**From:** Van de Water, Adam (ECN)
**To:** Matier, Phil
**Cc:** Rich, Ken (ECN); Falvey, Christine (MYR)
**Subject:** RE: from matier sf/chronicle - question
**Date:** Thursday, June 25, 2015 3:38:43 PM
**Attachments:** image001.png

---

Correct, though more than 4 out of 5 of them are expected to arrive after the peak commute period and mostly in the reverse commute direction.

Adam

---

**From:** Matier, Phil [mailto:PMatier@sfchronicle.com]
**Sent:** Thursday, June 25, 2015 3:33 PM
**To:** Van de Water, Adam (ECN)
**Subject:** RE: from matier sf/chronicle - question

So we are talking an additional 3,077 cars on the streets between 4 and 8 p.m.

---

**From:** Van de Water, Adam (ECN) [mailto:adam.vandewater@sfgov.org]
**Sent:** Thursday, June 25, 2015 3:27 PM
**To:** Matier, Phil
**Cc:** Rich, Ken (ECN); Falvey, Christine (MYR)
**Subject:** RE: from matier sf/chronicle

Phil:

Ken or Christine will send you a quote regarding the metering lights and bridge tolls shortly.

As to your question regarding the number of cars projected to drive to the arena, Table 10 of the Travel Demand Memorandum on page 306 of Volume 3 reproduced below shows the projected vehicle occupancies and trips by place of origin. For a peak event like a basketball game, we estimate that 524 cars will arrive during the traditional rush hour of 4-6pm and 2,553 will arrive during the evening peak hour from 6-8pm for a total of 3,077 cars. Adding the time periods together, 29% of these 3,077 cars are expected to come from somewhere within SF, 27% from the East Bay, 10% from the North Bay, 32% from the South Bay and 2% from out of the region.

**Table 10**
**Project Average Vehicle Occupancies and Vehicle Trips by Place of Origin and Time Period [a, b, c]**

| | Weekday | | | | | | | | | | Saturday | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PM Peak Hour of the 4 to 6 PM period | | | | | | Evening Peak Hour of the 6 to 8 PM period | | Late Evening Peak Hour of the 9 to 11 PM period | | Evening Peak Hour of the 7 to 9 PM period | | | |
| | No Event | | Basketball Game | | Convention Event [d] | | Basketball Game | | Basketball Game | | No Event | | Basketball Game | |
| Place of Trip Origin/ Destination | Avg. Veh. Occup. | Veh. Trips | Avg. Veh. Occup. | Veh. Trips | Avg. Veh. Occup. | Veh. Trips | Avg. Veh. Occup. | Veh. Trips | Avg. Veh. Occup. | Veh. Trips | Avg. Veh. Occup. | Veh. Trips | Avg. Veh. Occup. | Veh. Trips |
| San Francisco | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Superdistrict 1 | 1.9 | 46 | 1.9 | 58 | 8.1 [d] | 161 | 2.2 | 266 | 2.2 | 217 | 2.0 | 66 | 2.5 | 191 |
| Superdistrict 2 | 1.8 | 101 | 1.7 | 93 | 3.0 | 87 | 2.3 | 128 | 2.3 | 106 | 1.9 | 141 | 2.5 | 103 |
| Superdistrict 3 | 2.1 | 236 | 1.9 | 193 | 2.4 | 165 | 2.4 | 162 | 2.4 | 136 | 2.3 | 266 | 2.5 | 143 |
| Superdistrict 4 | 2.0 | 52 | 2.0 | 63 | 3.8 | 54 | 2.4 | 161 | 2.5 | 133 | 2.4 | 59 | 2.6 | 120 |
| East Bay | 2.1 | 70 | 2.2 | 146 | 2.2 | 93 | 2.6 | 787 | 2.6 | 898 | 2.4 | 74 | 2.6 | 831 |
| North Bay | 2.0 | 19 | 2.2 | 46 | 2.0 | 51 | 2.7 | 286 | 2.7 | 446 | 3.5 | 10 | 2.7 | 422 |
| South Bay | 1.6 | 148 | 1.7 | 261 | 1.9 | 245 | 2.6 | 907 | 2.5 | 1,024 | 2.1 | 129 | 2.6 | 938 |
| Out of Region | 1.7 | 30 | 2.0 | 27 | 1.7 | 62 | 3.7 | 55 | 3.6 | 59 | 1.7 | 40 | 3.0 | 66 |
| **Total Vehicles** | **1.9** | **702** | **1.9** | **886** | **3.3** | **919** | **2.5** | **2,752** | **2.6** | **3,018** | **2.2** | **785** | **2.6** | **2,815** |
| Inbound | | 255 | | 524 | | 256 | | 2,553 | | 134 | | 367 | | 2,687 |
| | | 36% | | 59% | | 28% | | 93% | | 4% | | 47% | | 95% |
| Outbound | | 447 | | 362 | | 663 | | 198 | | 2,883 | | 418 | | 128 |
| | | 64% | | 41% | | 72% | | 7% | | 96% | | 53% | | 5% |

Notes:
[a] Numbers may not sum due to rounding.
[b] Average vehicle occupancy rates vary depending on the time of day (i.e., analysis periods) as the proportion of trips generated by the various land uses components of the project, each one with a different average vehicle occupancy rate, is different depending on the time of the day. See Appendix B (pp. A-50 through A-62) for detailed vehicle occupancy and vehicle trip demand calculations for each individual land use.
[c] For all analysis scenarios, the average vehicle occupancies and vehicle trips include the proposed office, retail, and restaurant uses, as well as an event or no event at the event center, depending on the analysis scenario (i.e., No Event, Basketball Game, Convention Event, etc.).
[d] The average vehicle occupancy rate for a convention event includes trips by shuttle bus service with an average occupancy of 25 passengers per vehicle, per the Moscone Center Expansion Project EIR.
Source: Adavant Consulting – January 2015.

Let me know if you have any further questions.

Best,

Adam

---

**From:** Matier, Phil [mailto:PMatier@sfchronicle.com]
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 23, 2015 9:38 AM
**To:** Van de Water, Adam (ECN)
**Subject:** from matier sf/chronicle

Could you or someone call to talk about possible mitigations ASAP? Thanks

@@@

While most of the debate over the new Warriors' arena has centered around traffic and parking in the Mission Bay area — the real challenge may be elsewhere South of Market

and even on the Bay Bridge.

According to the newly released environmental impact report, the prospect of thousands of fans and concert goers rolling in and out of Mission Bay for the 200-plus planned events each year will likely have “a significant impact’’ on up to seven key South of Market intersections and even back up traffic on the Bay Bridge.

The report says the real problem will be on nights when the Warriors and the San Francisco Giants both have home games.

There will also be added traffic from the East Bay — much of it coming in during the already crowded evening commute — that could create “significant and unavoidable’’ back ups on downtown freeway ramps at Fifth and Harrison and Fifth and Bryant Streets, bringing traffic to near stand-still levels, as well.

The report concludes that “no feasible mitigations are available” to physically ease the problem because there is no room to widen the freeway ramps or city streets.

City planners tell us they plans to counter the crunch by dispatching traffic control officers to the intersections — but as anyone who has already been caught in evening traffic knows, oft times the officers are not enough to keep cars moving.

And as the ramps back up, so will traffic on the Bay Bridge — which is also heavy during the late afternoons and on weekends.

The report does suggest a couple of “potential” solutions for the Bay Bridge backups, such as turning on the bridge’s metering lights on the east end to slow traffic onto the span — or even increasing the price of bridge tolls during the crunch as a way to encourage public transit.

But taking mass transit to the arena could be a bit of a sport, as well.

For example, a BART rider coming in from the East Bay would be encouraged to hop off at at the Powell Street station, then walk underground to the new Central Subway Station at Union Square to take another 10-minute Muni Metro ride to the arena.

Or they could hop off at the Embarcadero, take the Muni line to line to near AT&T Park and join with Caltrain riders to either get on the Central Subway line or walk the three-quarters of a mile to the arena.