all afternoon and dinner) to do so</p>
<p>I agree with the need of turnover, but then the apartments that are above the stores that currently are not allowed to get a RPP should be, is that being proposed?</p>	<p>Everyone within the pink shaded zone shown on the "new RPP Area" slide will be eligible for RPP, even if they live on a street with traditional meters</p>
<p>Forgive me, but what you are, at least implicitly, saying is that we should push residents out to make way for burgeoning businesses. And by pushing residents out I mean that with the recognition that the transportation system in this city is nowhere near efficient, and the ride-sharing system is nowhere near functional, affordable, or sustainable, and the housing prices are insane, you will turn our neighborhood into "meter or permit" and limit homes to one car per address, so people can no longer have roommates. Are you telling people who have been living in the neighborhood to leave? Don't you think 2 permits per household would be a bit less punitive?</p>	
<p>I live on a block with paid meter on all sides. Am I able to apply and acquire a parking permit?</p>	<p>Everyone within the pink shaded zone shown on the "new RPP Area" slide will be eligible for RPP, even if they live on a street with traditional meters</p>
<p>As someone who currently lives on a so-called unregulated street (and hence can't get a parking permit), these changes would be a lifesaver! I'm currently stuck moving my car every 2 hours most days; it's incredibly disruptive. On the rare occasion I do manage to find a spot on an unregulated street, I'm then scared to move my car for fear of having to go back to moving every 2 hours.</p>	

<p>I'm curious about how revenue from the new meters will be used? I'd love for it to be funneled into transit and bike/ped safety improvements for the neighborhood</p>	<p>Per the City Charter, parking revenues that are in excess of the costs of administration/enforcement of the parking go to Muni</p>
<p>I have lived at this same address for over 25 years. I was once denied a parking permit and not given a reason. Is there a limited amount of permits available?</p>	<p>There is no limit on the number of permits that can be issued across an Area, though this proposal includes a one-per-address permit limit</p>
<p>I don't have a car but have a regular over night guest. Can I get an RPP and give it to him?</p>	<p>No, annual RPP permits are only sold to cars registered to addresses in an RPP area.</p>
<p>How often does someone with an RPP need to move their car outside of street cleaning times? is it 72 hours currently?</p>	<p>Currently, 72-hour parking is suspended but otherwise, yes.</p>
<p>Given board approval being needed, what is the earliest dates we could apply for a permit in this new area?</p>	
<p>The time for permit parking is 9am - 9pm. is a problem if you come home before 6pm.? And make get a ticket.</p>	<p>If you live in the neighborhood, you are eligible for a permit and thus would not get a ticket.</p>
<p>Thank you for your work on this! Just wanted to voice support for this plan. Space is at an extreme premium, we should prioritize space for people, bikes, and public transit.</p>	
<p>Maybe start with returning to required parking for new developments?</p>	
<p>Documented cases of people driving from farther out in S to have a shorter commute? Live here 26 years and never heard this. And if true isn't this an issue of unreliable public transportation to get to work?</p>	<p>In a 2018 study of this topic, we found that about 10% of cars in the area had out-of-area Area S permits</p>
<p>How do we stop this from happening?</p>	<p>The final point of input is the SFMTA Board hearing, which should take place in June.</p>
<p>What if a Household currently has two permits?? Do they lose one? Which one?</p>	

<p>You said the meters could be placed in 6ish months, but then the 1-car per household limit only starts in 2023. Would those of us unregulated streets now be able to get a permit as soon as those meters are placed, or do we have to wait until 2023? I'm confused.</p>	
<p>They are so many families with two working adults that need cars, shall they move out ??</p>	
<p>I thought it was said that post board approval, it would be 6months for signs and to start. But you just said July 2023 for effective date . Why is this going to take so long?</p>	
<p>hayes Valley is %99 residential , why are we getting penalized for the 1%</p>	
<p>So The pink New RPP for HV for will be aloud to get a permit.</p>	
<p>Give me an estimate - what is all day charge estimated at currently?(What is estimated \$ per hour for metered parking?)</p>	
<p>I'd like to ask about Market Octavia plan are we rewarding developers who honored our community request to have fewer parking spaces. But as a community we are to absorb the negative benefit of developers reaping the cost of not building parking spaces.</p>	
<p>Not everyone that lives in the area gets a permit though</p>	
<p>Timing of when this is implemented is not so much the problem as the project itself (viz., the RPP limit)</p>	
<p>I thought it was said that post board approval, it would be 6months for signs and to start. But you just said July 2023 for effective date . Why is this going to take so long?</p>	<p>The 2023date would be the effective date of just othe one-per-household limit.</p>
<p>I live in Lower Haight. I ask that you reduce parking capacity, because athe huge volume of cars is loud and dangerous where I am.</p>	
<p>Why doesn't SFMTA apply RPP to the whole city? It sounds like that would make millions of dollars, and it would make parking easier for everyone.</p>	<p>The Residential Parking Permit program currently operates on a cost recovery basis, meaning the permit price is determined solely</p>

	by the cost of operating the program. This also means that RPP is not designed to provide profit to the agency.
This policy would add to the financial burden of the many low-income residents of the area.	
Business in Hayes Valley will be dampened and deterred with implementation of evening and Sunday metering. Not all people use taxi, metro and Uber services in their travels. Deterrents to these mode shift options include but not limited to personal safety, timing, convenience, and physical disabilities. Another is the hassle factor; "Let's just go home and eat dinner. I have moved the car twice now". We must retain a variety of travel options in Hayes Valley and the City.	
Why not include an annual Muni pass with RPP? Charge \$1000 for parking each year.	The Residential Parking Permit program currently operates on a cost recovery basis, meaning the permit price is determined solely by the cost of operating the program
Why has a tiny portion of the Lower Haight (an already very small neighborhood) being included? It's extremely unfair to those of us who live in the tiny zone that's been included as part of "Hayes Valley." I will no longer be able to park in my OWN neighborhood, aside from a few streets. The 4 blocks bound by Haight, Fillmore, Hermann, and Buchanan should NOT be included. They should remain within the S zone so that residents of those blocks can continue parking throughout their own neighborhood – which is the Lower Haight, not Hayes Valley. Have you considered not including this small portion of our tiny neighborhood and breaking an already tiny neighborhood into 2 RPP zones? Have you considered including ALL of the Lower Haight? Would residents of Webster Street be able to CHOOSE between S and HV?	Thank you for this feedback. Residents of the buffer zone will be eligible only for one of the Areas, but will be able to park in either one within the buffer zone.
I understand we'd only be eligible for 1 permit, but can I choose between S and HV, if we live in a "Buffer Zone"?	You are either sent an HV or S permit, but the signs allow either HV or S permit to park
Can you please address the question about whether or not you've considered not adversely impacting the Lower Haight? What is the likelihood that the zone will be corrected to not harm residents of the Lower Haight?	
The buffer zone would not appear to benefit those on the boundary of this new zone, but rather allow those who remain in the S permit area to continue to park where they always have without any impact.	

<p>People in the Buffer Zone should be able to choose. It does NOT make sense geographically. I have lived on Webster at Waller for 10 years and can assure you I've never, ever parked my car in the Hayes Valley zone, aside from on the tiny portion that is actually Lower Haight (South of Haight).</p>	
<p>If you don't like noise or people maybe a city isn't for you?</p>	