

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

Page 1

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
1	GENERAL COMMENT	This draft is a huge improvement over the 97 Plan. There are many excellent recommendations, which unfortunately, get lost in the text. We'd like to suggest several structural improvements, following:		
2	General	Put all recommendations from each chapter together. Currently, there are recommendations listed as a group, but then sprinkled throughout the chapter are additional recommendations. Put them all together.		
3	General	Incorporate Appendix B into the chapter sections. These are important. For example, place all ordinances in regards to bike parking in the Bike Parking Chapter. For the ordinances/policies/legislation that don't fit into a chapter, add those as a separate appendix.		
4	General	Add existing bicycle-related plans to the appendices, such as: The Presidio Bike Plan, GG Park Bike Plan, Mission Creek Bike Plan, Bay Bridge Bike Plan, Market Street Study.		
5	General	A chapter on Funding was not included. We are assuming this is just an oversight.		
6	Front Cover	NEW CONTENT: For consistency with the project, please add the BPU logo.		
7	1-1 first paragraph	"Bicycles have been used for transportation in SF since the turn of the century." I believe it was 1880's or 90's when the bicycle became common in SF		
8	Intro, p.1-1, First	I believe SF had already adopted a Transit-First		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

Page 2

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
	paragraph in Policy Context section	policy before '99. This should be checked. This section still relevant to show that bikes are officially part of Transit-First policy.		
9	1-1 3 rd paragraph	"The SF Bike 2004"? Incomplete		
10	Intro, p.1-1	NEW CONTENT: Full set of Plan Goals should be included in Intro., or as separate section in front.		
11	1-3	Please check your use of complement vs. compliment throughout the document).		
12	1-3, #4	Add "and repaving" to the second bullet point		
13	Chapter 2, p.2	NEW CONTENT: Please add the next steps for Bike Network work, after short-term projects, which is to identify, do analysis of, fund, and implement mid-term projects. This is a five-year plan, so these implementable actions should go well beyond this Bike Plan Update action.		
14	Chapter 2, p.2-3	NEW CONTENT: Cabrillo bike lanes should be marked on "existing routes" map.		
15	Chap. 2, p.2-5	What does this sentence mean? Very confusing: "Because the highest priority for the public and City of San Francisco agencies is to improve bicycle safety along some of the City's most challenging transportation corridors, only preliminary design has been completed through the course of this bicycle plan update."		
16	2-10 2 nd to last line	NEW CONTENT This section, as well as the supp. Design guidelines, needs to address the need for etiquette signage along SF's multi-use paths, including "slower bikes and peds keep right," and		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		"faster overtaking traffic use a bell or call out before passing"		
17	2-11, paragraph 1	A cleaning schedule for bike paths such as Duboce does not need further study or input from the BAC. A suggested cleaning schedule should be part of this Bike Plan, with appropriate agency identified.		
18	2-11 2 nd bullet	NEW CONTENT This is a really important design standard for SF. Is there no state of the practice research that SF could draw from? How do other cities solve this problem? An example is Page St. at Stanyan.		
19	2-11 4 th paragraph	NEW CONTENT "Research indicates..." What research? This depends heavily on striping and other conditions, including type of intersections. Recommend removing sentence or further clarifying.		
20	2-11 Class II bike lanes first sentence	NEW CONTENT "Bike lanes are reassuring to bicyclists who are intimidated by traffic." This statement should be revised as follows: "Bike lanes provide a designated right of way on city streets that allow all types of cyclists safe and easy access, especially where significant speed differentials exist, as on many arterials"		
21	2-12, paragraph 1	NEW CONTENT: "For now, these examples can be implemented on a project by project basis."		
22	2-12 wide curb lanes section	NEW CONTENT "if the curb lane could be widened....." There needs to be guidelines about this- sometimes widening an outside lane can be		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

Page 4

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		detrimental to cyclists when the status of the lane as shareable or not shareable is ambiguous. Recommend new language: "If an outside travel lane can be widened to the point where a car and a bike can safely and comfortably share the lane, that project should be pursued. Otherwise sharrows and/or "allowed use of full lane" signs should be applied." In other words, a 12' outside travel lane is worse for cyclists than a 10 ft. or a fifteen foot travel lane		
23	2-13 2 nd para..	NEW CONTENT There should be mention here of the need to include diverters as a component of the bicycle blvd. In traffic calming guidelines.		
24	2-13, last paragraph	NEW CONTENT: Insert Language about special consideration for traffic calming that is primarily bicycle-related, such as the '03/04 example on Page Street. As we have discussed with the DPT's Livable Streets Program, there needs to be mention in the Bike Plan that the city's official Traffic Calming guidelines may not appropriately consider bike-focused traffic calming, etc.		
25	2-14, paragraph 1	Add NEW CONTENT:(last sentence) "And that bicycles are allowed full use of the lane."		
26	2-14 1 st bullet	"which may be further" (from the curb?)		
27	2-14, last paragraph	NOW IS THE TIME TO INCLUDE HOW MANY STENCILS AND SIGNS SHOULD BE PLACED AND HOW FAR THE STENCIL SHOULD BE		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		FROM THE CURB. Please add this.		
28	2-15, paragraph 2	Remove the section about the design guidelines being "conceptual in nature." These are guidelines, not standards and don't need to be weakened any further. They have been approved by ISCOTT, let's try to make them strong as you state in the following sentence. Also include NEW CONTENT: :stencils will be accompanied by "Bikes Allowed Full Use of Lane" signs"		
29	2-16 1 st para.	"For lower volume streets....(often called bicycle boulevards)" This is not a bicycle blvd. Bike blvds. Require three elements: traffic circles, stop signs on side streets, and periodic diverters to prohibit motor vehicle traffic		
30	2-17 2 nd para.	"...a high frequency of complaints and problems due to the increasing volumes...." From whom? What specific problems? Please be more specific.		
31	2-17, any paragraph	Again, it seems like an enormous omission to do a major study of pavement sharrow markings and not recommend how far from the curb they should be placed and at what interval.		
32	Chap. 2, p.2-20	NEW CONTENT: RE: section on construction – suggest more specific action to improve situation. For instance, do contractors/city agencies need permit before doing construction work? If so, include mention of bike considerations there.		
33	2-20 first para.	NEW CONTENT "due to staffing limitations" Is it staffing limitations or just a low priority? What		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		about getting OSHA involved?		
34	Anywhere in Chapter 2	NEW CONTENT: Mention somewhere that requests for valet parking permits along bike network streets should first be reviewed by DPT bicycle program to determine potential impact on bicyclist safety. Permits should only be granted if there are no significant negative impacts to bicycle safety, or only if such impacts are mitigated. If necessary, perhaps this should be a RECOMMENDATION to create such an ordinance.		
35	Chap. 3, p. 3-2, First paragraph in Intro.	NEW CONTENT: Please add "garages" to key locations lacking bike parking. Most SF garages do not provide the bike parking they are legally required to provide.		
36	3-5 2 nd para.	NEW CONTENT "there are ways to mitigate auto parking loss." It should be added that providing bike parking IS mitigation for auto parking loss.		
37	3-5	NEW CONTENT Please mention recent retrofit of parking meters, making it much more difficult to lock a wheel and a frame together with a standard U-lock- this should underscore the importance of bike coalition, BAC, and DPT bike Program review of any project that is likely to affect pkg. Meters or other street furniture.		
38	Chap. 3, p.3-6	Correct intersection for 1095 Market is 7 th St. Thanks for thinking of this spot!		
39	Chap. 3 (general)	NEW CONTENT: Might be good idea to include		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		Planning Code sections referring to bike parking in appendices. This is a common question and would be good to make it easy to reference.		
40	Chap. 3, p.3-14, first paragraph	Please change "private" to "nonprofit" to describe SFBC.		
41	3-8 3 rd para.	"Class I bicycle parking should be free ADD (wherever possible or at least where automobile pkg is free)		
42	3-9 3 rd para	"...provided by regular staffers...." Staffers of what? DPT? Shouldn't pkg garage staff handle?		
43	3-10 3 rd box	"mobile homeless shelters"? What does this mean?		
44	3-11	NEW CONTENT Please show local bikestations, like Palo Alto, Berkeley, and Embarcadero. Also list possible services, including rental, repair, sales, route consultation, etc.		
45				
46	3-12 last para.	"Garage owners and not this grant...." Awkward wording		
47	3-14 Major Events	This section is not clear about current regulations that require attended parking- please clarify- also change caption to specify Giants Stadium valet parking		
48	3-15 3 rd para.	This paragraph is not clear. I don't understand.		
49	Chap. 4, p.4-1	NEW CONTENT: There should be mention of other transit agencies in SF. Ex: City should work to ensure all transit agencies in SF (BART, Muni, Caltrain GGTransit, AC Transit) accommodate bikes to greatest extent possible, etc.		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
50	4-1 first bullet	NEW CONTENT We're beyond this stage. Revise by replacing language with: "Consider allowing bicycles on all LRV's in non-peak hours, to bring SF into uniformity most major cities with LRV lines"		
51	4-1 4 th bullet	NEW CONTENT WE're beyond this stage- replace with "complete full installation of racks on buses" (currently 85-90% installed- check w/ MUNI)		
52	4-2 end of 2 nd para	"constitute an official request...." What are the follow-up actions? How will transit agencies know this?		
53	4-3 end of 2 nd para.	NEW CONTENT "on the 3 rd st. light rail line" replace with "all LRV lines during off-peak hours."		
54	4-3 2 nd bullet	"proof of PAYMENT" -- not purchase		
55	4-3 3 rd bullet	NEW CONTENT Please include other guidelines- these will be very similar to BART's regulations- better to use those that NYC. SFBC can provide researched proposal to add content for off-peak LRV access- talk to Josh.		
56	4-5 first para.	".....and lead to reduce bicycle (AND BART) use."		
57	4-5 3 rd para.	NEW CONTENT Chris Weeks has other suggs. For Caltrain improvements- for starters increase enforcement of non-cyclists sitting in bike cars.		
58	4-5 3 rd para.	NEW CONTENT We need to add language about getting folding bicycles explicitly allowed on ALL MUNI vehicles.		
59	4-5 last para.	NEW CONTENT "Encourage MUNI to install		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		racks on buses that are predicted to be in the fleet for at least one year"		
60	Chap. 4, p.4-5, last paragraph	NEW CONTENT: Please add need to develop promotional & instructional materials around Muni's bikes on bus program – including brochure, web materials, etc.		
61	Chap. 4, p.4-6	GGTransit section: Include need for GG Transit to outfit bigger buses w/ racks per: new state law. (Can give more details on this if needed....)		
62	4-6 AC Transit	NEW CONTENT Discuss AC Transit's success installing racks on their 45 foot buses and their new design for accommodating bikes underneath these buses, allowing for six bikes to be carried.		
63	4-6 GG Transit	NEW CONTENT "Golden Gate Transit should install racks on all buses, including 45 foot commuter buses, in accordance with AB 1409 (?)"		
64	4-6 ferry bicycle access	NEW CONTENT I believe Blue and Gold and Angel Island Ferries charge an extra dollar or so- this could be illegal under common carrier regulations.		
65	Chap. 4, p.4-7, Bay Bridge section	NEW CONTENT: It should be noted that bicycle access is planned for only half of the retrofitted Bay Bridge. A strong recommendation should come from the SF Bike Plan encouraging implementation of a bike path across the entire bridge. And, the approaches to the Bridge should be designed to accommodate bicycles.		
66	4-7 GGB	NEW CONTENT Improved access is needed to		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		the Golden Gate bridge from the south, either through the maintenance yard or through the Battery area. Current access is circuitous, confusing, and leads to serious conflicts between cyclists attempting to access the west pathway and tourists clustered around the café and gift shop.		
67	4-7 Bay Bridge	NEW CONTENT There is no discussion of the planned cantilever bike/ ped/ maintenance pathway for the west span. This is SF's most important large scale non-motorized infrastructure project. CH2MHILL prepared a \$2 million feasibility study. Discussion should focus on funding, touchdown issues in SF and any conflicts w/ Rincon Hill projects, etc. Bike plan should wholeheartedly promote this great project. Please reference CH2MHILL plan and where it is available (at the SFBC offices, MTC library in Oakland). Inclusion in this plan is key to receiving funding for this crucial project		
68				
69	5-2, paragraph 2	Please remove any use of the word "accident" when referring to a collision or crash. The NHTSA has strongly discouraged the use of "accident" as it allows parties involved to absolve themselves of responsibility. Also, NEW CONTENT: mention that the vast majority of bicycle doorings are not reported, therefore the real # of doorings is exponentially		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		higher than 86. NEW CONTENT: Add that bicyclists often have a difficult time getting the police to actually take a police report in any sort of collision involving a bike. So the numbers are most likely very skewed. Also mention that there has been difficulty educating police about bicyclists rights and responsibilities and there can be police bias in reports.		
70	5-3 coexist campaign	NEW CONTENT "Signage should be added at all city boundaries emphasizing the City's commitment to bike and pedestrian safety, and reminding car drivers to share the road."		
71	5-3, paragraph 3	NEW CONTENT: Add "Police" and District Attorney's Office" to the list of groups in need of education.		
72	5-7	NEW CONTENT What about a Safe Routes to Schools reference? Marin has had extraordinary success at getting kids out of cars through development of an ambitious SR2S model program		
73	5-8 5 th para	"introduce effective cycling classes (NOW CALLED BIKE ED CLASSES) as phys. Ed courses" This is great- how can SFBC help??!		
74	Chap. 5, p. 5-9	NEW CONTENT: The rear-view mirror decal reminding motorists to check for bicyclists before opening car doors should be widely distributed. For instance, through residential parking permits.		
75	5-9, last sentence	NEW CONTENT: Include "police" in the list of		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		<u>groups needing trainings.</u>		
76	6-2 motorist moving violations	"ALL collisions between autos and bicycles"		
77	6-2	NEW CONTENT Include section on the city supporting legislation to strengthen these laws, improve conviction rates, etc..		
78	6-3, paragraph 5	NEW CONTENT: Add to the sentence about creating a task force..."and to integrate bicycling issues into regular police trainings."		
79	6-3	NEW CONTENT reference should be made to the possibility of cyclists being allowed to treat stop signs as yields, either codified into law (like Idaho) or applied to specific corridors or streets using a sign stating "bicycles yield". SF could take the lead and get a grant to run a demonstration project of this new sign.		
80	6-4, double-parking	NEW CONTENT: Add that "the option of designating a team of PCOs to ticket violators of the bike lane, should be explored."		
81	6-4 Traffic School	NEW CONTENT Possible Bike ED diversionary program?		
82	Chap. 6, p. 6-4, Awareness of Bicyclists' Rights...section	It should be noted that the SFBC has worked closely with the SF Police Department to develop training materials to increase officers' awareness of bicyclists' rights. Currently, both groups are producing a training video on this topic to be shown to officers. (should be completed this year)		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
83	7-1 3 rd bullet	"Development of a web-based bicycle trip planning system" This is a regional effort being coordinated by MTC for their 511 site. Contact Doug Johnson for more info.		
84	7-4 and 7-10	What about parking cash out for city employees?		
85	7-6, Pilot Program	NEW CONTENT: Add "the City of SF, which employs thousands of people is an ideal employer to pilot this project." Buy-in would be easier etc..		
86	7-3, 3	NEW CONTENT bullet point: "Translate and print copies of "Safe Bicycling in SF" into Spanish and Cantonese and include multiple language options for 585-BIKE.		
87	Employer sponsored Bike ED courses?	7-9	Employer sponsored Bike ED courses?	7-9
88	Chapter 8? Funding	Am I missing something? Where is the section on funding?		
89	3-1, paragraph 2	NEW CONTENT: Add a bullet point: "Partner up with SFPD to curb bike theft. Work with SFPD to create system to return found bikes to owners, and to make bike theft a higher priority."		
90	A-1, anywhere	NEW CONTENT: Insert a statement somewhere that bicycle-priority streets that utilize elements of the traffic-calming techniques in order to improve conditions specifically for bicyclists, are not required to follow the public approval process as set forward in the traffic calming guidelines.		
91	A-13	NEW CONTENT Discuss problem that these guidelines pose to implementation of bicycle blvds.		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		In SF. Page St. as an example- we need to have a diverter exemption for bike facilities.		
92	B-2	NEW CONTENT We need an explanation of these changes to code		
93	B-3, last paragraph	Please de-prioritize. An ordinance should absolutely not be recommended here. Etiquette signs should suffice.		
94	B-4 , bullets	NEW CONTENT: "Broadway Tunnel and Portions of Masonic from Fell to Geary"		
95	B-4	NEW CONTENT Embarcadero Promenade should be legalized for bicycle travel- with ped areas and in-line skate/ bike areas, similar to the presidio. Today's unregulated environment is dangerous and inefficient. In addition, the Marina Green pathway should remove its "no bikes" signage.		
96	B-4	NEW CONTENT Prioritize enforcement of sidewalk riding in business districts, de-prioritize in other areas.		
97	B-6, paragraph 2	Change the wording of the first sentence so it conveys the reality that it would potentially would be useless. As stated, "a more direct method to control behavior" directly contracts the experience of NY.		
98	B-8, paragraph 3	NEW CONTENT: A bike lane enforcing PCO's should also be on duty at all times, rotating along different bicycle routes.		
99	B-10, last paragraph	Include Paris, France is list of cities that allow bikes in bus lanes. MUST ADDRESS: BIKES MUST BE		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation "NEW CONTENT."	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		<u>ALLOWED IN BIKE LANES.</u>		
100	B-12,	This is a major issue, with serious ramifications. This would be best discussed at the Oversight Committee, where we plan to raise this at next meeting.		
101	B-14	NEW CONTENT "It is important to gather good data when a bike lane replaces a travel lane that demonstrates mode shift as a result of bike improvements"		
102	B-15 multi-lane streets	Potrero Ave. too		
103	B-16 bike thru lanes	This should be a written policy		
104	B-27, paragraph 2	Designate a department to maintain such a database.		
105	B-28 to B-32	Confusing. I think this still needs to be edited?		
106	Appendix E, page 7, Bicycle/Transit Guidelines	This should not be recommended ("In the event that the proposed bicycle facility is demonstrated to negatively impact transit operations based on transit...") Again, we plan to raise these issues with the TAC and Oversight Committees as these guidelines were extensively reviewed and approved by those two groups, yet subsequently changed without any notification.		
107	Design Guidelines 13	This design needs to specifically require a designated crossing phase for bike that prevents right and left turns from the adjacent roadway. This design is basically codifying the existing disastrous conditions at Fell/ Masonic		
108	Design Guidelines 19B	This is very bad. This encourages conflicts between thru cyclists and right turning vehicles.		

<i>Reviewer Name</i>	<i>Agency Name</i>	<i>Document Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Mary Brown</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</i>	<i>San Francisco Bicycle Plan 2004 Administrative Draft</i>	<i>2/17/04</i>

	Chapter, Page, Para.	Agency Comment	DPT Bicycle Program Staff Response to Comment	Alta Response to Comment
	To be filled out by reviewers, based on pdf copy of report provided on 2/17/04.	Provide specific comment that can be reviewed and incorporated into existing report narrative text, graphic figures, or appendices. Specify where new topics and content is required with designation “NEW CONTENT.”	DPT Bicycle Program Staff to provide response to each comment. Rationale for NOT incorporating comments to be provided.	Alta to incorporate comments into Public Review Draft based on DPT response and direction.
		In a dual destination lane such as this, cyclists must take the lane, regardless of width.		
109	General Comment	The SFBC requests that the design guidelines are brought back before the T.A.C. for additional review. There are additions with serious implications that members of TAC did not review.		