

**THIS PRINT COVERS CALENDAR ITEM NO. : 12**

**SAN FRANCISCO  
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY**

**DIVISION:** Sustainable Streets

**BRIEF DESCRIPTION:**

Amending Transportation Code Division II to implement Residential Parking Permit program reforms resulting from the recently completed RPP Evaluation and Reform project.

**SUMMARY:**

- The SFMTA has completed a comprehensive evaluation of the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) Program.
- The program evaluation led to the development and analysis of alternative RPP program policies and practices to be implemented in phases.
- The first phase amends the Transportation Code to implement RPP program reforms resulting from this evaluation.
- The proposed RPP program reforms include revising the procedure for designating, rescinding, or modifying RPP areas; authorizing pilot RPP areas that vary from existing permit requirements for the purpose of studying and evaluating the effectiveness of alternative parking management methods; modifying the permit requirements for educational institution permits; authorizing the Director of Transportation to issue parking permits to family child care homes; and eliminating the requirement for a signed petition to support the issuance of childcare permits.

**ENCLOSURES:**

1. SFMTAB Resolution
2. Transportation Code Division II Amendments

**APPROVALS:**

DIRECTOR



**DATE**

9/22/2017

SECRETARY



9/22/2017

**ASSIGNED SFMTAB CALENDAR DATE:** October 3, 2017

**PAGE 2.**

## **PURPOSE**

Amending Transportation Code Division II to implement Residential Parking Permit program reforms resulting from the recently completed RPP Evaluation and Reform project.

## **STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS AND TRANSIT FIRST POLICY PRINCIPLES**

This action supports the following SFMTA Strategic Plan Goal and Objectives:

Goal 1: Create a safer transportation experience for everyone

Objective 1.1: Improve the security for transportation system users

Objective 1.3: Improve the safety of the transportation system

Goal 2: Make transit, walking, bicycling, taxi, ridesharing & carsharing the preferred means of travel

Objective 2.3: Increase use of all non-private auto modes

Objective 2.4: Improve parking utilization and manage parking demand

These recommended Transportation Code changes will support the following Transit First Policy Principles:

- To ensure quality of life and economic health in San Francisco, the primary objective of the transportation system must be the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.
- Decisions regarding the use of public street and sidewalk space shall encourage the use of public rights of way by pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit, and shall strive to reduce traffic and improve public health and safety.
- Public transit, including taxis and vanpools, is an economically and environmentally sound alternative to transportation by individual automobiles. Within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile.
- Parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transit and alternative transportation.

## **DESCRIPTION**

The RPP program was established in 1976 “in response to serious adverse effects caused certain areas and neighborhoods of the City and County of San Francisco by motor vehicle congestion, particularly the long-term parking of motor vehicles on the streets of such areas and neighborhoods by non-residents thereof. . . .In order to protect and promote the integrity of these areas and neighborhoods, it is necessary to enact parking regulations restricting unlimited parking by non-residents therein, while providing the opportunity for residents to park near their home” (Ordinance 312-76). The first RPP Area, Area B (St. Charles Avenue), was established in 1977. Since then, the number of RPP areas has grown to 29. These RPP areas cover

## **PAGE 3.**

approximately one-fourth of the City's total land area, encompassing more than 150,000 households and nearly 80,000 parking spaces. The SFMTA issues approximately 90,000 resident, visitor, and specialty permits annually under this program. Under state law, the cost of a permit (\$128/year) is limited to recovering the costs of administering and enforcing the program.

The SFMTA has undertaken a comprehensive, data-driven evaluation of the RPP program for the purpose of aligning it with the Agency's and the City's strategic and sustainability goals, and improving its effectiveness.

The evaluation included data collection and analysis to reveal existing trends; a review of best practices in on-street parking management in residential areas; a robust public engagement program that included a citywide survey on residential parking; and an evaluation of the possible fiscal and policy impacts of alternative reform options.

At its November 17, 2015 meeting, staff presented to the SFMTA Board of Directors the purpose, scope, and initial research findings of the RPP Evaluation and Reform Project. Staff gave presentations of program findings and recommended policy reforms to the SFMTA Board's Policy and Governance Subcommittee on two occasions: November 18, 2016 and March 7, 2017. Staff also made three presentations of the project findings and recommended policy reforms to the Citizens' Advisory Council and its Operations and Customer Service Committee. Feedback from these and other public outreach activities, as described later in this report, are reflected in the summary of findings listed below:

- Demand for parking exceeds supply in many areas. Some RPP areas have occupancy rates above 90% and permit saturation rates (i.e., total permits divided by total permitted spaces) above 100%.
- Because so much of the demand for parking, and thus the challenge of finding parking, results from internal demand, the program should place more emphasis on managing demand for on-street parking from residents themselves.
- The process for establishing new and modifying existing RPP areas needs to be clarified and improved so that neighborhood parking regulations are made with more public engagement and as part of a comprehensive transportation and parking planning effort, especially in mixed-use and industrial areas.
- The RPP program should be consistent with the City's transportation goals and policies, including the City Charter's Transit First Policy and the General Plan. The achievement of goals and policies expressed in area plans and regulations for new developments that limit the amount of off-street parking to discourage use of personal vehicles is impeded when those residents are able to obtain permits to park on surrounding streets.
- The existing permit program is best suited for prototypical residential neighborhoods but applied in areas that were once primarily commercial and industrial. Residential and

## PAGE 4.

commercial/industrial uses have very different transportation needs and present challenges to the administration of an RPP program.

- The process of issuing permits to schools could be improved to encourage more sustainable commute modes by teachers. Schools vary greatly in size, but current permit requirements require that a school have a minimum of 15 certified employees or classroom teachers in order to be issued RPP permits. This prohibits smaller schools, including preschools, from obtaining permits.
- To improve program efficacy and efficiency, the boundaries of some RPP areas should be modified and regulations made more consistent throughout the areas.
- The RPP permit petition process for in-home child caregivers may present a hardship to families with newborns and very young children.
- The program could better take advantage of more advanced technological solutions to all aspects of program planning, enforcement, and administration.

Implementation of the RPP program reforms will occur in four phases. Approval of the proposed amendments to Transportation Code Division II constitute the first phase of implementation. These amendments will address many of the issues outlined above and clarify the process of establishing, rescinding and modifying RPP areas, improve the process of issuing permits to schools to be more equitable across schools of different sizes, simplify the process of obtaining permits for in-home care providers, and establish pilot RPP areas for the purpose of studying and evaluating the effectiveness of reducing the number of permits issued to households, and implementing alternative approaches to managing on-street parking. The second phase will include using neighborhood planning and increased public outreach to redraw existing RPP area boundaries (without removing eligibility) and regulations to ensure that the boundaries correspond with natural neighborhood boundaries and proximity to traffic generators. The third phase will consist of an evaluation of the pilot RPP Areas. The fourth phase will consist of consideration and drafting of recommendations for expanding the pilot RPP measures to all RPP areas.

### **Proposed Transportation Code Changes**

The following is a list and discussion of the proposed Transportation Code revisions that SFMTA staff is recommending:

#### **A. Definitions**

##### **Residential Area**

A definition for *residential area* be added because, although “Residential Parking Permit Area” is a defined term, the concept of a residential area is not defined.

##### **Institution**

Since the SFMTA is not authorized to issue RPP permits to any institution other than an

educational institution, SFMTA staff recommend that this term be removed.

## **B. Residential Parking Permit Requirements**

### **1. Number of Permits**

Currently, City residents can request additional permits over a household maximum of four. There are only 12 households—out of tens of thousands—with more than four permits. This amendment eliminates the option of requesting additional permits as of July 1, 2019, providing the 12 households that currently have more than four permits adequate time to prepare for a reduction in the number of potential permits. There are currently more than 150,000 households eligible for permits, while there are fewer than 80,000 parking spaces available for permit holders. Although the number of on-street parking spaces will either remain the same or decline, the number of households and number of drivers continues to increase. The 2015 Residential Parking Permit Program Resident Survey, conducted as part of this evaluation effort, found support for limiting the number of permits issued per household to no more than two. Attendees at community workshops and open houses also expressed a desire to further limit the issuance of permits. A maximum of two permits per household and one permit per driver will be tested in two proposed RPP pilot areas, if approved. Currently 5% of all permit accounts have three permits while 1% have four permits.

### **2. Business Permits**

Clarifies the definition of a *place of business* as a commercial space defined by a separate entrance and mailing address. This change will clarify how many permits may be issued to a single business address. Currently, the permit requirements can be interpreted to allow permits for each employee in places of business that employ independent contractors or self-employed persons, such as beauty salons, medical offices, legal offices and artists' studios. The intent of the change is to clarify the language to limit the number of permits to one permit per commercial property.

### **3. Additional RPP Permits**

This amendment moves the subsection (g) Additional Residential Parking Permits, to subsection (e) immediately following the subsection that addresses permit requirements. The intent is to keep all subsections concerning different types of RPP permits together. Amendments to specific permit types are discussed below.

#### **a. Health Care Worker Permits**

This amendment clarifies and simplifies the administration of RPP permits for in-home health care providers. It changes the permit from one that is permanently affixed to the health care provider's vehicle to a transferrable hangtag permit. It also limits the number of such permits to no more than one, but allows up to three vehicle license plate numbers to be listed on the permit in order to accommodate additional care providers.

#### **b. Educational Institution Permits**

This amendment will limit the number of permits that schools are eligible to obtain to no more

than 15 and deletes the option to request more than 15 permits. Currently, there are seven schools that have been issued more than 15 permits. This amendment also removes the requirement for schools to have at least 15 teachers, which will enable smaller schools, such as early elementary schools, to obtain permits. As of July 1, ~~2018~~2019, the number of permits would be limited to no more than 30 percent of full time teachers or 15, whichever is less. This is in keeping with the City's goal of reducing single occupant vehicle trips into and around the City. A school's Transportation Broker shall issue permits first to those teachers with no viable options for travelling to work other than driving a motor vehicle.

The requirements resulted in the inequitable distribution of Educational Institution permits because schools with 15 teachers could receive up to 15 permits, one for each teacher, while other schools with 80 teachers could only receive 15 permits, unless a request for additional permits is submitted. By issuing permits based on the number of teachers employed at the school site, rather than a specific minimum threshold, all school sites will be treated equitably. Currently, there is no requirement to prioritize the issuance of permits based on no viable options for travelling to work for a teacher other than driving a motor vehicle. Anecdotal evidence suggests that permits are distributed according to other factors such as seniority, rather than need.

**c. Childcare Permits**

The requirement that parents submit a petition signed by 10 residents or fifty percent of the residential units on a block in support of a person's desire to have a permit for an in-home child care provider is removed, and up to three vehicle license plate numbers will be allowed to be listed on the hangtag transferrable permit in order to accommodate additional care providers. The current requirement to submit a signed petition can present a hardship on young families with newborns or young children needing in-home care while parents work. Currently, all eligible households may purchase up to four permits and families with in-home medical care providers may obtain additional permits. Issuance of a permit for an in-home child care provider counts toward the four per household maximum.

**d. Family Child Care Homes**

Currently, preschools with 15 or more teachers can obtain permits for teachers. The proposed change addresses the fact that many preschools are (1) not large enough to meet this threshold and (2) located in family homes in residential areas. This amendment allows a permit to be issued to a care provider who works at a state-licensed Family Child Care Home. As a resident of the RPP area, the home owner/Family Child Care Home operator is already eligible for a permit. This amendment will enable the resident to purchase a transferrable permit for an assistant care provider that does not reside within the RPP area. Family Child Care Homes tend to be located in residential areas. Based on data from the Children's Council, there are approximately 60 Family Child Care Homes within RPP areas that are licensed to provide care for up to 12 children. Due to their small size, care providers having to move their vehicles every two hours place the facility at risk of falling below the state-mandated teacher/child ratios and jeopardize the safety of small children.

**C. Procedure for Designating, Rescinding or Modifying Residential Parking Permit Area**

The proposed legislation removes the requirement that residents submit a completed petition that either has signatures from 250 residences or at least 50% of the residences in the area for the purposes of initiating the process of establishing a new RPP area. In its place, the SFMTA Board of Directors is authorized to establish, rescind or modify RPP areas upon recommendation of the Director of Transportation, based on studies and public input that demonstrate whether the residential area proposed for Residential Permit Parking meets the criteria as established in the code, including the extent of public support, the extent that non-resident vehicles are parked in the area, the occupancy of available parking spaces, and the availability of off-street parking. In addition, a resident of an RPP area may submit a completed SFMTA application to request the SFMTA Board of Directors to consider the designation, rescission, or modification of an RPP area. The amendment simplifies and clarifies the process for designating, rescinding, or modifying RPP areas. For instance, the requirement for 250 signatures to initiate the process, before SFMTA has completed any studies to verify the need for a parking management strategy, can be misinterpreted as an adequate measure of public support, even when the area to be designated as an RPP area includes thousands of households. Similarly, a requirement for signatures from at least 50% of households is not practicable in that the number of housing units and households within a residential area is in constant flux and readily available databases do not fully account for all housing units. An additional reason for these changes is to rely more heavily on an inclusive public outreach process as part of a comprehensive neighborhood parking and transportation planning effort that looks more broadly at the most appropriate parking management tools within the context of overall transportation needs.

**D. Criteria for Designating, Rescinding or Modifying Residential Parking Permit Area**

The existing criteria section is moved from subsection (f) to subsection (g) and adds one new criterion to the existing five that must be taken into account when recommending a residential area for Residential Permit Parking. The new criterion provides that other measures to regulate parking that will improve availability other than the proposed designation, rescission or modification of an RPP area must also take into account, since establishing, rescinding or modifying an RPP area may not be the best tool for parking management in some areas. The intent of this change is to look more broadly at the most appropriate parking management tools within the context of the broader transportation system goals.

**E. Pilot Residential Parking Permit Program Areas**

The proposed change adds a new subsection that authorizes the SFMTA Board of Directors to establish, upon the recommendation of the Director of Transportation, the formation of pilot program areas that modify existing permit requirements for the purpose of studying and evaluating the effectiveness of alternative parking management tools.

There are two proposed pilot RPP areas that will be brought to the SFMTA Board of Directors at a later date should the SFMTA Board choose to approve these amendments. One proposed pilot area is that portion of the existing RPP Area X that is situated east of Highway 280, between Mariposa and Cesar Chavez streets (the Dogpatch neighborhood). The other proposed pilot area

## **PAGE 8.**

would be a new RPP Area in the northwest portion of Bernal Heights.

Within both proposed pilot areas, SFMTA proposes to: limit RPP permits to no more than one per licensed driver and no more than two per household; allow a resident to obtain a permit for use by a health care or child care provider that would not count towards the two RPP permits that may be issued to a single address; and, exempt a vehicle that displays a valid RPP permit from payment at on-street meters located in the RPP area where designated by the SFMTA with posted signs. With respect to on-street meters, while residents with valid permits would not be restricted by parking time limits or required to pay to park, visitors and other non-residents without permits would be required to pay at the meter for the entire duration of their stay. If the SFMTA installs new parking meters or pay stations in RPP areas, this tool will provide the flexibility needed by visitors and customers of nearby commercial establishments to stay longer than the typical two-hour grace period, but pay for the convenience of being able to do so. Also, research conducted by SFMTA has shown that pricing parking can be as effective, if not more effective, in discouraging non-residents from storing their vehicles for long periods of time, which improves parking availability not only for residents but for visitors as well.

In both areas, extensive public outreach was conducted with residents and businesses to define the boundaries of the pilot areas, the days and hours of parking restrictions and the number of permits for which each person and household would be eligible. A full description of these outreach activities will be included in the accompanying staff reports if these proposed pilot areas are brought to the SFMTA Board for approval.

## **STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

The Residential Permit Parking Evaluation and Reform project included a robust public engagement program that was implemented in three phases:

### **Phase I: Building Awareness**

After a year of research and data analysis, the project team formally kicked off the public engagement program with a presentation to the SFMTA Board of Directors on November 17, 2015. The presentation showcased some early findings from the research, the purpose of the Project, the scope of work and the timeline. The team launched a project website and sent email notifications to more than a thousand neighborhood and business groups and other stakeholders notifying them of the project's kickoff and linking them to the new website - [www.sfmta.com/neighborhoodparking](http://www.sfmta.com/neighborhoodparking).

At the same time, staff commissioned Godbe Research to administer a household survey (2015 Residential Parking Permit Program Resident Survey) to thousands of registered City voters who provided their email address on their voter registration. The sample was a close representation of the City's population as a whole. Some 2,349 residents completed the survey and staff released the findings on the SFMTA's [Moving SF blog](#).



## PAGE 9.

Four open houses, one in each quadrant of the city, brought the SFMTA project team out to the neighborhoods and earned press coverage about the project. Eighty people attended and 50 comment cards were submitted. The open house format allowed attendees to browse a series of presentation boards that summarized the findings of the SFMTA's research as well as the history of the program, while having an opportunity to speak directly with SFMTA staff.

### Open House Meeting Dates

Date	Location
February 23, 2016	James Lick School, Noe Valley
February 24, 2016	Chinese Cultural Center, 750 Kearny St.
February 27, 2016	County Fair Building, Golden Gate Park
March 1, 2016	City College, Ocean Ave. Campus

### Phase II: Stakeholder Involvement

During the summer of 2016, the SFMTA project team organized and facilitated eleven community workshops, one in each Supervisorial district. The workshops were held at neighborhood venues to make it easier for residents to attend.

The workshops differed from the open house events in that SFMTA staff facilitated group discussions about key program issues with attendees. Among the topics discussed were increasing efficiency through greater use of technology, making it easier to purchase short-term permits, rationalizing residential permit parking area boundaries and regulations, linking the number of permits issued to the availability of on-street parking, and possibly charging a premium for residents with garages.

More than 170 people attended (about 15 on average per workshop). Workshops were promoted through multiple channels, including email notifications, newsletters, updates to the project website, earned media and use of the SFMTA's social media accounts.

### Community Workshop Dates and Locations

Date	Location and Supervisorial District
May 3, 2016	San Francisco Day School, Western Addition (5)
May 4, 2016	Calvary Presbyterian, Pacific Heights (2)
May 9, 2016	Richmond Community Center (1)
May 10, 2016	Grace Evangelical, Sunset (4)
May 18, 2016	City College, Chinatown/North Beach (3)
May 19, 2016	City College, Mission District (9)
May 23, 2016	St. Stephens Church, 19th Avenue/ Stonestown (7)

May 25, 2016	Minnie and Lovie Ward Center, Ingleside/ Oceanview (11)
June 1, 2016	St. Anthony's, Tenderloin (6)
June 2, 2016	Southeast Community Center, Bayview-Hunters Point (10)
June 28, 2016	International School, Hayes Valley (8)

Feedback from these and other meetings was recorded and used to develop possible reforms to the program.

**Phase III: Evaluating Reform Policy Options**

After a period of developing and evaluating the impacts of alternative policy options for reforming the program, SFMTA project staff hosted two focus group meetings on October 4 and October 5, 2016, as well as a final public open house on October 12, 2016.

Each focus group lasted two hours and discussed each of the following eight possible permit reform policies:

1. Area-wide permit cap
2. Cap of two permits per household
3. Cap of one permit per driver
4. Graduated permit pricing
5. Premium permit pricing for those with access to off-street parking
6. Omit permit eligibility for new housing in certain areas
7. Paid + Permit parking
8. Subdivide large permit areas

**Other Meetings and Presentations**

Several stakeholder groups requested that staff make presentations at their meetings. Included in the list below are several neighborhood associations and business groups whose members could be impacted by changes to the RPP program. Staff also made several presentations during the course of the project to the Citizens' Advisory Council and the Board's Policy and Governance Committee. Staff received valuable input and feedback at these meetings, which is reflected in the policy changes being recommended.

SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council	11/5/15
SFMTA Board of Directors	11/17/15
SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council	5/5/16
Council of San Francisco Neighborhood Associations	5/23/16
Small Business Commission	6/13/16
South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood	6/13/16
Telegraph Hill Dwellers	6/14/16
Council of District Merchant Associations	6/21/16
Small Business Network	6/27/16
Office of Workforce and Economic Development	10/12/16
SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council	11/3/16
SFMTA Board Policy & Governance Committee	11/18/16

SFMTA Board Policy & Governance Committee	3/17/17
SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council	8/3/17

**Project Website Statistics**

In November 2015, the project website went live: <http://www.sfmta.com/neighborhoodparking>. Since then, there have been:

- 13,887 page views
- 11,486 unique page views
- 1,613 subscribers to project updates
  - 494 added directly from project website
  - 948 individuals added to subscriber list by attending meetings, open houses or focus group
  - 665 individuals added from a network

**Outreach to Members of the Board of Supervisors**

Staff offered briefings about the Project to members of the Board of Supervisors at least twice, and, in some cases, three times over the course of the Project, and met with Supervisors or staff for seven of the districts. Supervisors and their staff provided substantial input, including (a) potential policy options, (b) feedback on the RPP program from their constituents, and (c) thoughts about implementation of any approved changes. This input, along with the input gathered through the public outreach program, was used to inform the policy recommendations and phasing discussed above.

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The primary alternative is to leave current RPP permit requirements unchanged, which would limit the Agency's ability to align the RPP program with the Agency's and the City's transportation and sustainability goals and to improve the performance of the program. Staff considered a full range of alternative policy reforms (as noted in the previous section, under Phase III) and evaluated them using criteria that included: potential efficacy and achievement of goals; impact on revenue and staffing; public support; availability of required technology; and practicability of implementation and administration. Policy alternatives that did not score well on these criteria were not selected for moving forward in this phase of implementation. These policy alternatives include the following:

1. Market-based or Demand-responsive Pricing

This option would base the price of permits on parking occupancy rates, and would be set at a price that would achieve optimal parking availability. This would cause permit prices to possibly fluctuate over time, and also vary from permit area to permit area or from one block to another. This option is not pursued because state law dictates that fees for government services be limited to the actual cost of delivering the service. The current permit fee of \$128 is based on that cost.

**2. Area-wide Permit Cap**

An area-wide permit cap of 120% would affect six permit areas: A, C, S, I, J & N and because these are also the largest areas, would affect 45% of all permit accounts. Staff is not pursuing this option because of the complexity of administration, requiring the establishment of a waiting list and an educational campaign to realtors and property owners in the six affected areas. The educational campaign would need to address the perceived inequity or lack of fairness in a system that would issue permits to those existing households issued permits before the cap went into effect and newer households who would have to be placed on the wait list.

**3. Graduated permit pricing**

About 6% of permit accounts (households) have 3 or more permits. This change would double the cost of the second permit, triple the cost of the third permit and quadruple the cost of the 4th permit. To maintain revenue neutrality, the cost of the first permit would be reduced, possibly increasing the number of households with one permit. Staff is not pursuing this change at this time. We will evaluate the effectiveness of household caps implemented in pilot RPP areas first.

**4. Premium for access to off-street parking**

About 53% of permit-holders have access to off-street parking (2015 Citywide Household Survey). This change would double the price of the first permit and triple the price of the second permit for those with off-street parking. Staff is not pursuing this change at this time because, to have the hoped-for impact, SFMTA would have to have a means to verify whether permit applicants have access to off-street parking, which would impact administration and enforcement substantially.

**5. Use a system of auctioning permits in some highly impacted RPP areas, where new high-density housing is being constructed.**

For new high-density development in some RPP areas, the number of permits issued would be based on the availability of on-street spaces. An auction system would be used to issue permits. This is not being pursued at this time due to the need to design and implement an auction system, and because of potential issues with maintaining cost neutrality.

**6. In mixed-use areas only, apportion parking permits based on the ratio of residential units to businesses.**

Staff will not pursue this as it would completely change the purpose of residential permit parking (to discourage non-resident commuting into residential areas) and require a substantial amount of administrative effort in developing and implementing a protocol for verifying business employment using a third party data source.

**7. Require schools to prepare and implement a transportation demand management plan**

This change is not pursued at this time as an alternative option, limiting permits to 30% FTE or 15, whichever is less, was selected instead.

**8. Automatically grant permit eligibility to all addresses within two blocks of RPP boundaries.**

**PAGE 13.**

Though many residents living outside of permit areas have requested this, staff chose not to pursue this option at this time because the density of households and vehicles within most existing RPP areas are so great that allowing additional vehicles from outside the RPP area would undermine the goals of the program.

**FUNDING IMPACT**

The Residential Permit Parking program is operated on a cost-recovery basis. There will be no net fiscal impact.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

On May 10, 2017, the SFMTA, under authority delegated by the Planning Department, determined that the Residential Parking Program Reform is not defined as a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations Sections 15060(c) and 15378(b).

A copy of the CEQA determination is on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA Board of Directors and is incorporated herein by reference.

**OTHER APPROVALS RECEIVED OR STILL REQUIRED**

The City Attorney has reviewed this report.

**RECOMMENDATION**

SFMTA staff recommend that the SFMTA Board amend the Transportation Code Division II to implement Residential Parking Permit program reforms resulting from the recently completed RPP Evaluation and Reform project.

SAN FRANCISCO  
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREAS, The Residential Parking Permit (RPP) program was established in 1976 in response to adverse effects caused by motor vehicle congestion, particularly the long-term parking of motor vehicles on the streets of residential areas and neighborhoods by non-residents; and;

WHEREAS, The RPP program restricts unlimited parking by non-residents in designated residential areas, while providing the opportunity for residents to park near their home; and,

WHEREAS, The RPP program is administered by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency; and,

WHEREAS, The SFMTA has undertaken a comprehensive, data-driven evaluation of the RPP program for the purpose of aligning it with the Agency's and the City's strategic and sustainability goals and improving its effectiveness; and,

WHEREAS, There was a comprehensive public outreach program that included a citywide household survey, open houses, community workshops and meetings with neighborhood and business organizations to provide input into the development of possible reform measures; and,

WHEREAS, At its November 17, 2015 meeting, staff presented the SFMTA Board of Directors the purpose, scope, and initial research findings of the RPP Evaluation and Reform Project; and,

WHEREAS, The program evaluation led to the development and analysis of alternative reform policies and practices, to be implemented in phases; and,

WHEREAS, The Reform Project has resulted in the following proposed reform policies: revise the procedure for initiating the creation or modification of RPP areas; create pilot areas to test limiting the number of permits issued to two per household and one per driver, allow a resident to obtain a permit for use by a health care or child care provider that would not count towards the two RPP permits that may be issued to a single address, and exempt a vehicle that displays a valid RPP permit from payment at on-street meters located in the RPP area where designated by the SFMTA with posted signs; modify the requirements for teacher permits; provide family child care centers the ability to receive one permit for workers; and, remove the requirement of a signed petition for in-home caregiver permits; and,

**PAGE 15.**

WHEREAS, The first phase of implementation is to amend the Transportation Code, Division II to implement these proposed reform policies; and,

WHEREAS, The proposed modifications are subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and,

WHEREAS, On May 10, 2017, the SFMTA, under authority delegated by the Planning Department, determined that the Residential Parking Program Reform is not defined as a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations Sections 15060(c) and 15378(b); and,

WHEREAS, A copy of the CEQA determination is on file with the Secretary to the SFMTA Board of Directors, and is incorporated herein by reference; and, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors amends the Transportation Code Division II to implement program reforms emanating from the recently completed RPP Evaluation and Reform project; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors amends Transportation Code Division II to (1) delete the defined term for “Institution” and add “Residential Area”; (2) limit the number of parking permits that may be issued to a single address to four and eliminate the request for waiver provision; (3) revise the procedure for designating a Residential Parking Permit Area; (4) change the period for the validity of Educational Institution parking permits from certain hours of the day to hours of enforcement and limit the number of parking permits that may be issued; (5) eliminate the petition process currently required for Childcare parking permits; (6) authorize the issuance of one transferable parking permit to a resident licensed to operate a family child care home for use by a child care provider working at the home; and (7) authorize the establishment of pilot Residential Parking Permit program areas by the SFMTA Board to limit the number of parking permits to two that may be issued to a single address (with no more than one parking permit issued per licensed driver), exempt a vehicle displaying a valid parking permit from payment at on-street Parking Meters located in the Residential Parking Permit Area where designated by the SFMTA with posted signs, and exempt Health Care Worker and Childcare parking permits from the limit of two permits that can be issued to a single address.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its meeting of October 3, 2017.

---

Secretary to the Board of Directors  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

**Resolution amending the Transportation Code to amend the Residential Parking Permit program to: (1) delete the defined term for “Institution” and add “Residential Area”; (2) limit the number of parking permits that may be issued to a single address to four and eliminate the request for waiver provision; (3) revise the procedure for designating a Residential Parking Permit Area; (4) change the period for the validity of Educational Institution parking permits from certain hours of the day to hours of enforcement and limit the number of parking permits that may be issued; (5) eliminate the petition process currently required for Childcare parking permits; (6) authorize the issuance of one transferable parking permit to a resident licensed to operate a family child care home for use by a child care provider working at the home; and (7) authorize the establishment of pilot Residential Parking Permit program areas by the SFMTA Board to limit the number of parking permits to two that may be issued to a single address (with no more than one parking permit issued per licensed driver), exempt a vehicle displaying a valid parking permit from payment at on-street Parking Meters located in the Residential Parking Permit Area where designated by the SFMTA with posted signs, and exempt Health Care Worker and Childcare parking permits from the limit of two permits that can be issued to a single address.**

NOTE: Additions are single-underline Times New Roman;  
deletions are ~~strike through Times New Roman~~.

The Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors of the City and County of San Francisco enacts the following regulations:

Section 1. Article 900 of Division II of the Transportation Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 901 and 905, to read as follows:

**SEC. 901. DEFINITIONS.**



As used in this Article ~~901~~, the following words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

\* \* \* \*

***Educational Institution.*** Any school or other place of learning providing a preschool, elementary or secondary level of study.

~~***Institution.***~~ A place of employment with more than 200 employees or an Educational Institution located in a primarily residential neighborhood, including but not limited to such facilities as an accredited college, university, hospital or sanitarium.

\* \* \* \*

***Residential Area.*** A contiguous or nearly contiguous area of several blocks containing streets and highways or parts thereof, primarily abutted by residential property.

***Residential Parking Permit Area.*** A ~~R~~esidential ~~A~~rea designated pursuant to Section 905 wherein Resident Motor Vehicles displaying a valid Residential Parking Permit shall be exempt from specified Parking time restrictions.

\* \* \* \*

***Transportation Broker.*** The authorized representative of an ~~Institution, including but not limited to the principal or administrator of an Educational Institution,~~ who has primary responsibility for implementing the SFMTA's Parking permit program for that Institution and who is designated as the Institution's primary liaison with the SFMTA for all issues related to on-street Parking permits issued pursuant to this Article 900.

\* \* \* \*

**SEC. 905. RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMIT.**

**(a) General Permit Requirements.**

\* \* \* \*

(c) **Number of Permits.** No more than four Residential Parking Permits shall be issued to a single address. ~~Residents may file a request for waiver of this limitation with the SFMTA to obtain additional permits. Factors to be considered by the Director of Transportation when determining whether or not to grant a permit include, but are not limited to, the availability of on-street Parking in the requestor's residential area and demonstrated need. The Director of Transportation shall maintain public records for all waivers granted, including all documentation provided in support of approval. The annual fee for additional permits shall be twice the base annual permit fee for the fifth permit, three times the base annual permit fee for the sixth permit, and four times the base permit fee for any permits over six.~~ As of July 1, 2019, residents located at a single address previously approved for more than four Residential Parking Permits will be limited to no more than four Residential Parking Permits issued to that address.

(d) **Application Requirements.**

\* \* \* \*

(2) Residential Parking Permits may be issued for motor vehicles only upon application of the following Persons:

\* \* \* \*

(C) A Person who owns or leases commercial property and actively engages in business activity within a Residential Parking Permit area. However, a permit shall only be issued if the applicant presents a valid business registration or tax exemption certificate required by Article 12 of the ~~San Francisco~~ Business and Tax Regulations Code. No more than one permit may be issued for each ~~business establishment~~ commercial property defined by a separate entrance and mailing address for a motor vehicle registered to or under the control of such a Person. The authority to qualify for a Residential Parking Permit pursuant to this subsection is transferable to a bona fide employee of the business. A business may purchase up to three additional

permits for delivery vehicles provided that the vehicles are registered to the business' address and display commercial plates.

\* \* \* \*

**(e) Additional Residential Parking Permits.**

**(1) Health Care Worker Permits.** The Director of Transportation or his or her designee is authorized to issue no more than one transferable Parking Permit, for use by up to three vehicles, to residents of a Residential Parking Permit Area for use of Persons who, on a regular basis, provide health care or other related services essential to the well-being of the resident applicant, upon the certification by a licensed physician that such services are required. The Parking Permit issued to a resident for use by such Persons shall count towards the number of Residential Parking Permits that may be issued to a single address pursuant to subsection (c).

**(2) Fire Station Permits.** Upon the request of the Fire Chief, the Director of Transportation or his or her designee shall issue to the officer in charge of a fire station within a residential Parking area with more than one living unit, not more than 10 transferable Parking Permits and to the officer in charge of a fire station within a residential Parking area with more than one living unit, not more than five transferable Parking Permits for the exclusive use of uniformed members assigned to the station on a temporary basis because of staffing shortages. The Fire Chief shall adopt rules and regulations for the distribution of permits, consistent with this Code.

**(3) Educational Institution Permits.**

**(A)** Upon written request, the Director of Transportation or his or her designee shall issue transferable Parking permits to the Transportation Broker of an Educational Institution with Persons regularly employed as classroom teachers and located within a Residential Parking Permit Area, which shall be valid during the days and times of enforcement

**PAGE 20.**

for the use of Persons regularly employed as classroom teachers at such Institution who reside outside of the Residential Parking Permit Area.

(B) Until June 30, ~~2018~~2019, the Director of Transportation or his or her designee is authorized to issue a maximum of 15 annual permits per Educational Institution.

Starting July 1, ~~2018~~2019, the Director of Transportation is authorized to issue either (i) a maximum number of annual permits equal to 30% of the total number of teachers employed at each school site, or (ii) 15 annual permits per Educational Institution, whichever is less.

However, the total number of annual permits issued to an Educational Institution under this Section 905 may not exceed the number of unrestricted on-street Parking Spaces available between an extension of each property line of said Educational Institution to the middle of the Street upon which the Educational Institution directly abuts, as determined by a survey conducted by the Director of Transportation or his or her designee.

(C) Each Parking permit issued pursuant to this subsection 905(e)(3) shall be valid for one year and may be renewed annually. In distributing permits for a particular Educational Institution, the Transportation Broker shall prioritize those teachers who have no viable options for travelling to work other than driving a motor vehicle.

(D) In addition to permits issued under subsection 905(e)(3)(A), the Director of Transportation or his or her designee may issue City-wide permits for teachers and school administrators employed by the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) whose duties require them to travel to more than one school site and who have been approved by the Superintendent of the SFUSD, or his or her designee. For purposes of this subsection 905(e)(3)(D), "school administrators" shall be defined as those administrators who provide on-site, direct support to schools that have been identified as low-performing by SFUSD, the State of California, or the federal government. The permit shall exempt the holder from Residential

**PAGE 21.**

Parking Permit Area regulations on weekdays between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. when performing official functions for the SFUSD, and shall be valid for one year.

(4) **Foreign Consulate Permits.** One Residential Parking Permit may be issued upon application to foreign consulates located within a Residential Parking Permit Area, and up to a maximum of two additional Parking permits per Consulate for the exclusive use of vehicles registered to the Consulate with the Department of Motor Vehicles.

(5) **Childcare Permits.** The Director of Transportation or his or her designee is authorized to issue a maximum of one transferable Parking Permit, for use on up to three vehicles, to residents of a Residential Parking Permit Area for use of Persons who, on a regular basis, provide childcare services essential to the well-being of a child 12 years old or under who reside with the resident. No single address shall be permitted to be issued or possess more than one Parking Permit for use by such Persons at any one time. The Parking Permit issued to a resident for use by such Persons shall count towards the number of Residential Parking Permits that may be issued to a single address pursuant to subsection (c).

(6) **Family Child Care Homes.** The Director of Transportation or his or her designee is authorized to issue a maximum of one Parking Permit to a resident licensed by the California Health and Human Services Agency, in accordance with Title 22, Division 12, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations, to operate a family child care home for use by a child care provider working at the home who resides outside the Residential Permit Parking Area. The Parking Permit issued to the resident shall count towards the number of Residential Parking Permits that may be issued to a single address pursuant to subsection (c).

**(ef) Procedure for Designating, Rescinding, or Modifying Residential Parking Permit Areas.**

The SFMTA Board of Directors may consider designating, rescinding, or modifying a Residential Parking Permit Area which meets and satisfies the objective criteria set forth in

**PAGE 22.**

subsection (g) based on either subsection (1) or (2) below. The SFMTA Board of Directors may, after a public hearing, designate, rescind, or modify a Residential Parking Permit Area in which vehicles displaying a valid Residential Parking Permit are exempt from specified Parking restrictions including time restrictions for Parking and the days and times of enforcement.

(1) The SFMTA, on its own initiative, may recommend that the SFMTA Board of Directors approve the designation, rescission, or modification of a Residential Parking Permit Area.

(2) A resident of a Residential Area may submit a completed SFMTA application to request the SFMTA Board of Directors to consider the designation, rescission, or modification of a Residential Parking Permit Area.

~~(1) Upon receipt of a petition on a form prescribed by the SFMTA by residents of at least 250 residential units in the residential area proposed for designation or residents living in 50 percent of the residential units in the area proposed for designation, the City Traffic Engineer shall direct surveys or studies as necessary to determine whether a residential area is suitable as a Residential Parking Permit Area.~~

~~(2) The City Traffic Engineer shall make recommendations to the SFMTA Board of Directors regarding the proposed designation of new Residential Parking Permit Areas. Such recommendation shall include the proposed time restriction for Parking and the proposed days and times of enforcement. Before making any such recommendation to the SFMTA Board, the City Traffic Engineer shall ensure that the proposed area meets the following minimum qualifications for a Residential Parking Permit Area:~~

~~(A) A Residential Parking Permit Area must contain a minimum of one mile of street frontage.~~

~~(B) Objective criteria must establish that the proposed Residential Parking Permit Area is affected for extended periods by the Parking of motor vehicles that are not registered to an address within the proposed Residential Parking Permit Area.~~

~~(3) Nothing in this Section is intended to limit the SFMTA's ability to recommend a Residential Parking Permit Area on its own initiative for public hearing and approval by the SFMTA Board of Directors.~~

**(fg) Criteria for Designating, Rescinding, or Modifying a Residential Parking Permit Area.** In determining whether to recommend that a residential area be designated, rescind, or modify as a Residential Parking Permit Area, the SFMTA Board of Directors~~City Traffic Engineer~~ shall take into account factors which include but are not limited to the following:

(1) A Residential Parking Permit Area must contain a minimum of one mile of street frontage.

(2) The extent of the desire and need of the residents for Residential Parking Permits and their willingness to bear the resulting administrative costs even if the SFMTA does so on its own initiative.

(3) The extent to which legal on-street Parking Spaces are occupied during the period proposed for Parking restrictions;

(4) The extent to which vehicles Parking in the area during the times of the proposed Parking restrictions are not registered to residents of proposed Residential Parking Permit Area; ~~and~~

(5) The extent to which ~~m~~Motor ~~v~~ehicles registered to Persons residing in the residential area cannot be accommodated by the number of available off-street Parking Spaces; ~~and,~~

(6) Whether other measures to regulate Parking will improve availability.

~~(g) **Additional Residential Parking Permits.**~~

~~(1) **Health Care Worker Permits.** The Director of Transportation is authorized to issue additional Parking Permits to residents of a Residential Parking Permit Area for use of Persons who, on a regular basis, provide health care or other related services essential to the well-being of the resident applicant, upon the certification by a licensed physician that such services are required. The Parking Permit issued to a resident for use by such Persons shall count towards the four Residential Parking Permits that may be issued to a single address pursuant to subsection (c).~~

~~(2) **Fire Station Permits.** Upon the request of the Fire Chief, the Director of Transportation shall issue to the officer in charge of a fire station within a residential Parking area that quarters more than one unit not more than 10 transferable Parking Permits and to the officer in charge of a fire station within a residential Parking area that quarters one unit, not more than five transferable Parking Permits for the exclusive use of uniformed members assigned to the station on a temporary basis because of staffing shortages. The Fire Chief shall adopt rules and regulations for the distribution of permits, consistent with this Code.~~

~~(3) **Educational Institution Permits.**~~

~~(A) Upon written request, the Director of Transportation shall issue transferable Parking permits to the Transportation Broker of an Educational Institution with at least 15 certificated employees or Persons regularly employed as classroom teachers and located within a Residential Parking Permit Area valid between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on school days for the use of persons employed as teachers at such Institution who reside outside of the Residential Parking Permit Area.~~

~~(B) The Director of Transportation is authorized to issue a maximum of 15 annual permits per Educational Institution. The total number of permits issued to an Educational Institution under this Section 905 does not exceed the number of unrestricted on-~~



**PAGE 25.**

~~street Parking available between an extension of each property line of said Institution to the middle of the Street upon which the Institution directly abuts, as determined by survey of the City Traffic Engineer.~~

~~(C) Upon written request from the Educational Institution documenting the need for more than 15 permits, the Director of Transportation may issue up to an additional five permits if the total number may not exceed the limitation in subsection 905(g)(3)(B) above, and if Parking occupancy in the Residential Parking Permit Area surrounding the Educational Institution is low enough to accommodate the additional permits. Regardless of parking availability on surrounding Streets, a qualifying Educational Institution shall be entitled to at least five permits.~~

~~(D) Each Parking permit issued pursuant to this Section 905(g)(3) shall be valid for one year and may be renewed annually. In distributing permits for a particular Educational Institution, the Transportation Broker shall give consideration to those teachers who are regularly carpooling to work.~~

~~(E) In addition to permits issued under subsection 905(g)(3)(A), the Director of Transportation may issue City-wide permits for teachers and school administrators employed by the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) whose duties require them to travel to more than one school site and who have been approved by the Superintendent of the SFUSD, or his or her designee. For purposes of this Section, "school administrators" shall be defined as those administrators who provide on-site, direct support to schools that have been identified as low performing by SFUSD, the State of California, or the federal government. The permit shall exempt the holder from Residential Parking Permit Area regulations on weekdays between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. when performing official functions for the SFUSD, and shall be valid for one year.~~

~~(4) **Foreign Consulate Permits.** One Residential Parking Permit may be issued upon application to foreign consulates located within a Residential Parking Permit Area, and up to a maximum of two additional Parking permits per consulate for the exclusive use of vehicles registered to the Consulate with the Department of Motor Vehicles.~~

~~(5) **Childcare Permits.** The Director of Transportation is authorized to issue a transferable Parking Permit to residents of a Residential Parking Permit Area for use of Persons who, on a regular basis, provide childcare services essential to the well-being of a child 12 years old or under who resides with the resident. Before a Parking Permit can be issued for a specific block, a resident(s) will be required to submit a petition on a form prescribed by the SFMTA from either ten residential units or fifty percent of the residential units on the block, whichever represents the smaller number of residential units, supporting the issuance of a Childcare Parking Permit. No single address shall be permitted to be issued or possess more than one Parking Permit for use by such Persons at any one time. The Parking Permit issued to a resident for use by such Persons shall count towards the four Residential Parking Permits that may be issued to a single address pursuant to subsection (c).~~

~~(h) **Procedure for Rescinding or Modifying Residential Parking Permit Areas.**~~

~~(1) — Upon receipt of a petition on a form prescribed by the SFMTA by residents of at least fifty percent of the residential units in the designated residential area proposed to be rescinded, or the designated residential area proposed to be modified with respect to existing parking restriction hours, effective times, or the residential area covered, the SFMTA shall direct surveys or studies as necessary to determine whether the residential area designation should be rescinded or modified.~~

~~(2) — Nothing in this Section is intended to limit the SFMTA's ability to recommend on its own initiative for public hearing and approval by the SFMTA Board of~~

**PAGE 27.**

~~Directors a Residential Parking Permit Area to be rescinded or modified with respect to existing parking restriction hours, effective times, or the residential area covered.~~

(h) **Pilot Residential Parking Permit Program Areas.** The SFMTA Board of Directors may establish pilot program areas with permit requirements that vary from existing permit requirements for the purpose of studying and evaluating the effectiveness of alternative parking management methods. All other provisions of this Section 905 shall apply except that:

(1) No more than two Residential Parking Permits shall be issued to a single address and no more than one Residential Parking Permit shall be issued per licensed driver at a single address.

(2) A vehicle that displays a valid Residential Parking Permit shall be exempt from payment at on-street Parking Meters, as required by Division I, Section 7.2.23 (Payment of Parking Meter), located in the Residential Parking Permit Area where designated by the SFMTA with posted signs.

(3) The Parking Permit issued to a resident for use by a Health Care Worker pursuant to Section 905(e)(1) or Child Care Worker pursuant to Section 905(e)(5) shall not count towards the two Residential Parking Permits that may be issued to a single address pursuant to subsection (h)(1).

Section 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 31 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors approves this ordinance.

Section 3. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, letters, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Transportation Code that

**PAGE 28.**

are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions or deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN I. KENNEDY  
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2017\1700690\01219143.docx

I certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its meeting of October 3, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary to the Board of Directors  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency