

## Executive Summary

- Eliminate the word “alternative” from this first sentence- replace with “mode.” In general, presenting bicycling as an “alternative” sidelines the mode as secondary to auto transportation- the goal of this plan should be to make cycling a mainstream form of transport, not just an “alternative.” Also, using the word alternative assumes that auto is the “primary” mode and in SF, this isn’t necessarily true.
- On p. III, a new Action should be: “review all double turn lanes in the City to determine which can be eliminated, due to their negative impacts on actual and perceived bicycle safety.”
- On p. III, a new Action should be: “DPT Bicycle Program should review plans for every new or reconstructed street to ensure that bicycle facilities are included (example King St. which was recently totally reconstructed, does not have bicycle facilities even though it connects Caltrain to the Ballpark.)
- New Action under transit and bridge access: “Work with TA, MTC, and state and federal agencies to secure funding for a west span pathway on the Bay Bridge”
- Edit to Action 4.7: “.....to provide DIRECT AND improved access on all bridges connecting to San Francisco.”
- Edit to Action 5.6: “WORK WITH SFBC TO FURTHER DEVELOP AND EXPAND THE CURRENT.....educational program for Muni.....”
- Edit to Action 5.7: “Develop and ~~seek out~~ WORK WITH COMMUNITY PARTNERS TO MAINTAIN funding for educational programs aimed At....”
- Edit to #6 Enforcement Goals: add “with a priority on motorist violations.”
- Action 6.1: Clarify that motor vehicle violations are a MUCH higher priority.
- Action 6.6: “WORK WITH THE SFBC TO CONTINUE TO...develop educational materials for the SFPD and other City agencies.....”
- Last action: shouldn’t this be in network section?

## Chapter 1- Introduction

- 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph- replace “alternative” with “mode.”
- P. 1-3, under travel time to work, who suggested that a reasonable travel time is 30 mins?
- If we assume that travel is taking place on local roads during commute hours, often bikes are faster than cars, in the City, and especially in the Central and Business districts.
- P. 1-11 add the following to the end of the chapter 4 summary: “as well as direct access to the Bay Bridge and improved access on the Golden Gate Bridge.”
- P. 1-11 summary, clarification on Chapter 5 summary: The City does not offer any direct, bicycle education programs such as classes- only ads and outreach

## Chapter 2- Bicycle Network

- P. 2-7 add Sloat as an example of a multi-lane street?
- P. 2-15 put list in alphabetical order for ease of reference
- P. 2-15- what about Potrero St? Jefferson- the lack of these important bike network projects makes me worried that others have been left out too.
- P. 2-19- The first paragraph states, “....when planning for shared street use by transit vehicles and bicyclists.” All transit routes should be planned for “shared street use by transit vehicles and bicycles.” Change sentence to, “.....when planning for streets that are used by transit vehicles and feature dedicated bicycle facilities.”
- P. 2-20- At the end of the first paragraph, it says, “.....if bicycles and buses can coexist well on this street.” It should be noted that bicycles and buses already coexist on all Muni routes, except those that go on freeways. Recommend substitute “bicycle facilities” for “bicycles” in this last sentence.
- P. 2-20 “Ideally bicycle routes and Muni routes should not occupy the same streets” We don’t agree with this- who decided this?

- P. 2-20: Last sentence, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph should read, “The challenge for the MTA is to prioritize transit and bicycle projects, OVER accommodating vehicle flow. (that is the true meaning of transit first)
- P. 2-20 Add the following text to the end: “There is significant potential, however, that new bicycle infrastructure will lead to mode shift from cars to bikes, thus relieving congestion and improving Muni’s performance. Updating the City’s environmental review methodologies and modal standards will help to represent this tendency in planning documents.
- P.2-20 It states, “As a matter of policy. However, delays to public transit are not an acceptable cost of expanding and / or improving bicycle routes.” Based on existing LOS methodology, almost all lane removals on transit corridors would do this, when in reality adding bike lanes could end up reducing congestion and speeding transit service.
- P. 2-26 Add: “The current LOS methodologies and environmental review practices prevent projects that have the potential to decrease air pollution, and improve safety by providing badly needed bicycle facilities.”
- P. 2-26 first paragraph, change to “...and provide NO acknowledgement of the environmental benefits of bicycling
- P. 2-26: Traffic Calming and the Bicycle Network: There needs to be mention of the fact that the existing TC guidelines are ill-equipped to support bicycle boulevards- guidelines should be revised- add an action item to this effect.
- P. 2-30: Add a stage to the analysis:

#### Potential for Modeshift

-Are there circumstances that would contribute more or less to increased levels of bicycle use?

- P. 2-31: top of page- what is a “dead head route?”
- P. 2-32: Add to end of first paragraph: “Streamlining the environmental review process would enhance the timeliness of bicycle project delivery and is a major priority for the City.”
- P. 2-35: After first sentence, add “However, it is currently DPW policy to leave trenches as deep as two inches uncovered, and left open without barriers. DPW should consider revising this policy, and requiring barriers or steel plates in order to maintain the street network in a safe condition.”

- P. 2-35: “Open street cuts are SOMETIMES marked with barriers.”
- P. 2-36- Will reference for Palo Alto guidelines be included in the appendix?
- P. 2-38 “This railroad track is considered historic and cannot be removed.” What makes these tracks more historic than other tracks that have been removed? Dangerous conditions should outweigh historic preservation.
- P. 2-41: “It is unclear whether bicycle lanes can legally be striped on unaccepted streets.” Lane markings and crosswalks can be striped on unaccepted streets- why not bike lanes? More info and background needed.
- P. 2-44: end of first paragraph, “Therefore it is recommended that the status quo (of not explicitly allowing bicycles on the Emb. Promenade) be maintained.” This is not good enough- this is a total cop out- the existing use needs to be sanctioned and guidelines put into place to prevent conflict and injury.
- P. 2-44 2<sup>nd</sup> para. What about eastbound bikes in the south bore?

### Chapter 3- Bicycle Parking

- P. 3-5: Caltrain bikestation should be marked as a future bikestation on the map.

### Chapter 4- Transit and Bridge Access

- P. 4-2: Last sentence of first paragraph should read, “Direct bicycle access should also be provided on the Bay Bridge West Span, which has been shown to be feasible through a major feasibility study commissioned by MTC and Caltrans in 2001.
- P. 4-3 Muni LRV access- Other guidelines are available in SFBC report.
- P. 4-4 Add, “Caltrain’s new Baby Bullet trains have reduced the number of bikes allowed from 32 to 16- City staff should work with Caltrain to increase bicycle capacity.
- P. 4-6 first paragraph: Caltrain 4<sup>th</sup> and King is a new station- it’s outmoded?
- P. 4-8: Fourth and King Streets, change to, “At the urging of the DPT Bicycle Program AND THE SFBC, Caltrain.....”

- P. 4-10: Ferry Bicycle Access: I believe Blue and Gold charges \$1 on its Tiburon ferries- this is illegal under common carrier laws. Also, what about the Alameda/ Oakland Ferry? I don't think Blue and Gold operate the Vallejo Ferry.
- Action 4.8 Add, "Work to secure funding for such a path."

## Chapter 5- Education

- P. 5-2: Action 5.31: ".....bicycle AND PEDESTRIAN safety...."
- P. 5-2: Action 5.6: "BUILD UPON AN EXISTING, SFBC-LED educational program....."
- P. 5-2: Action 5.7: WORK WITH THE SFBC TO EXPAND THEIR EXISTING League of American Bicyclists...."
- P. 5-5 Reg'l Information Program: ".....City's commitment to bicycle AND PEDESTRIAN safety.
- P. 5-8: Action 5.7- see comments on p. 5-2 for edits
- P. 5-8: Bicycling should be promoted as a healthy, MAINSTREAM MODE OF transportation...."
- "The City could host a League of American Bicyclists (LAB) League Cycling Instructor (LCI) Training Seminar.....certified instructors who could potentially offer courses on a volunteer basis." This is not necessary- there are already more than a dozen LCI's in SF. Also, LCI's are professionals and deserve payment- this is like proposing finding "volunteers" to be school teachers. We should recruit talented instructors and pay them market value for their work. Please delete sentence starting, "Alternatively...."
- "The DPT Bike Program should become actively involved in the Bay Area regional LAB bicycle education program....." This is not a good idea- the DPT Bike Program should focus on delivery of bike projects- the SFBC already is running an active BikeEd program and has momentum in this regard. The City should support our efforts through promotion, grant support, materials, etc.

## Chapter 6- Enforcement

- Propose new action: "de-prioritize enforcement of bicyclists running stop signs when no other vehicle is present at a given intersection"
- Changes to Action 6.1: "Prioritize SFPD enforcement of motorist violations." (With limited resources, SFPD should focus on violations with the highest potential to kill or maim.

- Clarify Action 6.4
- Articulate Action 6.5
- Page 6-3: Add to end of 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: "Motorists should remain the priority for enforcement because they have a greater potential to do bodily harm than a cyclist."
- Page 6-6: 2<sup>nd</sup> para. Last sentence, ".....because CROSS traffic should wait..."

## Chapter 7- Promotion

none

## Chapter 8- General Plan Amendments

- Action 8.4- This is already happening- recommend direct improvements to env. Review guidelines to speed env. Review for bike facilities....
- P. 8-2: remove all mentions of "alternative" "The bicycle is a desirable MODE OF urban transportation in San Francisco, AS OPPOSED TO THE AUTOMOBILE WHICH IS ILL-SUITED TO BE A MAJOR FORM OF TRANSPORTATION IN A CITY AS SMALL AND DENSE AS SF.....active encouragement of bicycle use-----whenever possible"
- P. 8-3: "This policy encourages.....including the use of transit AS WELL AS bicycling and walking..."
- P. 8-5: Under Congestion Management, end of first paragraph, delete "if feasible" Double turn lanes are DANGEROUS- they should be removed period, not just "if feasible." Are we saying that delaying cars is worse than injuring or killing people? What are we saying here, exactly?
- P. 8-11: edit first paragraph to read, "The use of the bicycle as a mainstream mode of transport is steadily increasing.....As streets....."
- P. 8-12: 3<sup>rd</sup> para: What are sufficient levels of bicycle traffic? Some standard should be used.
- P. 8-13, Recommended Amendments..... change 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence to "Existing LOS standards and methodologies used by the City are focused primarily on automobile travel, and secondarily transit travel, with consideration for pedestrian travel being tertiary AND CONSIDERATION OF BICYCLE TRAVEL NON-EXISTENT." (there are no standards for bikes in SF currently)

## Design Guidelines

- 1B. Minimum parking and bike lane should be 14' 12' is too narrow, and leads to dooring. SF guidelines should be more stringent. Bike lanes like those on Grove west of Divis (12' pkg and bl I believe) are too narrow and basically useless and dangerous."
- 13. When a path crosses a roadway like this, a separate phase should always be required. The current guideline presented is a DANGEROUS CONDITION.
- 19B SHOULD BE DISCARDED IN FAVOR OF 19A- the dashed line and the r-turn arrow to left of "bike lane" indicates that drivers should cut across bicyclists' path.