

**A's Howard Terminal
TNC meeting notes
June 14, 2019**

1. Introductions
2. Surge Pricing
 - a. Surge pricing is internal to Uber/Lyft and not part of strategy or VTR reduction. That is a baseline condition.
3. Surcharges/on-site drop-off
 - a. F&P to provide overview of proposed plan
 - i. Surcharges would be on top of surge pricing as a trip reduction measure – can call it a “TNC fee” to reduce confusion of surge pricing and surcharges
 - ii. There would be a surcharge to drop-off in lots, have max number of vehicles and raise surcharge price to get to desired number. If companies don't agree to a plan, could institute partial street closures, on-street enforcement of no pick-up and drop-off to make lack of a management agreement undesirable.
 - iii. F&P/A's to do a review of management agreements with other MLB teams including associated TNC fees.
 - iv. For discussions with TNCs, could get to the ideal number of vehicles by demonstrating efficiency of roadway network at different numbers of vehicles.
 - b. Desirability and potential trade-offs of on-site drop-off
 - i. A's feel that on-site TNCs are a must-have amenity, will take away from number of parking stalls. Right now the plan shows TNCs + 3500 parking stalls.
 - ii. On-site parking lot could serve 600-800 TNCs per hour, less in off-site lots. F&P states that if streets cannot handle more than a certain number of cars per hour, then TNCs would have to agree to not send more than a certain number there.
 - iii. 1700-1800 cars can exit the parking lot per hour onto Market St. The plan would retain one lane inbound on Market St to accommodate ancillary development traffic.
 - iv. If MLK is transit only during game times, it is unclear if other streets (Market in particular) have capacity for all on-site parking. Model has 700 cars using MLK to exit the ballpark site.
 - v. Cannot have reversible lane at the railroad crossing or across the railroad.
 - c. Operational logistics
4. Geofencing/Drop-off areas outside Howard Terminal and logistics
 - a. F&P to provide overview of proposed plan
 - i. MLK has been discussed as a non-automobile connection (game day bus lane), but has also been discussed as the TNC access point to the parking lot
 - ii. For proposed MLK bus lane it would have to be staffed because it would be a game-day only vehicle restriction.
 - iii. Potential lots for TNC operation under the freeway on Caltrans property between Market and Brush, Brush and Castro, and Castro and MLK. The lot between MLK and Jefferson is an existing County staff parking lot. The lots between Castro and MLK and between MLK and Jefferson are potential expansions of Jefferson Square Park.
 - iv. Organization of TNC operations could be zone-based or first-in/first-out
 - v. A new proposed option is mixed commercial loading zone/TNC pick-up and drop-off like in Temescal, throughout the ballpark area on side streets. City does

not want to carry this option forward and prefers to concentrate drop offs and pick ups at the lot.

- vi. TNC plan would require a management agreement with operators. If they don't agree to a plan and want to operate freely AND/OR if they agree to a plan but compliance isn't working, the project would have to use other means to ensure drop offs and pick ups are taking place in the designated area. Other means discussed include:
 - 1. install signage stating the street is closed for local access only at entrances to each block.
 - 2. Staffing these locations with Traffic Control Officers who can also ticket drivers who are engaging in illegal drop offs/pick ups.
 - 3. install in-street diverters to make circulation for TNCs and all drop-offs/pick-ups difficult. Diverters or other means of restricting access to side streets
 - vii. If the plan limits side streets to local access and limits pick-up and drop-off activity, the plan will need to address how to handle commercial and on-street parking activity.
 - viii. The plan would need to be clear about what level of non-compliance with geofencing triggers the back-up plan(s).
 - ix. Rose Bowl Case Study: all drop-offs are in the parking lot, pick-ups are off-site via a shuttle – operators have come to the table and have an agreement – F&Ps to follow-up on specifics of this agreement with TNCs, as well as any fees involved.
- b. Operational logistics/curbside enforcement
5. CEQA implications and timeline
- a. TDM + TMP together have to demonstrate 20% VTR
 - b. F&Ps to propose threshold for number of TNC trips, with strategies to achieve it and back-up plans in a toolbox
 - c. Potential strategy for monitoring vehicle trip reduction can be based on trips per attendee
 - d. F&Ps to propose performance measures for drop-offs happening in geofenced areas
 - e. Non-CEQA memos will then need to be updated for consistency for inclusion with the final CEQA document, but can be updated during the CEQA review period to keep the timeline moving forward.
6. Upcoming public meetings
7. Action Items
- a. F&P/A's to do review of agreements with other MLB teams including TNC fees.
 - b. F&Ps to research specifics of TNC agreement at the Rose Bowl, including any fees involved.
 - c. City to discuss commercial activity and on-street parking implications of restricting side streets to local access only with parking subconsultant Jay Primus.
 - d. F&Ps to update the plan description in the CEQA Transportation chapter, including proposed metrics, for review.
8. Next Meeting
- a. Next Friday: Site plan meeting
 - b. At the end of this meeting, the group will decide what next CEQA-critical content should be discussed the following Friday – grade separation if the city has significant comments, or else follow-up on critical items from preceding meetings