BETTER MARKET STREET

Public Outreach — Round Three Appendix

- A. Survey Questions
- B. Survey Responses
- C. Workshops Stations Discussion Notes
- D. Online Comments
- E. Agenda
- F. Workshop flyer

Table of Contents

A. Survey Questions

July 2013 Workshop Survey

For more information about the Better market Street project,
visit **bettermarketstreetsf.org**

Placemaking

- Overall, what are the most appealing pedestrian improvements in the 3 options?
- To what degree do you believe having a cycletrack on Market Street contributes to the quality of the pedestrian experience?
- How willing are you to have less sidewalk space for Streetlife Zones to activate the sidewalk if it means including a cycle track on Market Street?
- What ideas presented at this workshop do you think are most likely to strengthen Market Street as a destination?

Transit

- Are you willing to have the Local and Limited lines stop at different locations, ½ to 1 block apart (i.e., the Rapid Transit Service option), if it means faster and more reliable Express line service? What are your main reasons for supporting or not supporting the Rapid Transit Service?

Bikes

- How comfortable would you feel riding in a shared lane on Market Street if there were fewer cars, more opportunities to pass stopped busses, and no bottlenecks at boarding islands?
- What parts of the raised cycletrack on Market Street are most appealing to you, and why? You do not have to respond from the perspective of a cyclist.
- What parts of the buffered cycletrack on Mission Street are most appealing to you, and why?

Auto circulation

- What do you find most appealing and/or of greatest concern about the private automobile restriction proposals? Why?

Plazas

- What appeals to you about the designs for UN and Hallidie Plazas that you saw today? Are there other things you would like to see at UN Plaza? At Hallidie Plaza?

Districts

- What do you like about the “One Street – Six District” approach to Market Street? Are there aspects of any of the Districts that you want to see emphasized?

Overall

- What design elements are most appealing to you from any of the options? Any additional comments?

Main Library, Saturday July 20, 2013

B. Survey Responses

Overall, what are the most appealing pedestrian improvements in the 3 options?

- 3
- " Hallidie plaza raising
- Bulbouts and I liked the modifications to the Larkin Street section."
- 3 way big crosswalks and separate bike path
- Activating the plazas and activating the alleyways. Making Market & Mission Street a destination encourages walking.
- Activation of pedestrian way.
- Activity zones with a variety of "things"
- Additional greenscaping, vehicular restrictions east of 8th.
- Better transit access/friendly; welcoming areas.
- Better waiting areas for public transportation. Places to sit down.
- Bike lanes
- "Buffers from vehicular traffic
- Greenery"
- Bulbout/intersection improvements that shorten crossing distances. Cycletrack behind curbside loading zones.
- Bulbouts
- Bulbouts for quicker street crossing safer
- Crosswalks and bulbouts.
- Cycletrack anywhere (Market (I like this one because more activation of Market Street) or Mission (but I think this is the safer option)) is so exciting!
- Cycletrack. Limit autos on Market. Sidewalk scouting (not necessarily streetlife hub-sided).
- Cycletracks, more pedestrian space.
- Don't like sidewalk reduction or tree reduction
- Easy access to outdoor cafes, street theater, transit hubs, info booths, signs.
- Eliminating pedestrian islands.
- Evaluating the options using computerized models is difficult. Would it be possible to take a small section of Market Street in each of the 6 districts and mark the options in colored chalk to really get the feel of the options?
- Extended curbs and enhanced plaza.
- Greenery, public furniture, bike parking, visual division of walking and streetlife. I'm concerned about installing performance spaces or other uses that might become obsolete. Traffic calming!
- Hallidie Plaza being filled in.
- Hub space for people to gather as a community!
- I like that cycling is away from pedestrians.
- I prefer the changing pedestrian spaces. i.e. They are not contiguous in combination with the bicycle track. It creates destinations along Market.
- Improving the trees.
- Improving UN & Hallidie Plaza
- Isolating bike lanes and bicycles in order [to] improve pedestrian safety.
- Knowing the bike lanes will have stoplights.
- Lack of bus traffic.
- Landscape improvements and seating.
- Longer and wider bus islands. Broader sidewalks w/ room for uses & space.
- Maintaining the sidewalk width in Option 1, 3 (and maintains the trees)
- Market street already has good pedestrian areas
- McAllister & Jones -- Less crosswalk.
- More active street life. New street furniture.
- More trees, the improved Hallidie Plaza, streetlife --> places to relax and eat.
- New elements and materials, more street life elements, safety, vitality, experimental (adaptive).
- No more pedestrian islands.
- Option 1 - Fewest clips to sidewalk width. Improving crossing on north side was the best thing.
- Option 1: Increased, concentrated ridership on Market St. Option 2: Raises bike lanes 3 inches, could provide innovation and be a fixture of SF's continuing dedication to creative solution. Option 3: Mission is incorporated to diffuse bicycle traffic.
- Option 2
- Option 2 = First choice. Option 1 + 3 = Second choice but I like as well.
- Option 3
- Paving over Hallidie Plaza. Doing cafes at Hallidie Plaza and Civic Center Plaza. Better seating arrangement at Civic Center.
- "Providing seating along market

- Shorten crosswalks"
- Raised crosswalks. Shortened crosswalks with reduced car turning speeds. Streetlife zones () as long as they're not taken over by homeless/ panhandlers).
- Raised plaza Hallidie. Enliven UN Plaza. Streetlife Zones
- Raised walkways and non-street surfaces. Wider crosswalks and bulb-outs. Cafes.
- Raising BART plazas.
- Raising Hallidie Plaza, larger bus islands.
- Realignment of wedge street intersections north of Market without all the islands; interconnection of Mission & Market streets w/ cyclists; cycle tracks as buffers at pedestrian edge.
- "Reduced crosswalk distance especially at intersections current requiring 2 crossing for one street
- Seating
- Removal of sunken Hallidie Plaza"
- Reduction in crosswalk space between corners
- Re-invigorating the plazas
- Removing islands on corners by enlarging sidewalk. More rapid transit.
- Safer crosswalks. Getting rid of pork chops.
- Seating!
- Seating, art, safety upgrades. Placemaking. City repair. Make a [freespace]
- Shorter crossing distance at intersections. Continuous, level sidewalks (raised alleyway crossings). The extra livable space.
- Shorter crossings at intersections!
- Shorter crosswalks. More trees (more structure shelter space).
- Sidewalks are wider, bulbouts, bikes buffer traffic.
- Street furniture
- Streetlife and street as a destination
- Streetlife hubs
- Streetlife zone.
- Streetlife zones and hubs; pedestrian throughways.
- Streetlife, dedicated bike lanes, widen sidewalks, trees, resting places.
- The cafes and public [areas]. Also the new and improved UN plaza.
- The division of usefulness within sectors -- Mid Market has different streetlife than Union Square and Downtown. Streetlife might encourage more people to be comfortable at Mid Market in conjunction with bumless development.
- The expanded streetlife zone and creation of streetlife hubs and UN Plaza and Hallidie Plazas. Suggest that scope of study / plan be expanded below for the public R.O.W. / SFDPW purview to include ground floor program of adjoining buildings / SF Planning purview.
- The improved plazas.
- The larger curbs and elimination of porkchops requiring double crossings are fantastic.
- The raising of Hallidie Plaza; the diversity, frequency of streetlife zones; improved crosswalk, curb conditions
- The walking experience will be significantly enhanced with attractive street scope, the various hubs and zones, less traffic-noise
- Trees, the cycletrack (somewhat ironic, I know).
- Urban life, more trees, safety
- Wasn't focused on pedestrians. I figure they'll be fine either way
- Widened sidewalks on 4th, 3rd, New Montgomery, 2nd 1st, etc. Public seating -- an aging nation needs/wants to sit down. Cycletrack buffers on Mission.
- Widening sidewalks and introducing streetlife zones.
- Widening space and streetlife areas
- Wider and smarter sidewalks and redrawn crosswalks.
- Wider medians for people with disability.
- Wider sidewalks / being ale to close off escalators after hours.
- "Wider sidewalks
- Shortened crosswalks"
- Wider sidewalks, bulb-outs, shorter crosswalks, calmer / less traffic, bikes buffer traffic, streetlife zone, amenities, trees.
- Wider sidewalks. Bulb-outs. Filling in Hallidie Plaza.

- Accelerated streets and alleyways. Streetlife hubs.
- Attracting bicyclists to Mission St where it is safer. I like the streetlife concept on Market -- this could also be done on Mission. I like the Rapid Transit options -- less stops means greater pedestrian safety.
- Bulbouts instead of pedestrian islands. Closing Ellis (Eddy?) to cars. Fewer parked cars on Mission (daylighting).
- Bulbouts, fun places to hang out, getting bicyclists on the cycletrack.
- Cycle tracks, private car removing, traffic calming.
- Cycletrack as transit separation and passive pedestrian safety. Streetlife hugs with active elements (art, cafes, landscaping). Additional trees, landscaping --> more comfortable transit waiting.
- Cycletrack is better to pedestrians.
- Fixing the intersections on the north side of Market.
- Greenery
- Have you considered the effect n the elderly and disabled if there are fewer MUNI stops? Having more reliable MUNI is not as important as are having more convenient stops.
- I like the buffered cycletrack and the green wave signal timing. However, I like these improvements IN ADDITION TO THE CONTINUOUS SEPARATED cycletrack IN OPTION 2!
- I would say enhancing it to attract home people and to accommodate a variety of good activities.
- Improved transit waiting places, intersection bulbouts, removal of unnecessary small structures, wayfinding (placemaking maps great), also treescaping.
- Increased bulbouts and reducing the "two-way crossing" zones. More shared space for seating and interaction. More unified public spaces (e.g. bringing Hallidie Plaza to street level.)
- Intensifying transit, making market a transit destination. Integrating bikes on market, creating activity and socialization.
- Minimizing clutter, which must include changing disastrous tree program, both species and double loaded scheme.
- More space? Skeptical of street furniture; would rather have wider sidewalks. Better crosswalks/intersections.
- Narrower intersection crossings. Trees and landscaping, seating. Private vehicle restrictions -- particularly in retail districts.
- Option 3 - Include Mission Street and fill in pedestrian passageways/alleys like Melbourne example.
- Outdoor seating, green space, and fewer cars.
- Restricted private vehicle usage. Wider sidewalks/smaller crossings.
- Sealing off Battery Street to traffic and creating other cul-de-sacs. Continuing sidewalk surface grade over intersections. Removing "pork chops" and decreasing crosswalk length.
- See answer to the 4th question (making Market Street a destination). [Retyped here for quick reference:] I suppose the streetlife zones -- but only in select areas. Table sand chairs notwithstanding, I'm not going to sit and talk to people or read a book at 6th & Mission.
- Separating pedestrians/bicyclists/buses.
- Shorter crossing distances. Nice paving. Eliminating "pork chops" at multi-street intersections.
- Shorter crossings by far. Converting the complicated multi-street intersections to a single crosswalk. Bulb-outs.
- Shorter crossings/elimination of shallow right turns for cars. Streetlife zone.
- Streetlife and street hubs, bulb-outs, pavement treatment, seating, event space, bike racks.
- The suggestions for creating a livelier Plaza environment would really attract people to spend time and socialize. Seating in the hubs and plazas a well as performance spaces.
- Wider sidewalks of option 3.
- Wider sidewalks, seating.
- “ shortened pedestrian crossings , - closing Ellis to traffic to create sidewalk, - raising the Powell Station homeless pit up into a real plaza, - Replacing the dated, generic red brick sidewalks with something new and the distinction between a walking zone and a street life zone.”

- Clarity of lanes and usage (feels safer) via signage and dedicated cycletrack. pleasantness of walking on Market Street through streetlife hubs.
- Clean sidewalks.
- Clearing the sidewalks of unnecessary clutter and adding more canopy.
- Cycletracks on Market Street, reduction in right turn-bicycle conflicts. more sidewalk space in busier areas of Market.
- Dedicated cycletrack and removal of private vehicles from Market Street.
- Far and away, the best improvements you could do for pedestrians are the on the north side of Market St. - “Eliminating Pedestrian Islands”. I would be over the moon if this is actually done! Also very much like the bulbout ideas. “Continuous Sidewalks” seem to be only mentioned in conjunction with the alley streets off of Mission. I would love to see this treatment applied to the alleys parallel to Market and Mission (and between these 2 streets). I’ve had lots of bad experiences with cars zooming out to turn onto whatever street I’m on (8th, 9th, etc). Usually the driver only looks to his/her right OR left, depending on what direction traffic is coming from. A continuous sidewalk would surely slow them down and make them more aware of crossing a pedestrian space.
- I hope that San Francisco can model Copenhagen because the most appealing is having separated bikeways, pedestrian area and motor/transit vehicle roads. I also like the idea of rebuilding the civic center and union square areas and providing more outdoor seating/cafe.
- I like the balance these options appear to attempt to achieve between pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders and private cars.
- Keeping and widening the pedestrian space.
- Less MUNI stops. It is ridiculous how often the bus stops on Market street. I also like it that cars may be banned. Any driver who goes down Market street now must be lost.
- Market Bikeway
- None!
- Nothing-- they propose more physical and visual clutter on the sidewalks.
- Removal of garage entrance at Battery/First Sts. Removal of BART hole at Powell Street Bulb-outs and straight-through crosswalks
- Sidewalk widening, buffering pedestrians from vehicular traffic, crosswalk improvements like bulb-outs and better striping.
- The raised Powell eating area - raising the BART area
- There’s already enough sidewalk space. Let’s not make Market into the Santa Monica mall.
- What 3 options?? The Survey doesn’t say.
- Wider sidewalks. Possibility of auto restrictions.
- Wider sidewalks. Reducing automobiles
- with no cars and better sidewalk improvements it is a nicer place to walk, sit and talk/read, catch the sun.

To what degree do you believe having a cycletrack on Market Street contributes to the quality of the pedestrian experience?

- ? Bad idea.
- A cycletrack on Market is crucial to enhancing the pedestrian experience, providing a buffer between pedestrians and motor vehicles. It also brings more foot traffic to Market since all cyclists are pedestrians too.
- A dedicated cycletrack would be extremely beneficial.
- A great deal. If you want to revitalize Market Street, bicycles are your greatest tool.
- A lot! As a pedestrian. I'd much rather be next to bikes than cars.
- A lot. Prevents conflicts with cars and pedestrians.
- Absolutely Essential
- All options omit an APS at the median island to the sidewalk for people with impaired vision.
- As an everyday bike commuter and weekend pleasure rider, I think a cycletrack on Market contributes greatly to the quality of street life for pedestrians. I think we should have cycletracks on both Market & Mission streets.
- Bicyclists and pedestrians are in danger. Bad idea.
- "Buffer from vehicles (cars/buses/trucks)
- Quiet
- Better sense of shared space"
- Buffers the pedestrians from bus traffic
- Clear bike tracks would provide organization and a neater, more streamlined interaction.
- Considerably -- pedestrians buffered from car/bus traffic.
- Contribute significantly
- Cycletrack would make the street look friendly :)
- "Cycling and walking coexist
- Both reduce traffic- congestion, smell, noise, accidents"
- Depends, if cyclists are commuting and at high speeds, interaction can be hostile. If cyclists move slowly, not all cyclists will be satisfied, pedestrians and cyclists would be best united by option 2.
- Doesn't -- but it's essential for the sake of the bikers.
- Doesn't. Sidewalks wide. We need cops keeping intersections along Market clear, don't block the box!
- Dramatically improves. It will increase eyes on the street. The city is safer and has more smiles when people aren't flying by at 40 mph in a metal box.
- Emphasizing pedestrians appeals to me more than emphasizing bicycles.
- Get sidewalk riders on to cycletrack.
- Given the overall width, probably little, but it does make it more active. The extended sidewalk treatment would look nice. The pedestrian realm would be larger.
- Gives a calmer sense of the street.
- Greatly, due to the further barrier between motor vehicles and pedestrians. Also demonstrates how safe, easy it is to ride a bike.
- High
- High.
- Huge degree -- clearer destination always better.
- Huge! Pedestrian & bicyclists should be one the same. Pedestrians & bicyclists & Metro vs. cars (bicyclists, pedestrians, board Metro).
- I am not a cyclist, but from observation, it seems like it would really provide better safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- I believe a cycletrack contributes greatly to pedestrian safety. It is definitively needed.
- I believe it adds to the pedestrian experience by safely defining where cyclists commute.
- I don't like it. We need stop lights for the bikers that don't stop for pedestrians.
- I don't want to be run over by bicycles. I really want bikes and pedestrians are separated.
- I like the idea of the Option 2 3" raised cycletrack. However have concern that SF's

"road warrior" bike culture will negatively impact pedestrian experience which goes behind transit loading zones. Therefore, prefer Option 1 with shared bike lanes.

- I love seeing bicyclists on Market --> high contribution.
- I support it, as long as it doesn't require a car-ban, which hurts businesses.
- I think it helps, but not being able to have it continuously detracts.
- I think it is great. It gives it a wider feel even through the track is officially separate.
- I think it will contribute greatly --separate vehicular traffic providing a buffer, making walking and cycling safer -- smoother pavement.
- I think it's really important to have a cycletrack on streets with room. It makes walking quieter, safer, and more distant from exhaust
- I think someone should be able to ride via bike lane from the Ferry Building to Golden Gate Park. A cycletrack is a must.
- I think the buffer at the sidewalk is good. I think the consolidation of transit & the car restrictions being lighter will ensure the street has lively multi modal movement sources.
- If it means getting sidewalks free of bicycles-great!
- If it would keep people from biking on sidewalks, it would be a vast improvement for pedestrians.
- If monitored appropriately could alleviate much of congestion on sidewalks but many might still be [relief]
- Integrating all modes on SF's main boulevard is important. Bicycling should be given dignity for everyone to see.
- It buffers people from busses/traffic
- It degrades the pedestrian experience by allowing a more unobstructed 'track" for cyclists.
- It engages the area more because bicyclists are connected with their travel environment
- It gives pedestrians something fun to be inspired by
- It is vital. Cycling is the ideal form of urban transportation. Regardless of how nice Mission is made, it won't change the fact that Market is the destination! Some riding on Market will always be there…
- It looks potentially dangerous [getty] between sidewalk and bus.
- It may have a negative impact if the cyclists won't abide by the rules of the roads.
- It may provide some separation between pedestrians and moving buses.
- It provides a safer experience for the cyclists which provides a safer feeling for the whole area.
- Lots
- Lots. Bicyclists hop on and off bikes and make purchases
- Major improvement.
- Make street more tranquil and welcoming.
- Makes bicyclists less chaotic so improve things for everyone.
- Neutral, although will create more people-cycle issues.
- None!
- None. It encourages cyclists to speed, discouraging them from observing traffic signals and crosswalks.
- Not
- Not much…better option is Mission where retail populace is minimized.
- Not really a big effect. If the idea is that cyclists shields the pedestrians from autos, that's not really relevant since auto traffic is already very slow
- Not really. More conflicts with pedestrians.
- Not significant
- Not sure having a cycletrack on Market will get better [quality] in the pedestrian experience, because I don't think it [interferes]. As a cyclist, I think the problem is interfering with the buses and cars.
- Not sure-- scared I'll be hit by a bike!
- Nuh?
- Only as it protects pedestrians
- Pedestrians may find it more welcoming.
- Positive.
- Providing a safer environment for everyone. Pleasant experience.
- Really like the idea of pedestrians and cyclists coexisting, especially small raised platforms. Ideally children should feel comfortable biking.

Navigating around buses is a very bad thing.
- Safer for pedestrians, slow down traffic, livable city
- Separate from buses encourage more bicycling and therefore activates street more. Also makes MUNI faster which will bring more pedestrians to Market.
- Separated bike lanes for cyclists in highly dense areas will avoid conflicts with pedestrians. Keep everybody safe -- especially as the numbers of cyclists doubles w/ committed and bike share users.
- Separates two activities and keeps pedestrians safer.
- Significant contribution Buffer traffic. Makes streets more lively and feels safer.
- So much better! With safer cycling options on Market, fewer people will ride their bikes on the sidewalk.
- Somewhat? Better for bikes!
- Strongly -- it separates bikes from people from vehicles. However, I am still concerned about pedestrians crossing into bike lanes unknowingly.
- The buffer is good for pedestrians -- but also bikes make a more lively street.
- This question is poorly worded and is leading. The cycletrack would act as a buffer for pedestrians. It will also invite cyclists to stop, enjoy the sidewalk/streetlife zone, etc.
- To a huge degree.
- Tremendously
- Unsure. I believe anything possible should be done to enhance pedestrian safety. At the same time, I'm not sure SF cyclists would follow it (opt for street).
- Very highly -- stringent separation of modes are essential.
- Very much. Narrow cycletrack feels safer than shared lane.
- Very much. People on bicycles are more likely to stop and shop (if there are streets to stop at and lots of safe bike parking!)
- When cyclists park their bike, they are pedestrians, and this transition is so much more fluid than auto/pedestrian transition that option 2 will have a great impact.
- With appropriate signaling for bicycles, it could encourage bicyclists to respect pedestrian spaces, especially crosswalks. Perhaps consider flashing lights in street at crosswalks urging cyclists not to cross crosswalk (or to pull up into crosswalks) while pedestrians are allowed to cross.
- Would definitely improve safety of cyclists, who are also pedestrians.
- Yes
- Yes, a little.
- Yes, less bikes in way of people and cars
- A buffer
- A cycletrack on Market is a great idea for pedestrian experience and provides a place of refuge for bus boarding, makes clear divisions, improves chances they'll pick up a bike.
- A lot -- I cycle and walk, but cyclists and pedestrians sharing causes conflict.
- A very strong positive effect.
- Bicyclists ride on sidewalks because they don't feel safe on the streets. Cycletracks go a long way towards fixing that problem. I think it would very much improve the pedestrian experience by encouraging cyclists to use the street instead of sidewalks.
- Depends on if cyclists will slow down when pedestrians are crossing (transit stops).
- Doesn't degrade pedestrian experience. Vulnerable pedestrians--seniors, people with disabilities, and adults with a baby in a stroller -- would have to contend at every intersection with the many many many bicyclists who blow through crosswalks.
- Good for intermediary scale visual element but in practical terms difficult for pedestrians to cross bicycle lanes to get to bus waiting pads.
- Greatly. This buffer seems to enhance safety/ quality of each zone. Option 2 plus Option 3 Mission Street. Try this now!
- Having a cycletrack on Market would increase the number of people on the street who share the same space, in general. More cycle traffic is a much more pleasant pedestrian experience than more motor traffic.
- I don't necessarily thing that it does, though it certainly improves things for cyclists. The requisite narrowing of the sidewalks seems detrimental to pedestrians, if anything.

- I think city Design needs to allow separate spaces for pedestrians, bicyclists, an meter vehicles. And the cycletrack is a very strong first step in that and will improve pedestrian experience.
- If it helps that bicycles off sidewalks -- especially the 5th and 8th area -- GOOD.
- If it keeps bikes off the sidewalk, I can see it as a benefit to pedestrians.
- If there is an adequate buffer, would be an enhancement to current model.
- It does a lot because it would encourage cyclists to not ride on the sidewalk and ride on the cycletrack.
- It doesn't, due to a huge jaywalking problem in SF.
- It helps. How will you keep pedestrians and trucks and cop cars out of the cycletrack?
- It provides a safe/comfortable biking experience for families, women and older citizens to cycle. Gives cyclists direct access to businesses and offices on Market, rather than having cyclists pushed off Market to mission.
- It separates pedestrians from cars.
- It will improve pedestrian and bike experience immensely.
- It would give the pedestrians experience a huge boost. It's much calmer to walk next to bikes than cars. Dedicated cycletracks would encourage more leisurely bike rides, families.
- It would make biking much safer. It's a nice buffer for pedestrians from traffic.
- No
- Not too helpful.
- Probably relatively neutral, maybe would help take cyclists off sidewalk.
- Protect feeling to pedestrians separate bike and transit boarding.
- Reduces traffic, calms the calamity of traffic congestion.
- Strongly believe it will create a buffer between pedestrians and vehicular traffic.
- Though cyclists & pedestrians share characteristics, I don't think a cycletrack improves the quality of the pedestrian experience except for when a cyclist dismounts and becomes a pedestrian.
- Tremendous improvements.
- Vital! Bicycles bring eyes and ears to the sidewalk and intensifies activity.
- With SF Bike Share it would let pedestrians easily rent a bike and ride.
- Yes
- Anything that makes it easier to ride bicycles and take transit will reduce automobile use. Anything that reduces automobile use improves the pedestrian experience.
- I believe having a separated cycle track provides safer and more predictable riding for both the cyclists and the drivers. And when there's a better harmonized system throughout Market Street, pedestrians feel safer too utilizing other modes in addition to walking.
- I believe that is a loaded question because the direct impact of a cycletrack on Market comes at the expense of sidewalk.
- I think it enhances it and promotes multi-modal transportation use. If biking is more accessible to me as a pedestrian, I am likelier to try it. If it's separated entirely or part of the regular streetscape, I am likelier to view it as non-pedestrian friendly. I think the cyclcetrack is an opportunity to make biking more friendly to pedestrians and vice versa. Bikers need to be more award of pedestrians too. The cycletrack protects bikers but I think it also helps protect and improve the pedestrian experience as well.
- I think it is absolutely essential. We cannot afford to keep status quo with the issues at hand (an increasing population, environmental concerns, safety issues, the list goes on...)
- I think this will work well with the pedestrian experience and keep bikers and pedestrians separated.
- I'm not sure how it will affect the pedestrian experience, but I think it would be good for cyclists and traffic in general.
- It is important to encourage bikes to stay in the track and stay clear of the sidewalk.
- It provides nothing for pedestrians and is unsafe, since pedestrians would have to cross the cycletrack to get to buses, cabs, and other amenities, with bicyclists consistently defying the law. It does nothing to promote dangerous bicyclist behavior, that has killed three pedestrians in the past 2 years.

- Keeps cars off the road. Slower traffic, easier to cross the street if the lights aren't in favor of high volume of cars.
- Must have a dedicated cycletrack.
- No effect. Narrower sidewalks degrade the pedestrian experience, especially in the crowded parts of the Financial District around Montgomery Street.
- No. Bikes are dangerous for pedestrians.
- None.
- Not at all, it will only take more space on the street.
- Not sure it makes a difference at all. As a pedestrian, I feel well separated from traffic when walking mid-block.
- Only somewhat. With the dense number of walkers, a busy cycle track intersecting with crosswalks seems like a recipe for a collision.
- Possibly, if not at the expense of pedestrian space.
- Quite a bit -- seeing bicyclists rather than cars feels so nice and comforting, and makes you feel like you're part of a sustainable yet bustling city.
- Somewhat
- Yes, good idea.

How willing are you to have less sidewalk space for Streetlife Zones to activate the sidewalk if it means including a cycletrack on Market Street?

- 100% willing!
- 100%. I am all for cycletrack
- Absolutely willing!
- All for it.
- All in favor. Reduce street lanes from 4 to 2 when putting gall buses onto Mission Street will give you more room to design space for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users.
- Ambivalent. I think there's ample sidewalk space as is and if activation is moved to wider areas? Plaza it doesn't seem problematic.
- A OK. Sidewalks are still wide enough.
- As long as a 15' width is maintained for movement.
- Both are important, but I feel streetlife zones with more sidewalk space would be more beneficial for the Market St environment and the users vs. the pass-thru cyclists.
- Completely willing. Human-powered transport is absolutely vital for urban placemaking.
- Completely willing. In fact, given the car-ban plan, due to limited space along Market, I would like to eliminate the street life zones entirely. Additionally, I fear the streetlife zones and car ban will only attract homeless, crime, etc.
- Crowd sidewalks. Add to the urban feel. Willing to accept the trade-off.
- Current construction (Marshalls) makes that difficult in the short run, aside from Union square it would be ok.
- Cycletrack is #1 priority, everything else should come after
- Fairly willing. There is a lot of negative sidewalk streetlife (hoodlums), and Market Street is cold and windy, so I'm cool with losing sidewalk.
- Fine
- Fine with it.
- Great separated bike lanes. Clean plazas.
- I am not in favor of diminishing sidewalk. I am of the opinion that there are more pedestrians than bicyclists so I would not sacrifice sidewalk space for cyclists.
- I am very willing.
- I am willing to have less sidewalk space on Market St. for bikes if necessary.
- I am willing to make that trade-off (& my primary mode is walking!). A cycle-track seems like a guaranteed improvement for pedestrian experience, but the streetlife zones seem like more of a gamble. Also, most blocks (except near Powell) have more space than pedestrians.

- I feel like there is ample sidewalk space presently
- I think I prefer to have more space for streetlife and [sett] the bike lane in Mission.
- I think it would be an acceptable trade-off.
- I think it's worth it. We should have more streelife zones elsewhere in the city.
- I would rather have streetlife zones because it attracts businesses to vacant spaces.
- I'd prefer additional sidewalk space.
- If it means getting sidewalks free of bicycles- great!
- I'm very willing because a cycletrack is so important
- It is a necessary sacrifice.
- No
- No. [Ooz]
- No. I think less pedestrian space is a bad idea.
- Not
- Not all areas; be very selective where you do this.
- Not at all.
- Not willing -- bicycles and transit have to play nice together (see comment re: "road warrior" bike culture above [Retyped here for quick reference: have concern that SF's "road warrior" bike culture will negatively impact pedestrian experience which goes behind transit loading zones]. The pedestrian activity on Market Street is what makes it special (it's not simply about transit), so the streetlife zone enhances pedestrian experience.
- Not willing / bad idea.
- Not willing at all
- Not willing at all.
- Not willing to have less sidewalk space.
- Not willing.
- Not willing. I like more trees, landscaping and activated areas. I also like incorporating business, lingering, and alleyway plantings.
- Ok with it.
- OK.
- People with mobility disability need a wide sidewalk.
- Prefer Mission St. option.
- Quite willing
- Rather have more streetlife.
- Safety for cyclists is wroth the sacrifice but it seems Opt. 3 would allow for cyclist options without sacrificing streetlife zones.
- Sidewalks seldom feel crowded. When they do, it reminds me of New York- in a positive way
- Some.
- Somewhat to very
- Somewhat willing.
- Sounds/looks good in what we've seen to date.
- That is an acceptable compromise
- There are busy streets (between 3-5th on Market) and having less sidewalk space will make those parts more congested and affect traffic flow.
- This is an interesting question…biasing, but good point. Less willing.
- This trade-of is ok with me because I believe the cycletrack will activate the street in a different way but to same degree as streetlife zones. Seems like streetlife can still occur in 7 ft zone--small public spaces work, too, i.e. parklets.
- Totally
- VERY
- VERY -- Market Street cycletrack is CRUCIAL.
- Very agreeable cycletracks provide safer cycling.
- Very attractive idea if well throughout and naturally defined by the community. i.e., if you cannot force people to enjoy a space and need to have direct community support and development.
- Very willing
- Very willing
- Very willing
- Very willing
- Very willing as long as the cycletrack feels part of the pedestrian realm & not foreign & vehicular.
- Very willing- Hard to create community. I.e. lots of empty parklets when a local business doesn't cater a parklet to use space
- Very willing over 11,000 people are SF Bike coalition members. Many more bikes aren't members. It's important to have streetlife zones and a cycletrack.
- Very willing to lose sidewalk space to make room for bicyclists.

- Very willing, it's a large sidewalk and can accommodate the changes.
- Very willing, Market needs auto, bike, and sidewalk.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing. Streetlife zones add vibrancy and livability to the streets/sidewalks.
- Very willing. A cycletrack on Market St. is essential.
- Very willing. I think many people would be afraid to bike in a shared lane.
- Very willing. It's a compromise.
- Very willing. There is tons of sidewalk activity space already. It's not space that revitalizes. It's activity
- Very.
- Very. Sidewalk activations are interesting only for tourists.
- Very. The streetlife zones are great, but untested in the area with lots of homeless. Bike lanes and cycletrack are proven enhancement to safety and reliability.
- Willing
- Willing
- Willing
- Willing. Parts of Market Street sidewalks are so wide that people hang out and disrupt movement or seem intimidating (Mid Market) and in others, the width is needed.
- Yes
- Yes -- it will be awesome.
- Yes -- this means faster MUNI service for all!
- Yes I am 100% willing to lose sidewalk space if it means we get separated cycle lanes. In fact, I think having both is a good thing.
- Yes, absolutely with improvements to plazas and the streetlife zones in general, I think a little less sidewalk space is 100% worthwhile to provide a world class, family and kid friendly bike facility.
- Yes, preferable in blocks with less foot traffic
- 1
- Cycletrack is much safer than shared facility with buses. Market Street has many opportunities for small public spaces, so small [sidewalk] in places is ok.
- Cyclists are part of street life! The sidewalks on Market are huge and can accommodate all uses (glad autos are no allowed). Please don't treat cyclists as 3rd rate citizens!
- Except for large events (e.g. pride) I feel that Market does a respectable job at having enough space already. However, the cycling experience is miserable without a dedicated track.
- Hard to say I can't really assess. The value of a streetlife zone given we don't have one already. I'm far more concerned about pedestrians having less space for walking.
- Highly willing and promote it. It improves the overall experience.
- I can kind of see it both ways… maybe a little more info over of wide streetlife zones.
- I personally prefer more streetlife space.
- I think there should be sufficient space for pedestrians.
- I think you can have a cycletrack still because you can make the cycletrack narrower since more people bike on Market for going to /from work to they're not necessarily going to be biking side by side.
- I want wider sidewalks.
- I would be willing so sacrifice some sidewalk space if it encourages more biking safety.
- If it doesn't [fit] activate the sidewalk
- I'm in favor.
- No
- No hesitations. Do it!
- No. Here again, this favors bicyclists over people with disabilities, favors a political powerful group over a legally-protected class--the disabled, a cycletrack, at curb means vulnerable pedestrian hazard by cruising cyclists.
- Not really; especially if the "streetlife zone" are given over to those who engaged in "anti-social" behavior.
- Not very much.
- Not very willing, prefer dedicated cycletracks on Mission.

- Prefer options 1 + 3.
- That's not a bad trade-off.
- This presentation did not provide enough examples of what a streetlife zone is used for, what specific activities would occur in the zone and why pedestrians would be drawn to them but in general, I oppose less sidewalk space.
- Very willing -- there is too much under utilized sidewalk space anyway. We just need to use our many plazas better.
- Very willing to have less sidewalk. Cycletrack provides buffer that will make streetlife zones feel larger and be safer.
- Very willing!
- Very willing.
- Very willing. There are wide sidewalks.
- Very! I think the raised cycletrack is a key aspect of this project. Physical barriers are much safer than mere painted lines an space. The many plazas on Market provide streetlife space -- especially if Hallidie Plaza is raised.
- Very.
- Why are sidewalks and bicycles fighting for space? Give both space and lose traffic lanes.
- Willing to do this.
- Would be ok.
- Yes.
- Absolutely - much of the sidewalk on Market Street is quite awkward as it is... The space between trees and the street would be better served as a bikeway.
- Fairly willing - I like the cycletrack idea a lot, but I'd love to see areas - like that chess playing area btw Turk and golden gate - given more space and formality.
- Good idea.
- I am NOT "willing" to have less sidewalk space for "streetlife zones" and "cycletracks." Many more people walk on Market Street than ride bicycles. The cycletracks are dangerous and the clutter on the sidewalks makes less space for pedestrians to use walking as a viable travel mode.
- I believe this is a block-by-block issue and some areas the cycletrack will come at the expense of needed streetlife zones like the blocks around Union Square, or around plazas that are way more space and opportunity for activation. Especially in the thick of the Financial District, the streetlife zone comes at the expense of walkway space while there doesn't seem like that much activating is needed given the area is pretty dead outside work hours and even then the most pressing need is dining space for lunch.
- I don't like the streetlife concept. Market street is not a park. I like the idea of additional commerce (cafe seating, vendors) in public sidewalk space, but Market street is a busy corridor and shouldn't be a place to just "hang out". That's better for plazas and side streets. There is already a frustrating amount of pedestrian traffic at peak hours between fifth sty and the Embarcadero. Off-peak and weekend uses of the sidewalk seem ok, but the streetlife zones will be a nuisance.
- I think that is a permissible concession considering that Streetlife Zones and the cycletrack do much to enhance the pedestrian and user experience of Market Street. If Market Street is to be a true destination it needs both the Streetlife Zones and a cycletrack in addition to enhanced pedestrian amenities.
- I would be fine with less sidewalk space for streetlife zones. I would NOT be OK with less travel space for pedestrians (i.e., if the width for pedestrians passing through was narrowed).
- I would rather have cycletrack on Market Street than added Streetlife Zones. Cycling is my mode of transportation that gets me to and from work. Residents/I contribute to this city's economy much more than the tourists so its important to me to be able to access Market Street and BART via bike.
- Less sidewalk is okay if there is cycletrack. There is still more sidewalk than most places in the City
- Moderately willing. I would prefer that auto/transit street space and usage be reduced for a cycletrack instead of sidewalk.
- Not at all.
- Not willing. Market Street is so busy, hardly a place to walk as too many people already.
- Not willing. A wide sidewalk is essential to Market Street. I am a regular commuter

cyclist.

- Pedestrians should trump bicycles and all other street users. Sidewalk space should not be removed from already crowded areas, as shown in “1st to 2nd Option 2”. Crosswalks across Market would also be longer. Further down Market between 5th and 8th there is less pedestrian traffic and less “Streetlife” would be fine.
- Put the cycletrack on Mission. Market should have has much sidewalk space for street life as possible.
- The sidewalks are twice as wide now as they were in 1958. It has nothing to do with the quality of experience walking down the street.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing.
- Very willing. Bicycles help activate the street in other ways.
- You don’t have to have less sidewalk space for Streetlife if you remove automobiles from the picture.
-

What ideas presented at this workshop do you think are most likely to strengthen Market Street as a destination?

- ?
- 1. Cycletracks. 2. Revamp Hallidie Plaza. 3. Civic Center Plaza.
- A Market cycletrack will attract everyday, casual cyclists (e.g. families, kids, seniors, tourists) and create an opportunity for more people to experience and enjoy Market.
- A one-way cycletrack in each direction. Streetlife zones are great! Extra space for people waiting for buses.
- Accommodating pedestrians, bikes, transit, delivery vehicles.
- Additional cafes/restaurants, auto restrictions, more trees/planters, better lighting more sculptural elements.
- All of them will be a huge improvements
- As a destination? Enhanced sidewalks and streetlife zones/hubs. People won’t visit just because cool cycletracks or transit loading zones. As a destination it has to be about streetlife and activities and enhanced plazas.
- As mentioned having transit (except F-Line) move to Mission Street will strengthen Market Street as a world class city boulevard where people are willing to spend more time to shop, entertainment, outdoor cafes, etc.
- Auto restriction zones -- this should be a transit haven/hub first. Then pedestrian/bike next and autos last.
- Auto restrictions
- Beautification & ability to stop & enjoy it (benches and trees).
- Best idea was introducing buffers and green light timing for bicycles on Mission and removing bus traffic from mission. It seems like the most practical and cost efficient option.
- Better major plazas, better pedestrian crossings at intersections.
- Bike and transit improvements.
- Bike facilities. Redoing plazas with [freespace] concepts would be great. Http://freespace.io
- Bikeway. Better transit [hear dog] islands
- Continuity
- “Continuous cycletrack on Market
- Rapid transit option”
- Cycletrack (Option #2)
- Cycletrack and pedestrian space.
- Cycletrack and streetlife.
- Cycletrack, hubs, Hallidie remake
- Cycletrack. Restrictions on cars. Six districts. Streetlife zones -- encourage more sidewalk cafes, galleries, etc.
- Cycletracks on Mission, seating, Maintaining/ expanding sidewalk widths.
- “Eliminating of fixing the “”sunken”” plaza in Hallidie Plaza.
- Wider transit islands, not upgrading transit shelters”

- Encouraging more people to [liven] “activate” The sidewalks for all types of use, not just as a pass through from A to B
- Fewer cars or no cars
- Fewer private autos = less noise
- Fix hubs at Civic Center and near Powell Street
- Fixing Hallidie plaza, preserving multi-modal transportation that allows cars, bicycles and mass transit on market and updating the infrastructure, i.e., sidewalk pavers.
- Hallidie, less traffic.
- Having designated bike lanes and restricting private car access will encourage more public trans. usage.
- I do it daily. It is dangerous. Women, children and old people can’t use market unless we have a separated bike lane.
- I like the idea of a tree-lined boulevard. I like making the alleys more appealing. Changing the bus shelters would be nice. The plazas improving would be great.
- I like the ideas of pedestrian hubs and places for sitting gout in public -- not necessarily at cafes.
- Important not to lose the identities of the different neighborhoods that touch Market such as Union Square, Yerba Buena, etc.
- Improvements for bike commuters.
- Improving MUNI / less crime/panhandling
- Including Mission Street and diverting both cycling and auto traffic.
- Increase public space and redoing
- LESS CARS!! More trees, streetlife, safer and more pleasant for pedestrians and bikes, cafes, etc.
- Less cars, more streetlife.
- Less traffic, more pedestrians and bikes.
- Limiting for traffic. Thinking holistically about surrounding alleys and Mission Street.
- Making the street more leisurely, slower.
- Making the street more pedestrian friendly
- Material, technological, and connectivity improvements (like paving, trees) (i.e. main boarding (biker+walk)
- Mission St bike lanes and the alleys.
- More “streetlife”, possibility for pedestrians to take a seat
- More trees, cycletrack, limit private vehicles
- None
- None- Market Street already has fixed buildings basically from 3rd Street to Embarcadero- day time use for work. I don’t see this area
- Nothing -- that’s all up to businesses to create a reason to come to Market St. Cafes, galleries, bars, clubs, boutiques, etc. I like the idea to include more art and sculpture along the way, but it doesn’t need to take up extra street space to do that in these “hub” zones.
- Option 2 cycletrack. Elimination of cars and trucks 7 am to 7 pm.
- Option 2 is the hands down winner. Option 1 endangers pedestrians. Option 3 restricts vehicular traffic too much.
- Option 2 with Mission Street improvements.
- Option two. The protected cycle track.
- Paving over Hallidie Plaza.
- “Pedestrian enhancement
- Free downtown transit (Zone transit)”
- Plazas, good transit, more bikes, LESS CARS.
- poor lighting and no audio aids made it all less informative.
- Public space, making bicyclists separate from cars
- Public spaces, street art, cafes.
- Public spaces/Commerce opportunities/ Activity space
- Raising Hallidie Plaza. Adding Streetlife Zones.
- “Raising Powell Street (Hallidie Plaza)
- having the pass-through Street between Market and Mission (as in Option 1 and 3)”
- Redevelopment of the Plazas, Streetlife Zones, Traffic Restrictions.
- Re-invigorating the plazas, cycletracks the whole way, auto restrictions the entire way
- Restricting traffic, more seating.
- Reuse Hallidie Plaza
- Revamping Powell Street plaza Hallidie / UN Plaza
- Separated bike lanes; easier pedestrian crossings; wider transit islands
- Shared. Segregation might sound logical (Mission option) but how does separate but equal really feel? Kind of shitty. Market without private cars, can easily accommodate all

users. Its direct, historic, more dramatic, and feels best to citizens and a huge # of tourists.
- Sidewalks activity/life; cycling; active store fronts.
- Street life elements, materials, safety. Easier for new bicyclists.
- Street like zone. Cycletrack.
- Streetlife *cycletrack*
- Streetlife areas/consistency throughout the area.
- Streetlife hubs and zones to build and strengthen the sense of community.
- Streetlife hubs and zones; revamping UN Plaza & Hallidie Plaza.
- Streetlife zone.
- Streetlife zones, plaza renovation, cycling, canopies.
- Support/ build out of two plazas
- The bikeways in Option 2.
- The great plazas; enforced restriction of private auto use; cycletrack.
- The plazas creating casual destinations. Ability to include safer/greater biking opps (cycletrack to the wiggle and ultimately Golden Gate Park and Ocean Beach) --> increase biking/walking and benefit the environment (less carbon, etc.)
- The regeneration of the plazas, UN Plaza and Hallidie Plaza. The streetlife zones.
- The remodeling of UN Plaza.
- Transportation improvements & streetlife zones.
- Un and Hallidie Plaza improvements.
- UN Plaza & Hallidie Plaza redesigns; street life hubs more than overall street life zones.
- Using very creative designs that also function. Need large scale to see the grandness of Market.
- Well, option 2 will bring more bikes who become pedestrian as soon as they get off and park. But option 3 makes a continuous unbroken track of a reality, which will increase biker number and if the alleyways become activated… this would be idea, I think.
- Auto restrictions -- private autos make no contribution to Market as a destination, if only degrades it. The argument of cars being “more eyes on the street” is weak. Cars do not increase safety, pedestrians and cyclists do.
- Auto restrictions, I don’t see any discussion of class/race/poverty issues on Market, or of the cultural issues and conflicts, or how these options would affect those issues.
- Better pedestrian walkways.
- Better public space on Market. Would be great to see the Hallidie space substantially improved. Substantially improved transit times. Better cycling infrastructure.
- Eliminating the dismal chaotic experience that currently prevails.
- Enhanced sidewalk and streetlife zone.
- Everything to improve transportation access, reliability and safety as well as the quality of life in those areas.
- Fewer cars.
- Generally, cleaning it up -- new paving, landscaping, furnishings, and streetlife zones.
- Hallidie & UN Plaza improvements, cycletracks, restricted auto access, designated and colored transit lanes, streetlife zone and hub, better boarding areas. Iconic shelters, unified [legvy] canopy trees.
- Hallidie Plaza at Street level. Revitalization of UN Plaza. Streetlife concepts. Bulbouts at north side of Market.
- I suppose the streetlife zones -- but only in select areas. Table sand chairs notwithstanding, I’m not going to sit and talk to people or read a book at 6th & Mission.
- If the “deterelicts” and drug dealers are not removed, the whole project will fail.
- Improve Hallidie Plaza -- fill in Bart “cave.”
- Improvements to UN Plaza and Hallidie Plaza.
- Intensifying alleys. Bold transit stations/ shelters that tie into underground stations. Cafes in current empty spaces. Cycletracks on Market. Rapid network makes Market a reliable and trustworthy destination.
- No Autos! Extending sidewalks and eliminating mid-intersection pedestrian islands -- Pedestrian throughway, separate cycletracks for cyclists!
- Overall pedestrians comfort, traffic reduction/ compartmentalization green space/trees, active gathering/cultural space.
- Public seating, greenery, plaza clusters. Restrictions for private cars.

- Raising Hallidie Plaza, getting vehicles off Market & rethinking UN Plaza.
- Redesign of two plazas, improved streetscaping, wayfinding help.
- Redesign the entire stretch.
- Safety improvements.
- Separate cycletrack. New Hallidie plaza. Close Ellis.
- Streetlife zone and functional Hallidie / UN Plazas.
- Streetlife zones. Improved traffic. Cycletracks.
- The concept of the streetlife zone is the most innovative idea. However, the plan is transit/ cyclist heavy so “streetlife” hasn’t been adequately defined.
- The redesigns of UN and Hallidie Plazas, plus the addition of the new plaza at Ellis St.
- The seating and the space for interactions to happen.
- Transit stop waiting spaces are interesting places. Raising Hallidie -- and keep that public space public, not private. Cycletrack! Café at UN Plaza while preserving sightlines into the Plaza. Free wifi for all in this space. The wayfinding signs look awesome!
- Trees.
- Wayfinding.
- 1. A better pedestrian experience, especially on the north side of Market. 2. Upgrading cycling infrastructure (but not at the expense of pedestrians). 3. I have mixed feelings about streetlife zones. Could be good or bad. For example, walking through the north side of Market at 5th and at Powell can be a challenge at times with the various streetlife activities. This is not to say I am not in favor, just that it has to be done right and not adversely affect pedestrians travelling through.
- Adding more programmed space to the plazas.
- Bringing Hallidie Plaza to street level.
- cycletrack and the bus rapid transit. BRT means that you can move up and down Market easily, and make it a good place to traverse as a pedestrian.
- Cycletracks, better transit operations (faster and more reliable), less transit on Mission, more trees, better use of SOMA alleys as plazas.
- Dedicated cycletrack and removal of private vehicles from Market Street.
- Getting rid of vacant and boarded-up buildings.
- I really liked the Hallidie and UN Plaza proposals. How will you keep these plazas safe and clean though. Both seem to be bum central these days.
- It will make it more appealing to locals and tourists to walk and bike through our city. And spend more money.
- Looks modern and less 1970s. Hallidie Plaza better for shoppers and tourists.
- Making it better for transit riders and cyclists and that’s a good thing. It will mean more people will go downtown by car alternatives.
- Market Street is not a destination, nobody says “let’s go to Market Street!” “You know what would be fun? Sitting next to a Muni stop downtown in front a CVS! Who’s in?” Market Street is first and foremost a thoroughfare, one which has many destinations along it, but for the most part the destinations are a block or two off of Market once you get passed the McDonalds, discount stores, Starbucks and Walgreens’s. Some art will make that last block or two from the station interesting, but it isn’t going to make me want to stay and study it because when it comes down to it, the art and seating is overwhelmed by the advertising cluttering up the entire street: I can get Burger King, Starbucks, and iPhone ads in any city or suburb. Do we really need a Chase branch on every single corner? Do we really need three types of advertising kiosks on every single damn street? One of the things I like about the Mission Street bikeway plan is the emphasis at stronger north-south connections on the block between Market and Mission. I envision Mission as the interesting street frequented more by locals with more local shops since Market Street is overwhelmed with ads and chain stores. The same way I visit Valencia Street to shop, eat, drink, but not Mission Street since even though its the main street, all it has are chain stores, fast food and gross discount shops.
- n/a
- No cars, better separations, designed bike

track.

- NONE.
- None. It will just make things more difficult to walk, transit the street.
- separated bike, pedestrian and motor/transit ways. redeveloping union square Bart area, civic center area and
- streetlife zones and accessibility via transit and bike, including the lanes and clearer delineation of usages of spaces. fewer cars and delivery trucks!!!
- Streetlife Zones, restricted car use, enhancements to public spaces like Hallidie Plaza and UN Plaza, cycletrack, rapid bus lanes and local bus lanes, and widened sidewalks
- There are none of the intimidating list of suspects in your presentation -- that would most strengthen Market Street's desirability by pedestrians. And autos that carry away large packages to homes West of Twin Peaks. Bikes & Muni don't help there.
- Thinking big! Relook at transit. Consider market specific buses. Consider 3 lanes for transit.
- Wider sidewalks and extended cycle tracks.
-

Are you willing to have the Local and Limited lines stop at different locations, 1/2 to 1 block apart (i.e., the Rapid Transit Service option), if it means faster and more reliable express line service? What are your main reasons for supporting or not supporting the Rapid Transit Service?

- ? Make it easy.
- Absolutely to move buses quicker- although there will be more room and less congestion if buses are moved to Mission Street.
- All stops unified is cognitively much easier! However if the service is significantly improved with rapid then prefer that
- definitely! The most important aspect of public transit is how quickly it gets to there
- Don't really care I don't ride bus, but I might expect it to cause confusion.
- I am happy to walk a bit.
- I am willing to have the stops moved. I support the Rapid Transit Service because I don't own a car and it's better for the environment than cars
- I am worried about the fact that for motor vehicle lanes are on market at all. Let underground be the rapid transit. I'd prefer slower buses and more pedestrian and cyclist room
- I don't regularly ride Muni buses but I would be willing to walk more for better service (if the service was actually better)
- I don't take transit much, honestly
- I like the rapid service, Market Street is already easy to walk on and the buses are slow as slugs, fewer stops the better. If anything putting a few more buses on Mission would be great.
- I prefer the rapid transit option. Walking is a good thing.
- I think this is a great idea, as long as there is clear signal regarding the local/limited option. It is totally inefficient as is.
- If it were at the reliability of a subway, this would be ok- also need lots of next bus info so people can plan their trip accordingly
- I'm ambivalent, because I rarely take buses on Market. I love stops served by both local & limited buses, but am ok dealing when they aren't.
- It sounds like a good idea but I doubt Muni's ability to deliver
- No I am not willing.
- NO NO NO. And, this is a ridiculously biased question. If center lanes are more "reliable" then local buses will be even slower & less reliable than now. Rapid will tend to be over

used and over loaded, “local enhancement” will better balance loads. Separation of local & Hd. will be inconvenient and confusing for users, force more running between stops esp. off peak.

- NO. I want to have the option of taking either.
- No. Confusing! Reduce options.
- No. Confusing. There must be a better way.
- Rapid Transit would work only if there times connections if you have to transfer.
- Somewhat. The way it is now is simple and easy to figure out. All the buses headed toward wherever I want to go stop at the same stop and I can hop on whichever bus comes 1st. If the local and limited buses are separated, someone waiting for a limited who sees a local approach may run across the right lane without warning.
- Support having more reliable service.
- Sure
- Sure. However, removing Muni bus service from Mission Street creates a hardship for people who exclusively use transit (like me)….
- This wouldn’t be ideal. I think it would be ok as long as there is real time transit info in both loading that showed what was coming for both stops.
- Unimportant to me. I use underground for rapid transit.
- Unsure. I don’t really understand this option.
- We already have ample underground transit service for the bulk of commuters. In my opinion when I ride buses downtown, its bicyclists who impede bus efficiency.
- yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes (local, Market) Free F in downtown corridor! Look at Portland, OR
- yes- but it may not make a difference if the street is still congested with cars, especially those trying to get on/off Bay Bridge. Cross traffic is atrocious When they block intersections. Traffic enforcement would be awesome.
- Yes- I hate getting on a slow bus. But I worried about disabled people and elderly.
- Yes I support separate stops for rapid transit.
- Yes please! I am up to whether it posttest the transport, get rid of some stops, separate them. Right now transport is horrible!
- Yes! If speeding transit is one of the main priorities of this project, then this should be pursued. Transit riders will adjust there habits/ expectations and enjoy the faster and more reliable service.
- Yes! Muni need to be more faster and this is best solution. Make sure transit signal priority works.
- Yes, as long as it is consistent & clearly defined & market so it doesn’t seem haphazard.
- Yes, as long as SFMTA, MOD, local N/P, HAS increase Para transit to assist with the disabled neighbors and San Franciscan that would be most important.
- Yes, as long as signs are clear for transfers.
- Yes, faster transit is a priority.
- Yes, fewer stops= increased reliability and reduced travel times and with pedestrian improvements, walking more should be pleasant
- Yes, however the walking experience should also be carefully considered.
- Yes, in order to increase Muni efficiency/ reliability
- Yes, it is better to have faster and more reliable buses. This is an obvious trade off.
- Yes, it is ok with local and limited to be at different locations as long as signage is improved.
- Yes, RTS could be great, improved signals
- yes, speed is important even if it means walking a bit further between stops.
- Yes, support as I am a walker.
- Yes, very much in favor if it improves transit. I support RTS because it will increase transit use, saving carbon emissions and making street safer.
- Yes, very much so!
- Yes, whatever is more efficient

- Yes, yes, yes. Too many buses and F cars blocking passenger transit shelters.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes. Buses travel too slow. Too many stops. People can switch to local and express before buses get on Market.
- Yes. I'd prefer to be able to count on transit.
- Yes. Rapid service would be great.
- Yes. Anything that can be done to make waiting for buses more pleasant and buses moving more rapidly is encouraged.
- Yes. As long as the data supports the move. And limited Muni should stop far less frequently than every other block. One per district max.
- Yes. Biggest issue with Muni now is slow and odd frequency. Encourages more walking
- Yes. Both need to provide balance for transit users, pedestrian uses and bike uses for all user types.
- Yes. Bus transit is too slow in SF. Anything to speed up I support. Fewer bus stops will help
- Yes. Buses stop way too often, inefficient, hard to manage as a cyclist (pedestrian traffic)
- Yes. Currently the bus speed on Market Street is painful. It's a joke! It is not a rapid transit
- Yes. Faster
- Yes. Faster and more reliable service is very important.
- Yes. Faster! Reliable!
- Yes. Faster, more reliable option.
- Yes. For pedestrians, but not so its in the way of bikers (confusing, inconsistent)
- Yes. Good signage can make it easy and effective.
- yes. I am willing to walk. But I am able-bodied young person. If elderly or disabled riders make up the large portion of ridership I might defer to their interests.
- Yes. I need to get from Van Ness to Powell and Stuart faster.
- Yes. I support it. Beside many people who dislike taking buses because they are so slow.
- Yes. I support the idea of faster transit times
- Yes. I would use the express, not the local
- Yes. It make sense in order to speed up service.
- Yes. Less crowding, faster movement and wouldn't likely impact local residents as it does in more residential areas (handicap and elderly access)
- Yes. More people will use public transit, if it is faster.
- Yes. Rapid transit by definition should be rapid, less stops.
- yes. Rapid transit systems are good- I went shorter travel times.
- Yes. Reliable and dependable public transit.
- Yes. There should be at least one speedy way down Market and transit serves everyone.
- Yes. Think people who are disabled or obese have a hard time with the stops being further away.
- Yes. We can move more people on the bus
- Yes. We need a system that works best for the whole, not for particular individuals.
- Yes. With that there be a transit only lane in the center and a transit priority mixed-use lane on the side
- You are limiting options for the less mobile.
- Absolutely the rapid transit option is the right way to go. It will improve transit turns at the express buses & the F , and will make riding Muni much more pleasant.
- I am totally fine with this if it can speed up express lines.
- I like having a stop that everything stops at. I prefer not having to make a decision on my bus until I know what is coming.
- I love this. Market is a comfortable place to walk between stops, and this would improve timing/speed of service (top priority). It would also reduce lane conflicts (bikes, pedestrians, cars)
- If there is accurate "time until the next bus comes" information
- It is great in theory- but the current spacing- Montgomery , Kearny, Grant, etc- is great currently for me, at least for trips between Van Ness and Embarcadero. Otherwise you can use Muni
- Muni chugs along and the rapid transit option would improve service
- No- I am dependent on Muni- and rearranging the stops, even if the purpose was beneficial.
- No, this option views transit as a system to

move vehicles and the …. This option ignores that people with disabilities seniors and adults with babies and strollers need to transfer
- Not sure, but I think so.
- Rapid is necessary. Current spacing is unreliable and too slow. Embarrassing. A great pedestrian experience will make it wonderful to walk further.
- That's fine. The most important thing when it comes to this is to improve Muni service
- The RTS is a good idea but I believe all transit except metro and autos should be moved to Mission and bike and pedestrian should stay on Market.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes! Faster buses are always better.
- Yes! Please! If signage directs to local/limited clearly circulation will be improved
- Yes! This is a much more understandable approach to stop locations. The Height/ Everywhere else split doesn't work, and the Ferry/Tran bay is worse. Plus I absolutely support fewer stops and faster service. Limited buses on Market are currently frustrating because there they make very stop.
- Yes, do everything you can to make it faster. Faster transit service will probably bring more customers to Muni
- Yes, I am willing. Boarded rapid stops wit better service + F-line improvements.
- Yes, I support rapid transit. If Market Street is made more walkable, if should be walked.
- Yes, rapid transit is really needed.
- Yes, sparing out the stops would be useful. The current pace of main along the busiest arterial section of Market street makes for a very frustrating transit experience. It's so slow, I may as well walk.
- Yes, very willing to walk farther, if it benefits transit performance
- Yes.
- Yes. Faster and more reliable express services should be a priority. Limiting the number of stops will improve traffic congestion and pedestrian safety.
- Yes. Faster limited
- Yes. Faster service means more riders
- Yes. Strongly support fewer stops
- Yes. We need to have more raid transit for people travelling longer distances. If there was some way to provide arrival info about both local and limited options, that might address concerns of people who just want to take the next bus regardless of local vs. limited.
- Absolutely. They currently stop too often.
- I will support ANY effort to speed MUNI including different stop locations if it means service is more reliable and faster. Please please please do this now! MUNI sucks now.
- I'm in favor of faster and reliable service in general of course, but I did not pay much attention to this aspect as I rarely ride MUNI - poor, slow, service and I'd much rather walk if a destination is within 2 miles or so.
- It completely depends on the line, destination and frequency: If I'm going somewhere every 38 or 14 bus stops at, and they aren't running that frequently I may take whichever comes first, the local, limited, or express. Likewise I'm also willing to walk a few blocks on the other end and often heading outbound I take either the 5 or 21, whichever comes first. Both of these are corridors I'm familiar with and know the ins and outs of, but I would be lost with some of the other lines and I know how ticked off I get when I trust that damn Next Bus sign and wait at the wrong platform at 4th & King for an N or T and then have to run across traffic when it turns out the other one is coming first because it would require to crossings to do legally and by then I'd have missed the train. When frequency is high, which also when busses are usually most crowded, I'm happy to wait for a faster bus, but it would still be easier if they shared stops instead of having alternating stops for locals and limited on alternating blocks.
- Limited lines should start outside of the downtown area of Market Street.
- No. Muni is very slow, no matter what it's done it will continue to be slow.

- Sure
- This is a bad idea, as Market is congested and not a raceway for buses. This works against pedestrian safety. FYI Muni and BART operate limited stops under Market Street and provide fast transit connections under Market Street. There is no need to duplicate this on the surface.
- yes
- Yes
- Yes!
- Yes, but it would be better to eliminate local service.
- Yes, faster and more reliable express service should be the goal
- yes, I love taking AX and BX buses during rush hours in the mornings/evenings so there's no major issues with having different stops. I will go a little out of my way to take those buses to/from work just because of their efficient and fast service. If you want to improve transit services, I like the idea of restricting passenger vehicle access during certain hours of day.
- Yes, if next bus reliability is improved for outbound buses. Rapid service is much more desirable and should be expanded. 38L is the only market street line that moves at something approaching a reasonable speed. With the others, you may as well walk until you get to eighth street.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes. It's very important to have limited service options that further efficiency.
- Yes. The rapid transit service option will make transit more reliable and reduce travel time. Limited stop spacing matching the Muni Metro/ BART stations will make the service more legible as a rapid option. It will also enable rapid transit network redundancy for the Muni Metro in the event of a service disruption. For example, riders can use 71L to reach Inner Sunset more quickly if the N-Judah is disrupted.
- Yes. Because the idea is to move people to where there going quickly and efficiently.
- Yes. I hate riding a bus on Market right now, and would love to see it move faster.
- Yes. We are a Transit First City, and that means we need to put transit first. The more reliable and faster transit is, the more people will ride it and come to rely on it. We need to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips in the city and particularly in the downtown corridor. The Local and Limited stop schematic is a reasonable re-configuration that will improve service quality greatly and hopefully increase ridership too.

How comfortable would you feel riding in a shared lane on Market Street if there were fewer cars, more opportunities to pass stopped busses, and no bottlenecks at boarding islands?

- As a very little car user but a big pedestrian- bicyclists are the terrors of market Street- going the red light all the time far more dangerous for pedestrians.
- As a walker, I may reconsider taking up cycling for transportation if there were more options and less traffic.
- As bad as I do now. Some buses are not all safe in the sharing of space. Bike use will continue to grow faster than transit. Ideally all transit would be in the center with a whole lane for bike, not just a cycletrack.
- As long as the bikes know the rules of the road, I don't care.
- As long as you get the cars off & taxis honor the sharrows, it works well. I'm an aggressive cyclist and know many who wouldn't be comfortable.
- Better. I prefer option 2 with cycletrack. Buses hate cyclists, best to keep separate as much as possible.
- Bikes and buses should be separated.
- Bikes are better off with their own track/lane.
- Bikes should not have to share lanes with vehicles.
- Dedicated cycletrack better
- Don't feel safe passing MUNI in a car let alone exposed on a bike. MUNI drivers already dealing with a lot of distractions with passengers. Don't like shared option at all.
- Fairly comfortable. I think I'm less nervous biking in traffic than most people.
- Feel ok with that
- Fine, already very comfortable, I'd be in favor of the road surface variation
- I already ride on Market and it is way too congested. Removing autos would be great.
- I am very concerned that cyclists will endanger pedestrians
- I currently ride so I would be comfortable, but I would be more comfortable in a cycletrack. Sound my mom, my young niece and nephew, etc.
- I don't bike.
- I don't ride a bike but it is a great idea.
- I don't ride a bike in this city / not safe!
- I don't ride bikes any more only at the gym.
- I don't want to bike in a shared bike lane. It's a much more pleasant and safe ride to have a separated bike lane. Many drivers are unaware of cyclists or are distracted while driving.
- I feel more comfortable with green painted lane.
- I would be comfortable. However, I would prefer cycles have their own lane.
- I would be for if annoyed, but my kids would not. I would still not have any way to get them by bike to the waterfront.
- I would definitely feel safer.
- I would feel comfortable, but a separate bike lane would make many more people comfortable
- I would feel fine, but my wife would hate it. We need cycling to be comfortable for everyone.
- I would feel more comfortable -- I do not feel comfortable now.
- I would feel more comfortable than I do now -- it would make a big difference.
- I would feel somewhat comfortable; but this would be more dangerous and result in deaths and children and families would not be able to ride.
- I would love it! Sometimes it is a big scary to ride the bike through market, boo many things to worry about, the train, bus, cars….
- I would welcome this IF there were dedicated track on Mission; people who want to commute fast can use it, while track on Mission creates a safe space for ALL (families, tourists, etc.)
- Id' feel ok, but not ideal, especially for kids/ elderly.
- If fewer cars (or no cars), I'd be more comfortable. My preference, however, is for protected lanes/cycletracks.

- If there were fewer cars, OK, if not then I would feel uncomfortable/unsafe.
- I'm absolutely opposed to restrictions of any kind on automobiles. The entire country is trending AWAY from car bans and restrictions, i.e., Sacramento, Fresno, DC., Raleigh, Kalamazoo, Youngstown, & Chicago, after 50 years of car-bans that hollowed out downtowns. Cars bring "eyes on the street!"
- It is better than what exists today -- but short of what should happen.
- It would be ok but much prefer raised cycletrack.
- Less comfortable than cycletrack.
- More comfortable
- More comfortable than I already am.
- More comfortable than I already am.
- More comfortable than today, but less than if there was a cycletrack.
- More comfortable, but as I ride I will ride in most lane conditions. Most riders, most people, need separation
- Much more comfortable- it currently feels unsafe
- Much more comfortable.
- Much more comfortable. Currently the cars next to cyclists are scary and not safe
- MUNI drivers are generally assholes with respect to sharing the road with bikers. The more separation the better.
- N/A
- No danger of getting hit by a tourist SUV or bus. Please limit the winding (like at landing zones) -- keep the cycletrack straight.
- Not a biker, I'm pedestrian only.
- Not a biker.
- Not as comfortable as if there were a separate cycletrack. Also, even if shared lanes are wider, I don't trust MUNI drivers not to pull away into passing cyclists, and I don't trust cyclists not to try to pass when it is dangerous to do so.
- Not as great as cycletrack.
- Not at all if I were older or a child.
- Not comfortable.
- Not much more comfortable than presently; drivers ignore sharrows. A separate cycletrack is a must.
- Not sure -- still scary. Could get run over by buses pulling out of stops.
- Not that much. Biking on Market St. will only increase -- already at certain times is the primary mode of transit conflicts with cars are for primary mode of transit. Conflicts with cars are far too dangerous for cyclists even when a car is passing at a relatively low speed (under 15 mph).
- Not very comfortable.
- Not very comfy
- Okay
- Only slightly more comfortable than currently
- Personally I would be fairly comfortable. If you want 20% by 2020, you should provide facilities to get there.
- Same as today because visitors don't follow "No Turn" and other signs/laws.
- Scary
- Self-serving question. It makes the argument while asking the question.
- Shared lanes are far inferior to dedicated cycling lanes. I'm always less comfortable sharing lanes with cars and buses when I bike. I believe shared lanes are significantly more dangerous than dedicated bike lanes.
- So uncomfortable. (But also not an avid cyclist)
- Somewhat -- I like Option 3 the best.
- Somewhat to quite comfortable
- Sounds too good to be true. Doesn't sound too much different than the status quo. But, sure, if you can make it happen, that'd be great!
- Still not quite comfortable; cycletrack would be best.
- The real answer is to have separated bike lanes. That is the way to make cycling safest and encourage it for more people.
- The reality is there WILL be bottlenecks, too many cars, etc. -- it's unrealistic to believe you can limit these -- so separate track is vital.
- The same comfort level as now. Which is not very comfortable. And I'm an experienced cyclist in SF and bike everyday.
- These ideas sound nice, but my comfort is most impeded by sharing lanes with big, scary buses.
- This is our opportunity for a world class

bikeway on Market St.
- Too scary.
- Very comfortable - I already bike on Market as it is.
- very comfortable, but no sharing with large vehicles, i.e., buses and garbage trucks.
- Very comfortable, but not as much as with Option 2.
- Very comfortable.
- Very comfortable.
- Very comfortable.
- Very comfortable.
- Very comfortable. As a bike rider I use Market Street a lot right now and it's not too bad. With less cars it would be better and don't think really need separate cycletracks.
- Very likely.
- Very!
- Very. I commute via bicycle on Market.
- YES
- Yes
- Yes! :)
- All of these improvements would make me more comfortable, but I'm doubtful about the ability to make "fewer cars" happen. Also, taxicabs are cars, too.
- Alright.
- How comfortable would you be if I was doing that helmetless?
- I already feel comfortable but that would be great!
- I don't bike enough to answer that competently.
- I feel OK biking Market Street now, but I would like a broader group of people to feel comfortable and I know that most feel don't' feel comfortable sharing track lanes with cars/ buses. Bigger concern as we get bike share.
- I would be for this as it represents an improvement over the status quo, but a cycletrack is the right way to go.
- I would feel comfortable (as a "strong fearless, mid-20s rider) but I know my partner would not.
- I would feel much more comfortable riding on Market Street if there were fewer cars and no bottlenecks at boarding islands.
- I would much prefer a dedicated bike lane, especially when riding with family members and on my kick scooter. The main tracks on shared lanes are also dangerous.
- Less so than dedicated lane.
- Might be okay -- better than now!
- Missed opportunity for increased safety/flow/ atmosphere.
- Moderately comfortable.
- More comfortable though I suspect but drivers will be resentful of cyclists and will need awareness training.
- NA
- No comment, I'm not a biker.
- No shared lane! Been to Vancouver or any European city? There is a recognition that pedestrians, cyclists, transit all need dedicated separate modes of travel.
- No, this is an invitation to an increased number of bike accidents.
- NOT comfortable with shared lanes!
- Not comfortable, especially if Option 3 were picked and more transit lanes came on Market.
- Not ideal but it would be an improvement. However, less bold riders/companions may not feel comfortable.
- Only if designated as shared street (i.e. with different pavement treatment to slow down traffic). Maybe more taxis to Mission Street. Shared facilities with increased number of buses increases potential to conflicts.
- Safety! I want this from every perspective. Please put this on Market.
- Since this question is worded as to only solicit the views of bicyclists, this deters answers/ concerns from transit riders and/or pedestrians, who outnumber bicyclists by a factor of more than 12;1.
- Somewhat comfortable. Not completely. And I know that many other people still would not feel comfortable at all.
- Sounds better than present.
- Sounds good.
- Sounds great!
- Very comfortable with this.
- Very comfortable!
- Very comfortable.
- Very comfortable.
- As a pedestrian, driver, and transit user, I would not feel "comfortable" at all. Bicycles are already dangerous to pedestrians, and

the lawless behavior of bicyclists should not be supported by more rewards that endanger others and use up resources for other travel modes.

- Fairly comfortable.
- Fine
- I don't think bikes should be on Market. Too busy already.
- I would still feel in danger of buses as they have poor sight lines and drivers can get distracted.
- I'd feel more comfortable, but not completely comfortable. The reality is, unprotected or shared bike lanes can still be unsafe. Bike deaths often result from bigger vehicle collisions, like trucks and buses, so the argument that fewer cars alone will make it safer is not reassuring to me as someone who would like to bike in San Francisco but does not currently.
- I'm a cyclist at heart, but had to give up my bicycle several years ago (landlord issue)... so no comment.
- It would be advantages to the safety of cyclists if the lanes were not shared.
- it would be an improvement than what is existing as buses are more predictable than passenger vehicles. taxis on the other hand needs further education in order to coexist harmoniously.
- much more comfortable
- Much more comfortable. Biggest issue on Market Street is not really the cars, but the pinched intersections.
- Not as comfortable compared to a separated facility
- Not comfortable. Too many buses on one street only it's not good.
- Not that comfortable -- I really like separated bike areas and feel nervous riding in shared lanes.
- Ok. Easier to pass other bikes than with cycletracks.
- Riding with busses is the worst. If busses use Market, bikes should use Mission, or vice versa.
- Somewhat comfortable.
- Still uncomfortable and dangerous like it is now.
- Very comfortable.
- Well duh: I feel much more comfortable riding a bike in a shared lane when "there were fewer cars, more opportunities to pass stopped busses, and no bottlenecks at boarding islands."
- Why fewer cars? Why not NO cars? I would feel more comfortable.
- You're assuming I'm in a car, I guess? I'm usually on a bus or on foot.

What parts of the raised cycletrack on Market Street are most appealing to you, and why? You do not have to respond from the perspective of a cyclist.

- clear space for cyclists also indicates other spaces are not for cyclists (keep bikes off sidewalks)
- Accessibility to risk-averse riders.
- Activates the street, makes it look and feel friendly, functional street about moving people!
- As a cyclist, not playing hopscotch with buses and cabs.
- As a pedestrian, I appreciate being protected from bicycles.
- Being able to have less conflict with cars/ transit, a smoother, more comfortable ride overall.
- Being apart form pedestrians.
- Being closer to bikes than cars and nice pavement treatment = pedestrian POV; protected bike lane = biker POV.
- Better safety for cyclists
- Cars kill .Protecting cyclists (and pedestrians) is key.
- Clear definition of bike space vs. car space.
- Clear delineation, easy on/off.
- Clearly marks the separation of space
- Directs cyclists away from pedestrian zones and vice versa
- Don't want to lose sidewalks or trees
- Ease of movement.
- Easy access to Market St. More defined and protected space for bicyclists on the main streets.
- Emphasizes cyclists on the most efficient route between many points
- Encourages cyclists to not ride on the street.
- Everything! Safer cycling, more awareness of cycling. More people will want to bike.
- Feels like a real, integrated urban plan that puts cycling smack in the center of priority. Don't like the "dead zone" where track disappears (but I can see why). For this reason, I like [points to mission street cycletrack].
- From a cyclist's perspective, it's separates from pedestrians. I don't like.
- Getting off and making left turns.
- Greenlighting so cyclists don't have to stop and no cars turning through bike lanes!
- Having dedicated raised cycletrack experience is too limiting in case it doesn't work.
- I like that a raised cycletrack more closely associates pedestrians and cyclists in a casual rider and pedestrian space.
- I think it is important for cyclists to feel safe.
- I think making bikes more like pedestrians is great. As a cyclist it's safer and more comfortable. As a pedestrian or driver it makes it easier to predict cyclist behavior
- I would like to bicycle one day and would feel safer.
- Improved safety, clear differentiation between vehicles, bikes, pedestrians. Autos should still be restricted east of 8th.
- It gets the cyclists "off" the street. I also like the pavement treatment
- It is a fairly direct route going where many people want to go.
- It is separated from vehicular traffic -- making it safer. Potential opps to create cycle greenway to GGP/Ocean Beach.
- It offers cyclists that well-needed buffer from cars. And if an emergency maintenance vehicle needs enter the cycletrack is still
- It will attract riders of all ages and abilities, not just the fearless, and make Market more accessible to more people. If we want to have a cycling city, we must put cycletrack on Market, our city's main street.
- It will keep it in the pedestrian realm & keep them aware of their interaction with them.
- It would encourage thousands of more cyclists with safe and effective transport
- It would make me and my wife much more

comfortable, and it would help eliminate cycling on the sidewalk.
- It would make the bike lane obvious & maybe keep people from biking on the sidewalk.
- It's existence. Separate from street traffic
- It's safer for cyclists. There's a buffer between pedestrians and automobiles, so it's safer for pedestrians.
- Just have lights for stop and go from there.
- Keeps things separate
- Less crashes with or due to cyclists weaving in and out
- Materials and visually expanded pedestrian. Zone (?) Safety for bikes.
- Merging of cyclists and pedestrians families.
- More areas where transit can't compete with cyclists.
- "More cyclists= more commercial activity
- More safety= more cyclists"
- More organized space. You know where the bikes are, I won't block or slow down the bus when on my bike
- My kids could get to the waterfront by bike while not killed or [maimed].
- N/A
- need raised curb to ensure bicyclists stay off sidewalk.
- Nice divided area clearly for cyclists. Safe for family of bikers.
- No appeal
- No conflict between buses/cars and bikes.
- None. Eats up R.O.W [right of way] that could be used for sidewalks or loading zones.
- Not very much.
- People will still use Market. Market needs a protected bike lane.
- Physical barriers are clearly needed -- drivers don't comply otherwise. Unsure from pedestrian perspective.
- Physical separation from cars. They encroach on cyclists lanes all the time. Although, honestly cars (private vehicles) should not be allowed on Market anyways.
- Protecting cyclists.
- Puts bikes and pedestrians together. Safer for bikes and pedestrians. Faster for buses.
- Raised cycletrack if not taking from sidewalk/ streetlife zone is ok. Raised cycletrack between streetlife zone and transit zone is ok. Cycletrack mixed with streetlife will be a problem.
- Raised track [get] is buffer from traffic.
- Right now cyclists don't have their own space on Market except for the lanes that start at the Civic Center. Having a bigger space for bikes will make it easier for everyone to know where to expect cyclists.
- Safe zone for bikes.
- Safer, visually appealing
- Safety and avoiding the problem that currently exists of Market Street as an obstacle course (especially with vans, trucks, trains and MUNI buses).
- Safety and promotion of biking (which is better for city).
- Safety designating zones for different modes.
- Separate cyclists from buses.
- Separated from car/bus traffic. Paving materials different from street.
- Separated from transit, safety.
- Separated pavers.
- Separates MUNI from bikes, making it much safer. Speeds up MUNI since they don't get caught behind bikes. Separates bike track should run whole length of Market Street. Can squeeze to 4' to get past BART portals, but still stripe separate time bus lanes.
- Separates the bikes from traffic.
- Separating other traffic (e.g. cars, buses, and pedestrians).
- Separation - both
- Separation from vehicles and dedicated lane.
- That it is located where people want to go with better connection to the wiggle and BART stations.
- That it will protect cyclists more.
- That it's on Market. Mission is depressing.
- The ability to handle an ever-increasing amount of bicycle travel. It's only going up.
- The fact that it's raised; but it must be beveled to allow bicyclists to enter/exit the cycletrack from the adjacent travel lane, (i.e. not only at intersections, but all along Market).
- The separation it gives -- but it should be painted green -- drivers will double park otherwise.

- To have the separate lane by a rise is also a great idea. Whatever the means safer for cyclists and pedestrians.
- “Visibility
- Sense of separation
- Surface”
- Willis Polk street lights on Market need to be painted with more care with reinstate the original gold touches. Separation-safety but “enforcement” needs to be a focus. Assumption that separation will ensure compliance seems naïve. Ask PUC.
- A huge step forward in bike lane design for this city! Casual cyclists are most excited about bicycling on Market and this allows them to. Physical boundary makes it so much safer. City design that gives individual space to pedestrians, cyclists, and motor vehicles, so less fighting between groups.
- Allows transit to have 4 lanes!! Improving transit. Makes Market St a wonderfully active destination. Reinforces the importance of Market Street. Safety for everyone. Integrates pedestrians with other San Franciscans.
- Allows transit to have 4 lanes!! Improving transit. Makes Market St a wonderfully active destination. Reinforces the importance of Market Street. Safety for everyone. Integrates pedestrians with other San Franciscans.
- Appeals to me to define the separate track versus pedestrians from traffic.
- Appeals to me to define the separate track versus pedestrians from traffic.
- Avoiding pedestrian/cyclist conflict -- I am both, but I don’t jaywalk or run lights on bike.
- Avoiding pedestrian/cyclist conflict -- I am both, but I don’t jaywalk or run lights on bike.
- Buffer zones / more signaling between cyclists/ pedestrians.
- Buffer zones / more signaling between cyclists/ pedestrians.
- Colored lanes.
- Colored lanes.
- Continuous (other than single break), raised bikeway, improves and relieves bus/bike conflicts, ability to move into bus lane if necessary.
- Continuous (other than single break), raised bikeway, improves and relieves bus/bike conflicts, ability to move into but lane if necessary.
- Easier and safer to cycle.
- Easier and safer to cycle.
- I like the continuous cycletrack from Embarcadero to Octavia -- separated completely from other modes of travel.
- I like the continuous cycletrack from Embarcadero to Octavia -- separated completely from other modes of travel.
- I want this too. Don’t’ leave Mission dangerous to make Market less dangerous. Do both.
- I want this too. Don’t’ leave Mission dangerous to make Market less dangerous. Do both.
- If it keeps the cyclist in their cycletrack lane, the safer for all
- It separates pedestrians from cars.
- It separates pedestrians from cars.
- Pedestrian/traffic buffer. Narrower streets = calming cyclist safety.
- Pedestrian/traffic buffer. Narrower streets = calming cyclist safety.
- Raised cycletrack would be hazardous.
- Raised cycletrack would be hazardous.
- Raised. No buses. Good separate to pedestrians.
- Raised. No buses. Good separate to pedestrians.
- These two questions also show a pro-bike bias. We are only asked to state positive aspects. This mitigates/deters negative comments.
- These two questions also show a pro-bike bias. We are only asked to state positive aspects. This mitigates/deters negative comments.
- Again, the separated bikeway is clearly the safest option, allowing each mode of traffic (pedestrian, bicycle, auto/bus) to be separated.
- Cars have to slow down or at least recognize they are crossing a cycle track.
- Dedicated bike lane would improve things greatly for bicyclists at the expense of pedestrians in some instances. It looks like transit users would have to cross the cycletrack to get to the outer boarding islands, which could be a problem because bicyclists

would increase their speed significantly if they have their own “track”.

- dedicated space with clear barriers. more consistent flow of cycle traffic.
- Hey thanks for including the 97% of travelers who do NOT use bicycles! Nothing about “the raised cycletrack on Market Street” is “appealing.” It takes space away from other modes, makes bicycles travel on sidewalks, endangering pedestrians, and pedestrians have to cross through lawless speeding bicyclists to get to bus stops and across the street. This is a bad idea that benefits only 3% at the expense of street space and safety for the vast majority of travelers.
- I don’t like the idea of a raised cycle track at all. It reduces space for already crowded lanes of cyclists. Passing would be a nightmare. Keep it level with the ground, just separated from the traffic and with the buffer zones.
- I don’t remember seeing a “raised” cycletrack.
- I learned in the meeting that taxis and para-transit will be allowed to use the cycletrack so its not really a “cycletrack” and more of a parking lane bikes will occasionally get to use. Do you really want to make my keep scratching delivery trucks and knocking rearview mirrors out of place when people park in the bike lane?
- I like that it clearly separates bike from traffic and from pedestrians.
- I like the idea of riding on a separate track, and I like the idea presented at the meeting that bicyclists and pedestrians are really in their own category while buses and cars are in another. That said, I’m kind of nervous about devoting that much infrastructure just to bikes.
- I would just like a separated buffered bike way on market street. I guess having it raised will make it easier for bicyclists to get on and off the cycle track to the pedestrian way but I don’t think that is a necessity as much for ADA compliance.
- It’s probably the most specific delineation of just where the bicycles are to ride.
- No opinion.
- None.
- Not appealing. Bike traffic is too high to accommodate the cycletrack on market.
- Safety for cyclists.
- Safety of cyclists and pedestrians from vehicles and each other.
- Safety, safety, safety. Having a dedicated bike lane along the majority of Market Street would definitely encourage me to bike more because I’d be comforted by the fact that I was shielded from vehicular traffic. While the design would require loss of some sidewalk space, I think you could make the argument that a cycletrack will encourage more pedestrians to consider biking. Particularly there will be a nice synergy between the Bay Area Bike Share program’s bike pods along Market and the cycletrack. My perspective is, if we want to reach our goal of 50% of all trips to be by sustainable modes, we need a cycletrack.
- Separated from other traffic by more than just paint.
- Separation from fast moving traffic.
- Separation! It is more like Amsterdam which I think is the epitome of mixed street use.

What parts of the buffered cycletrack on Mission Street are most appealing to you, and why?

- (Problem) It's less bike as pedestrian and more bike as vehicle. It opens up more options, but also conflict
- "* Bikes are a key part of street activation but will be moved to Mission, where no public activation is being invested in.
- * Not as pretty a ride. "
- ?
- A buffered cycletrack is not that appealing to me.
- Additional photos, additional options for cyclists. Autos should not be restricted west of 8th.
- All of it is good for bicyclists.
- An alternate bike route. Also can consider NO bikes on Market (and no cars) allowing optimal transit signals priority on Market with Bike signal timing on Mission.
- Between 1st and 2nd.
- Buffered cycle track offers opportunities for stormwater management and increasing urban forest with grasses.
- Cycling freely without worrying about pedestrians or vehicles.
- Don't like it. It belongs on Market.
- East and safe to use
- Fast community for cyclists.
- Few, I'm not confident that there will be easy pathways between Mission and the BART stations. Moving the SamTrans buses to Market will further the bus issued on Market
- Good bike options on Market and Mission. Should be well separated and safe at intersection like Market Option 2.
- Good on paper but would be much more difficult to implement
- GREEN WAVE
- Green Wave & protected.
- Green Wave would be nice if you are shooting across town. If you aren't going far, it's less valuable. Take out the parking-transit- first? The cycletrack is too narrow.
- Greenery in the islands.
- Having bike lines on Mission instead of Market may ease traffic (buses/street cars, etc.) and will make Mission St. more accessible.
- I dislike the Mission option because it tries to move cyclists two block out of their way (one there, one back) Many simply won't use it.
- I don't want to bike on a separated Mission Street. I'd much rather bike on Market on a separated bikeway.
- I like having division between bus - bike, but the reality is that bikes will go on Market, so let's just make that smooth and safe.
- I like the idea of a bike lane on Mission as it could be used to revitalize the corridor, but not if it means removing bike lanes from Market.
- I often ride Mission because it's faster, but there's no buffer. It would be great to not have buses and cars parking ---> [leading to] faster cycling traffic needs the option.
- I prefer the raised cycle track on Market St. that would provide more protection for cyclists.
- I would not use it. So there is very little benefit to me. Only people going/coming from the South would use Mission Street, that's why it would be so bad.
- I'm fully opposed to the option to move bicyclists and cars to Mission and ban or restrict them on Market.
- I'm ok with either option. With less traffic or buses street will be ok.
- inclusion of another street --> widening the improvements.
- It seem faster but calmer, with fewer stoplights and obstacles. Fewer potential conflicts.
- It will be speedier. Bust most everyday cyclists don't care about speed!
- It would make mission street a much nicer place.
- It's a burden but worth it. Stop catering to autos -- they are anti-city living.
- It's a good route into SoMa

- Its contiguous- as opposed to breaking up at 3rd/4th
- Lack of bus traffic, and the physical barrier.
- Lane size, better separation from street, but I very much prefer Option 2.
- “Love rerouting buses to Market
- Love the passageways between Mission/ Market”
- Love to have an independent lane, to enjoy the ride more, to get faster and safer to places. :)
- Market Street should be where cycling is safest. That is where everyone’s destinations are. Cyclists add to the vitality of the space. Mission is just a thoroughfare for cars.
- Mission great, market better
- More landscaping, enlivened parallel streets, save the trees and the habitat they create for the Western tiger Swallowtail.
- N/A
- N/A
- No MUNI tracks - much better option for cyclists.
- None. If I’m travelling on Market Street to get to my destination (the main corridor for commuters too) go to work, I’m not going to ride over to Mission Street when going to Financial district, SOMA, North Beach, Embarcadero.
- None. Mission Street buses which I ride daily) straddle lanes as it is.
- Non-professional drivers from the suburbs are dangerous on Market with bikes. No cars on Market from Van Ness to the Ferry terminal.
- Not many -- concerned more with taking buses away.
- One appeal- keep the crazy bicyclist away from people/cars/buses
- One long continuous track, inviting for newer and timid cyclists; older folks, etc. Fosters a “cycling culture”; love the Great Wave!
- Protecting cyclists. More of a “locals” street to transverse.
- Protection for everyone
- Provides extra buffer from traffic for pedestrians, but I don’t know what the conditions on Mission are
- Reduces possibility of being hit.
- Safe space from traffic and won’t be in the way of the bus
- Safe zone for bikes but Market is priority.
- Safer Green Wave.
- Safety! Unbroken the entire length; better for new riders.
- Safety! Unbroken the entire length; better for new riders.
- Safety, especially for kids and families
- Safety, less pollution from motor vehicles.
- Same as above. [Retyped here for quick reference:] Just have lights for stop and go from there.
- See above. However, what about north-south connections?
- See above. Maybe less effective.
- See earlier comment.
- Seems like there are less interruptions at the cycletrack on Mission than Market (i.e. more contiguous travel length).
- Separated from transit, safety.
- Separation from the cars
- The buffer lane!!!
- The buffer! An opportunity to beautify. Also the zippy timed lights. (maybe time to 15 mph, not 14, please?
- The buffer. Protect cyclists from cars!
- The elimination of travel lanes for vehicles and moving bus lines to Market.
- The fact that it’s separated.
- The grade! That it seems faster.
- The idea of a planted buffer at intersections. (But I would only support this proposal with Option 2!)
- The same as above. [Retyped here for quick reference:] The separation it gives -- but it should be painted green -- drivers will double park otherwise.
- The separation and the Green Wave. But I am skeptical that cyclists will use them because I don’t believe the connections and Market Street (especially Upper Market Street, which has a lot of cyclists) will be suddenly frictionless. So, I support Option 2, rather than Option 3.
- The separation from pedestrians.
- The timed lights. Reusing the GG Park bike lane is a bad idea. If cyclists are still on Market, this is a waste of resources.

- There is less conflict between cyclists and cars. Buses should run on Market St.
- There is more room for expansion and feel a dedicated cycletrack would be more user friendly and beneficial to cyclists
- This option is not appealing. The cycletrack belongs on Mission Street.
- Too restricted in terms of on/off.
- What we've seen so far looks good but you neglected to show the cross streets N/S that make this option work. Huge missing piece today.
- Wider bicycle lanes? More definition and more of a barrier for cyclists.
- Would be nice to have the buses off of Mission
- Best facility (location aside). I'm getting sold on it.
- Best facility (location aside). I'm getting sold on it.
- Buffered is safe to all ages. Left turn lanes on Mission are good. Ellis Street closing.
- Buffered is safe to all ages. Left turn lanes on Mission are good. Ellis Street closing.
- Can ride faster
- Can ride faster
- Clear zone for cyclists. Safer.
- Clear zone for cyclists. Safer.
- Don't think this will be a popular route except with hard core commuters -- Not very visually interesting.
- Don't think this will be a popular route except with hard core commuters -- Not very visually interesting.
- Fully continuous, separation (trees, parked cars) from traffic, timed lights (14 mph) is great.
- Fully continuous, separation (trees, parked cars) from traffic, timed lights (14 mph) is great.
- Incorporating Mission into the design and making the whole area better. I only want this option if it is mostly physically protected buffers.
- Narrower/calmer vehicle. Green/bicycle buffer.
- Narrower/calmer vehicle. Green/bicycle buffer.
- Not "dancing" with the buses
- Safe for bikes. Can bike fast!
- Safe for bikes. Can bike fast!
- Safe[r] than raised cycletrack. First must [be coherent].
- Safe[r] than raised cycletrack. First must [be coherent].
- SAFETY-- creates less tension between cyclists and buses and will increase ridership an safety for all!
- SAFETY-- creates less tension between cyclists and buses and will increase ridership an safety for all!
- Should be better than Market cycletrack--road less cluttered.
- Should be better than Market cycletrack--road less cluttered.
- Timed lights -- keeps bicyclists away from pedestrians on Market concerned about more pedestrians with new (No Suggestions) building.
- Timed lights -- keeps bicyclists away from pedestrians on Market concerned about more pedestrians with new (No Suggestions) building.
- Cycletrack along entire length providing uninterrupted safe cycletrack.
- I am a regular cyclist. I prefer a buffered cycletrack on Mission Street.
- I like that is adds another clear bike path in SOMA
- I like the idea of a more fluid buffered lane throughout such as the one proposed on Mission as opposed to Market. The separated bikeway on Market is not as fluid as some areas are flat vs. raised and curves and narrows/widens throughout the street. Some of the blocks will have the cycle lane painted while others are raised... hopefully its not confusing for pedestrians where the bike lanes are as I hope the bicyclists won't be trying to negotiate with pedestrians.
- I think as a rider it will be more appealing and safer feeling, look nicer, and make riding on Mission St a destination. I can imagine even taking kids along a buffered Mission St. I like it more than the raised in a lot of ways, especially since I feel like bikes are getting more and more preferential treatment on Market, and Mission is so primarily cars right now.
- I think the Mission design is a good design worthy of consideration, but I still think the

focus on biking should be on Market. The evidence indicates that Market is currently handling the majority of bike traffic. Mission is not. To shift bikers to Mission to me seems counterintuitive to current travel patterns, and the fact that Market still remains a more destination laden corridor than Mission. I think in the long-term Mission deserves a makeover that includes a cycletrack, however, I think the focus of this project should remain on Market Street.

- It ensures bike traffic is well separated and has clear signals and locations. Full separation via cycletrack seems much safer for bikes and pedestrians.
- It gives cyclists another option and will improve traffic flow on Mission, which is stupidly slow.
- It would be safer. So people don't get hurt.
- It's a buffered cycletrack: no asshole delivery truck drivers and shitbag cabbies parking in the bike lane.
- It's safer.
- Moving bikes to Mission St. makes no sense. If they are moved to Mission St., then a raised track will provide better safety.
- n/a
- No opinion.
- None.
- Probably more cost effective than the cycletrack. In 20 years autos may be as small as bikes and then you'll have to rethink all this anyway.
- protection from cars and delivery trucks
- Safety for cyclists.
- Separation from fast moving traffic and green wave.
- Since I live north of Market, I would probably never use this.
- WHY DO YOU PROPOSED "BUFFERED CYCLETRACKS ON MISSION STREET" WHEN YOU ALREADY PLAN TO PUT THEM ON MARKET STREET????? Nothing is "appealing" about usurping more street space for an activity that is dangerous to pedestrians and takes up more street space for other modes used by the vast majority of travelers. You propose to virtually block access on Market to cars, which are the mode of choice of the vast majority of travelers, you have funneled traffic to Mission Street for your scheme that has never been put to a vote of the people, and now you propose to also bottleneck traffic on Mission Street. Your public agency needs to consider the travel modes and safety of the vast majority, not the preferences of a very small minority.

What do you find most appealing and/or of greatest concern about the private automobile restriction proposals? Why?

- Allows for public transport to move more freely.
- Anyone who drives on Market Street right now is totally nuts. I see no reason to not totally restrict private vehicles. They don't need to be there.
- Appealing because I believe it reflects a greater trend in transportation and approach to climate change.
- Appealing to get cars off the street. They are menace.
- Appealing-no more cars in the way of my bus
- As long as traffic of all sorts is better I'll like it.
- Ban private autos from Market completely. That would be great!
- because if rich people don't drive they will hire goons like Zimmerman of Florida. I say let private cars flow
- Cars just shouldn't be allowed on Market Street
- Cars pollute are dangerous
- Cars shouldn't be on Market Street
- Clarity for drivers
- "Concern: Slopping when cars needed to carry purchases would be restricted
- appealing: Reduces traffic volume which improves the area for pedestrians"
- Concerned that we're eliminating options for drop off/ pick up at retail.
- enforcement
- Fewer autos = better. (and I have a car and drive to work often)
- Fewer cars + speedier transit
- Fewer cars on Market the better.
- Fewer cars will make it a more inviting street to be on as a pedestrian.
- Fewer cars, slower, less traffic is great.
- Flagrant omission of APS at medians and raised bike lane near sidewalk
- Fully support this! Let's design for bikes and pedestrians and we will get more bikers and pedestrian. If we design for cars we will get more cars
- Get rid of them on this street
- Good consideration of Tran bay Terminal peek transit flow, but would the new left turns impact cyclists more?
- Good idea! Cars don't really gain anything by being on Market.
- Greatest restriction
- I 100% support removing or further restricting private autos.
- I am all for greater restrictions and recommend better enforcement for vehicles that block intersections that block buses and pedestrians from crossing safely.
- I am concerned about the businesses & ensuring that they have the ability to receive/ drop off passengers and deliveries. Needs to be proper signage directing people to neighborhoods adjacent esp. North like Union Square.
- I am vehemently opposed. I am from Fresno, CA, which in 1965, enacted a ban on cars in its downtown core and destroyed most large and small businesses within 5 year. Today, Fresno is planning to restore autos, Sacramento , meanwhile (which like the Market Plan reversed master transit) has ended its ban on cars as of 2011. Car bans kill retail!! I'd also like to see parking on Market restored. Look west of Van Ness.
- I find most appealing that traffic will be restricted. I feel cars shouldn't be allowed at all.
- I like 2 blocks off Market near the Embarcadero- This plan doesn't address residents needs for car use at all- has main to market to Pine been addresses? NO, Chicago is much larger city and functions fine with a much nicer Grand Blvd/Michigan Ave). Lets look at Chicago- We are not a Euro City- who got a design firm from Denmark? Ridiculous!
- I like option of directing traffic to Mission.
- I like that SF is prioritizing alternative modes and think driving should be disincentivized as

much as possible

- I like the idea of auto restriction from 7am -7 pm on as much of Market Street as possible.
- I like the private auto restrictions. Many drivers seem confused and unable to deal with congested intersections. It would be safer and improve flow of traffic.
- I support auto restriction.
- I support restrictions and don't own a car
- I think you have underestimated the needs of vehicular traffic downtown. If you over restrict traffic on Market and Mission it will simply shift to other streets (Pine, Howard< Harrison, etc)
- I think you need a consistent rule. Having rules that change per block and change per time are confusing and don't get followed. So I like the ban all cars and use Mission street. Though I am not sure about the traffic flow at Mission and Van Ness. Also you had to improve the flow crossing Market. Having a one way street dumps into a 2 way street doesn't work.
- I would like the buses and street car to be on Market not cars
- I would prefer a car free Market Street. I would vote for the highest level of restriction.
- In favor of elimination cars on Market except for ADA and after hours loading.
- It is not an efficient route to anywhere by car. Drivers really suffer from using side streets. Cars will do better on Mission than on Market. Full ban sounds equal to me.
- It sounds great for everyone to restrict autos. I commute by bike on Market and regularly see gridlock caused by cars and conflicting with pedestrians. Remove cars from 6 am to 9pm and weekends!
- It's a burden but worth it. Stop catering to autos- they are anti city living!
- It's a good idea. No comment.
- Just get rid of cars from Van Ness to the ferry outright. We are a transit first city, right?
- Less cars the better- send them to Mission Street. It is better for everyone.
- Less traffic and pollution on the streets.
- Less traffic- Better flow for transit and cyclists
- Less traffic will cause the street to feel less cluttered and restrictive.
- Limit private vehicles Encourage people to get out of their cars. There are a lot of options, improve health and community
- Limited transportation options for some individuals, tourists, visitors.
- Limiting cars = good for Market
- Love it. Market will thrive with foot, cycle traffic. Using Mission for cars is a small or not an inconvenient at all.
- Love the auto restrictions! It has made it so much more pleasant to ride and walk on Market
- Market Street is a lousy place to serve a car already. Fewer cars will make Market Street feel more friendly to pedestrians, safer for cyclist
- Market will be safer, quieter, more beautiful. Even drivers find market stressful. I am when I drive on Market. Lets please go with the most aggressive option.
- More complex to negotiate Market Street for drivers but can lessen traffic on Market makes it generally calmer
- More traffic? Where will all the existing traffic go?
- Most appealing to ease congestion on Market Street. I don't think it causes problem as long as there are ample ways for cars to cross Market Street from North to South.
- Most appealing: more restrictions.
- Much better with no cars: 1. Faster transit 2. Safer for pedestrians and bikes
- Need to consider with traffic and future changes to traffic flow (change of one-way to two-way)
- No cars on market seems great
- No reason for private cars on Market, or room
- Non professional driver from the suburbs are dangerous on Market with bikes. No cars on market Van Ness to Ferry terminal.
- Not many cars on Market St not much of an issue diverting them. Those on Market clog up Muni so moving them off make lots of sense. Should be no cars, loading and this from 7am-7 pm from Embarcadero to Van Ness.
- Overall, they look good. But I am worried about how effectively they can be enforced and weather there would be any advantage to having them only during certain hours over all

day.

- Overhead signs are ugly and unnecessary. Lots of auto traffic makes an area much less appealing. So I believe autos should be restricted east of 8th. If you restrict autos east of Van Ness it makes it too difficult to drive to destinations in SOMA and South Beach and Mission Bay. 9th and 10th are major corridors that should remain accessible to autos.
- Please, yes restrict them
- “Prefer no private autos between Van Ness and Stuart (Option 3?), but could live with no autos between 8th and Stuart (Option 1?)
- Autos have no business on Market and as a local I go (like everyone else) on Howard and Folsom. “
- Private auto restriction= appealing. We need to discourage driving private vehicles in the city in general
- Private autos greatly detract from market Street. If you want to revitalize Market, you should ban them completely.
- Reduced carbon emissions, safer for all users, more pleasant space.
- Responsible auto-diversion is the only choice to avoid and LA like gridlocked future
- Restricting private autos gives everybody else breathing room. My concern is that autos not restricted.
- Speedy transit, relief from bikes, constrict loading to evening hours
- Temporarily I believe it will lead to civic unhappiness from the carpooling community, but if it leads to more people taking public transportation I support it. Generation Y doesn’t buy cars anyway.
- The enforcement. The current restrictions still have many drivers willing to turn right off Market when going fast. From Van Ness to Embarcadero should only be taxis / emergency vehicles/ maintenance trucks and delivery vehicles permitted to travel on Market.
- The fewer private cars, the better.
- The less autos on Market Street the better the plan. Autos have become a nuisance [ ] . Remove them!
- The potential of street life suffering due to lack of multi modal options & businesses struggling against it.
- There should be no cars on Market St. It slows down the buses.
- This street is already hard to drive on- in large part because of unclear wayfinding/signage. Restrictions come with clearer demarcation.
- This will just send more traffic onto Mission Street. Many residents who live off Mission will not be happy.
- Traffic back up- frustrated drivers
- Transit first should be the rule. Restrict cars all you need to/ want to in order to prioritize transit
- We need congestion pricing now. Indifferent as long as traffic congestion and accompanying air pollution does not increase as result.
- Will it work? How to enforce? How to deal with car traffic? How to distinguish between private cars & not private cars? (I don’t have a car, & I fully support auto restriction!)
- Would prefer to move them to Mission Street instead of the bicyclist
- Appealing- autos don’t belong on Market. Please put in place restrictions, make the design self-enforcing.
- Appealing! Less traffic.
- As a pedestrian, transit rider, cyclist, and car owner, I say: cars have no place on Market. They should be banned completely to create an environment as pleasant to be as possible.
- Could impact certain business poorly as most older people will not take buses or bike
- Curbside cycletracks mitigate against curbside drop off of vulnerable passengers. Senior people with disabilities or adults unloading babies/young kids
- Drivers breaking the rules, lack of enforcement, bad signage in approaching restricted areas, failing to sign the alternate routs
- Eliminate private autos and taxi pick ups on Market
- Enforcement
- Fewer cars is great. More taxis is better.
- I am concerned mostly about Option 3, placing massive restrictions on people’s ability to come and go to shops an/around market Street to transact businesses-e.g.. Transporting big ticket items
- I am ok with any auto restrictions, as long as

pedestrian/bike/transit safety + performance are significantly improved.

- I found it appealing because Market Street is not a street designed to cars. That means major alleviations of congestions improve safety, reliability.
- I have lived over a decade in Germany where pedestrian zones work great and folks are encouraged to take public transit. Everyone would benefit from keeping Market Street clear of congestion and conflict between private cars and bikes
- I like the idea of limiting cars on Market, but there is concern for the elderly or disabled folks who attend theaters or programs on Market Street. They may need especial accommodations for curbside drop off.
- It improves the experience for transit riders, cyclists, and pedestrians. I worry that the restrictions will be ignored as they are now. 7am -7pm does not seem to extend late enough in the evening. 7am -9pm would be better.
- It is critical the art based growing nightlife. Economy is also considered. This is more at a car depended economy.
- It is idiotic to pretend one can free SF from vehicle traffic. Nor is it desirable. If you want to know the consequences of low level of vehicle traffic, visit Vallejo.
- It sounds great on paper, but enforcement has been … so far. How can we make it effective? Police resources are spent ticketing cyclists instead of drivers. This is not Transit-First. Please get better enforcement
- Less noise, less danger, less pollution, more positive urban experience
- LIMITING TRAFFIC ON Market seems fine
- No cars! Better for everyone! Open up room
- No problem. No one drives on Market
- None- cars are for the 1% superrich in SF only- What about us 99%
- Nothing- if only we could make the N-S streets two-way, instead of one-way
- Only concerned that it is cleat and enforced
- Private vehicles have no place on the most important public space in the city. They are … of the past and should be removed like a garbage
- Restricting cars (i.e.. Limiting to delivery, handicap, etc.) would greatly improve Market for all users. Since enforcement is problematic use design to enforce cars off Market Street. Consider focusing cabs on Mission.
- Restrictions are a great benefit for inviting people to use the space
- Sounds great to me
- The design of this must make it very obvious what a driver should do and practically impossible to do it wrong- self-enforcing design
- Too many cars. Too many taxis.
- We concern. It is about time. We are the densest city outside of NYC. We need at least one street free of auto traffic please.
- With Option 3, consistent timing of signals on Mission could speed up traffic. More left-turns off mission east bound would make it easier to get North of Market
- You look at trying t cross market from Battery to Bush Street very difficult. Will you repeat this everywhere?
- You mentioned that bike and pedestrians share commonalities. Why not in any of your option are the 2 on the same street. Why not make all transit and auto to Mission and keep bike and pedestrians on Market.
- Appealing: restricting private cars as much as possible, and not just Market if you can do it elsewhere. Greatest concern: this does nothing for me in Upper Market. Our sidewalks are narrow, the crossings are too long with the timing off so that completing a crossing means blocking traffic. How about some restrictions on autos up here? Wait a couple times at the corner of Duboce and Market for the endless light cycle to change.
- Auto restriction will allow Muni and bikes to move on Market Street faster. However, restrictions and forced right turns might exacerbate the problem of motorists failing to yield to pedestrians. Possibly mitigate with leading pedestrian interval signals and no turn on red.
- Biggest concern is that private vehicles should be more restricted or, preferably, completely removed from Market Street.

- Every time a Market Street parade ends there is a brief period when the street belongs solely to pedestrians. It is a great feeling. Have to live with buses but cars crowd everything and make it so congested.
- I am a native and love driving. The inability of autos to access Market will discourage residents from frequenting that section of the entire city as it becomes more difficult to get around. Disallowing cars also limits the types of businesses that locate on the street which will now be serving a residential population. It's very impractical to think people are going to schlep grocery bags on bikes or the Muni and keep their families in the city. You are basically encouraging tourist-creep instead of letting tourists visit our daily world as one would when visiting Paris or Florence.
- I find it very appealing. The less vehicles on Market the better. We have an opportunity here to prove to the world that the greatest ways to experience the City aren't through a personal vehicle, but rather, on foot, on bike, or on transit. As a Transit First City, San Francisco needs to live up to its commitment to transit. Restricting vehicles along Market Street would help encourage behavior change by emphasizing multi-mode use and also re-enforce the City's Transit First commitment.
- I like the restrictions on hours.
- I loved the old Market Street with four tracks for rail cars, but even then, we still had room for autos.
- I think it wonderful that the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders are being considered. We should to encourage alternatives to private cars, which not only create more traffic congestion and noise/ air pollution, but require more space accommodation for parking.
- It is fairly hard to drive cars down market as it is. I think eliminating autos from Market is a great idea and will improve public transportation while giving autos other options where they don't have to compete as much with buses and pedestrians.
- less congestion and more efficient roadways for transit, bicycle increased ridership of other modes possible increase of pedestrians walking which could lead to healthier people catering of food and other items delivered to businesses along market street major cities already do this and it works
- No concerns about restricting private autos. Please do it. Please also close Powell St. to private autos between Market and Union Square while you're at it.
- none
- Nothing
- The greatest concern is that there is not complete restriction. Automobiles are killing not just people in accidents, but the human species through global warming. We have the geography to eliminate cars downtown. We just need the political will to do so.
- They are confusing to me -- auto restrictions from 7 AM to 7 PM? I'm never a fan of that because it confuses drivers. Does that mean NO drivers at all? That'd be super cool, but I'd love a fact sheet on what you think that will actually look like.
- This should be a non-issue. Private automobile use in a dense, modern city should be restricted to actual need, not convenience or a continuation of the way things have been. Ever been to any given major European city? Cars are not the life of the party, so to speak.
- Unless you're leaving the city or going to pick up something of substantial size in the City, it doesn't make sense to drive anywhere. Biking and MUNI will get you where you need to go.
- Very few private cars drive on Market Street so I don't think it make much difference. Outlawing right turns at major Market Street intersections would be a good idea as turning cars conflict with pedestrians and cause 'gridlock'.
- Very much in favor. Safer for pedestrians and cyclists, and a more appealing streetscape that is not constantly clogged with cars.
- Will you have police 24/7 to determine who is a private car or not? Of course not!!!
- Your "private automobile restriction proposals" to create amenities for PRIVATE BICYCLES (and bicycles are "private" vehicles, just like privately owned cars, disserve the

public, cause gridlock and traffic impacts with inevitable air quality impacts that San Francisco conveniently blows across the bay. Whether you like it or not, you need to accommodate the travel preferences of the vast majority of people, not just the ideology and practices of a tiny minority. The impacts of making driving unpleasant, difficult, dangerous, and more expensive, have not and will not result in significant changes in the mode split, and because this is supposedly a democracy where laws are enacted in the public interest, you, as a public agency need to consider ALL travel modes and make ALL travel modes more efficient and comfortable in proportion to the level of their use by the public.

•

What appeals to you about the designs for UN and Hallidie Plazas that you saw today? Are there other things you would like to see at UN Plaza? At Hallidie Plaza?

- * Food truck work. Great idea to raise Hallidie Plaza. But you must ensure these areas are not dominated by homeless petty criminals, and drug dealers, as UN plaza is today.
- "* Greater visibility of programming at halide Plaza
- * Need to keep spaces for SFAC street artist program
- * Love public seating at halide Plaza. Yes, there is a good sun.
- * UN, great to cut wind, make fountain more appealing, speaker's space , should think about wind protection for the stage"
- "* Hallidie plaza- great idea, put it up, make it more useful
- * Information center- more accessible and attractive for transit
- * UN plaza- café idea and auditorium love it, get more life in there, so more variety of people will use it"
- * Hallidie, how about an amphitheater, which is cheaper than filling up? Main reason why Hallidie plaza sucks is because of the plants that eat up space, making it uninviting. An amphitheater could also create more public performance opportunities for the city.
- "* Love raising Hallidie
- * UN Plaza- great but consider the connection Northeast of plaza"
- "* UN Plaza- don't ignore the area near Fed building and integrate with UN Plaza
- * Hallidie- don't ignore the plaza near Carl's jar/ payless integrate with halide"
- "* UN Plaza should have facilities to enhance farmers market and to discourage the fountains being used for bathing and clothes washing.
- * Hallidie Plaza raised to street level is great! Do it! And I suggest continue raised paving across 5th Street/ Cyril Magnum."
- "1. Raised halide
- 2. Stage at UN"
- Actually I find them both rather enjoyable as they are.
- Both: more trees, maybe a playground/ park, more options for families, residents or people on lunch breaks to congregate
- Bring it out of the hole- raise it to street level.
- "Bringing the plazas to street level
- maybe keeping the underground level as separate space or transition to street level. Maybe a space for city history, temporary installments, transitions, welcome to the city"
- Cafes
- Covering the entrance and raising the activity

to street level on Hallidie is great. Otherwise, it's a total mystery And underused as it is. Maybe these changes at UN Plaza will encourage a change in the type of activity already present.

- Definitely improving. That fountain is an eyesore. UN Plaza needs more thoughts.
- Didn't see them as real restrictions, but improvements. Hold a design competition. They were rather uninspiring
- Expand farmers market
- Filling the Hallidie hole! Making UN feel safer - please prioritize this.
- Frankly, I'd like to see multi-story mixed use buildings returned to Hallidie. The city only needs so many plazas.
- Getting rid of the sunken Hallidie Plaza is a great idea. The fountain in Civil Plaza should be removed. It is too big. It is ugly.
- Hallidie- anything would be better
- Hallidie Plaza - cover the hole with colored glass, rig lights underneath by set to dance music at night!
- Hallidie plaza currently is a sink hole with uninviting entrance to BART- raising to street level is ideal. UN plaza still needs improvement.
- Hallidie Plaza don't ... off the portion west of …. With a building parallel to ….., .. You won't improve half of Hallidie Plaza
- "Hallidie plaza: love it, yes.
- UN Plaza: Local art and food vendors"
- Hallidie should be raised
- "Hallidie: Previous Halide Plaza charette design (2005?) seemed to deal with the space better with SF travel below grade, maximizing open space (no building at street level), and maximizing 2 story space below ground, allowing tourists who arrive by BART (or more) to be greeted directly by SF travel.
- UN plaza: Good idea is here, stair podium not necessary. Design must incorporate/ support farmers market (the only positive thing that has ever happened here). Also this base should connect to Civic Center. Fulton Mall is probably more in need of redesign than this space."
- "Hallidie: Yes, bring plaza to street level. Pavilion concept is great for safety (i.e.. Active and lighted transit entrance)
- UN: Is this a right space for public speaking? Where does it occur now?"
- How do we address homeless people hanging out in the areas?
- I am worried about drug deals, people showering in the fountains, sleeping on benches. The design for Hallidie looked beautiful.
- I like both proposals.
- I like raising Hallidie to street level
- I like the area for free speech with the raised platform
- I like the Civic Center farmers market a lot and having Hallidie Plaza raised up. I think public art/design would be great to make it identifiably SF.
- I like the idea of making Hallidie Plaza a destination rather than just a BART station.
- I like the idea of more active public spaces
- I like the raised Hallidie Plaza but am concerned about wind. Need more street arts. Café and lights at UN Plaza - where do the homeless go?
- I think that one of the plazas needs to be or make a grand gesture or some kind perhaps establish a theme that can be touched upon/ repeated as design professes.
- I think UN plaza is already great, a simple cleaning of the bricks would do wonders. Raising Hallidie plaza is a great idea.
- I think UN plaza was timid and won't help much , lots of poorly used space. Hallidie filled is genius.
- I would love to
- If families can actually hang out there is safety we all win
- Important to fill in halide- safer and more appealing, lots of trees and diverse activities
- Improving both
- Improving the present depressed seedy spaces. I think the idea of public stage area is great. Maintenance will be important
- Increasing room for street cafés and entertainment /performances/art (sculpture) is definitely great idea to make Market Street more enjoyable for folks to spend time- not just walking or riding to work. Merchants will have

greater sales too.

- Like the raised Hallidie idea, but, please see below*. *Plaza Designs: Both appear a bit cluttered with no major focal point. Why not engage an Architect or Artist to create & engage the space? We (SF) need more grand visions & less fuss!
- Liked the raised plaza idea
- Looks great. What is missing are plans for maintenance, cleaning, services to homeless (to reduce their hanging out) and "beat" policing.
- Love it. It's a wasted space right now.
- Love the integrated BART entrances and the repetition of a similar entrance. Large public art would be wonderful.
- Love them
- Major concern: they will just be covered with bums panhandling, like the plazas w/benches at Montgomery & Market.
- Maybe a bit too much programming
- More gardens, benches, no more cafes, public restrooms, fountains at both plazas.
- More landscaping to encourage habitat- buckeye trees, other flowers to feed bees, butterflies and hummingbirds.
- More seating.
- More temporary and permanent street art. Hallidie Plaza plan seems plain and uninspired. Precedent at Lincoln Center, NYC and Seville, Spain are better.
- "More trees, raised Hallidie Plaza.
- Make space for farmers' market."
- More trees; more seating.
- Need more art, more programming. This places can be true public places, but it's not a "if you build it they will come" situation.
- Need to make sure there is enough space to accommodate BART/MUNI passengers through entrances/exits. Need to make sure elevator is monitored (currently it is used as a urinal. Do not like the retail kiosks sprinkled throughout. This gives you no flexibility with the space if you want to utilize space (unless they are mobile).
- Needs to be less inviting for homeless and drug addicts. That fountain is hideous.
- Needs to be more underground/ above ground integration.
- No PAS at either plazas
- No PAS at either plazas
- Opening them up for congregating and providing public outdoor seating and outdoor café table space
- Raise Hallidie Plaza to street level.
- Raised Halide Plaza= wonderful!
- Raising Hallidie plaza is a great idea. It is so difficult to navigate right now. Café life, daily events, more greenery, .. Anything that will bring in more steady stream of people and allow for night time activity. Interesting and beautiful lighting, sculptures, ...
- Raising the depressed plazas, putting active uses, cafes, etc. Perhaps allow food carts and trucks to further activate. Use space that is covered below for bike parking, bike and car share parking. Also raise McKesson Plaza that is also depressed.
- Saving Hallidie Plaza to be more pedestrian friendly
- Shelter promotes what already occurs. Sleeping under it. Remove the great urinal and expensive water street users
- Signs of life at Civic Center - café, food trucks, music, something to counteract the mass homeless there.
- smaller/smarter BART entrance , seating in the sun
- Street level Hallidie Plaza! (yay!)
- Street vendors, local businesses, art, performers
- The "hole" is a recognized disaster. Street level plaza is a great improvement.
- "The contiguous walking surface
- Much better use of space"
- The improvements look great. But I cannot help wonder/worry about how they will function with the locals
- These are fantastic - very inviting. Both spaces are diamonds that are currently very rough - such a waste.
- These spaces are really underused. Also, there are so few places to sit and eat in Civic Center. It would be great to make it more of a destination.
- They all look fine to me. No strong opinion.

- They are great. But let's focus on the transportation improvements first with our limited budget, and make the plazas a future phase of the project.
- Trees
- UN - café, outdoor seating, stage - all good ideas; seating should be flexible-like UN Square; night time lighting?; Programmed space? Movable; adjacent first floor spaces; and their uses. Should be public service/retail/ food. Engaging with UN Plaza
- "UN - More trees, to contain the ""wind tunnel"" effect
- Hallidie- Raising the plaza to street level, to make it an integrated space."
- UN Café at street edge is good & the BART station redesign is good. Hallidie Plaza infill is awesome! Bring it to street level! It definitely needs sculpture and canopy of grand scale.
- UN plaza is a great opportunity for public art, more integration with Civic Center. Will public use discourage the number of people hanging out there now?
- UN Plaza is horrible- No matter what is done if people don't go there what's the point? Mid Market has long way to go to rid itself of slime
- "Wind protection, mixed use space
- Don't rely on cafes for public space, I don't always- in fact rarely- feel in the mood to buy a beverage at a café."
- Worried about homeless- Both where they go? But also how "furniture" becomes public when so many would use it for living on? (Cleanliness?)
- Would like to see improved public restrooms.
- * At Hallidie: lets flatten the plaza, then turn the Eddy/ Cyril Magnum space into a part of that plaza creating a large pedestrian zone that uninterrupted by car traffic. All of the Europe pedestrian zones had to street somewhere: Its here for us.
- "* BART entrance on street not plaza
- * Seating at street edge
- *Those café that fill the empty space make plaza inviting and useful
- removing the pit at Hallidie presents
- * Signage
- * Unsocial activities that ruin the space"
- "* Better utilization of space
- * Permeable pavements
- * Bathrooms"
- "* Connectivity is great
- * Green space and retail/cultural/gathering opportunities
- * How can edges (Forever 21) be activated/ improved?"
- "* Incorporating BART station portal into pavilion
- * Adding trees
- * Bringing Hallidie to street level to link it better with street life"
- "* Like raised Hallidie Plaza
- * Would like fountain eliminated"
- "* Raise Hallidie! Keep private café out- This will be a lively public space regardless
- * Add a stage/amphitheater to UN plaza. Add a café open late so there is nightlife. Keep the space for farmers markets that exists. Add public interactive art. Add free Wi-Fi for all and seating spaces. Add lighting.
- * Sightlines! Make sure pedestrians on Market can see fun events happening on the street between the plaza and the City Hall."
- "* Raising Hallidie brilliant.
- * Remove disgusting, dangerous, and destructive UN plaza fountain. Radically improve BART portal."
- "* Raising Hallidie
- * More trees/activity at UN"
- "*A stage at UN
- * Raise Hallidie."
- "*Places for pees (green)
- * Public drinking fountains"
- Agree with raising sunken areas
- Brining Hallidie Plaza to street level is great. Elimination of the congestion when exiting BART /underground Muni at cable car turnaround is good.
- Cafes with outdoor seating are great. Would prefer that they sell beer & wine and offer heat lamp for cold/ windy days.
- cafes/ buildings could have same architectural language to make them part of market Street. Street level Hallidie good idea, extended to south side due to high pedestrian activity. Consider more iconic elements and public art.

- “Hallidie plaza: Bike lockers, good wayfinding, good idea to move entrance to underground to Cyril/Magnum. Not sure about Hallidie café.
- UN café good, more BART entrances is good.”
- I like the idea of raising halide Plaza. I don’t like the idea of losing the red brick, and I don’t want a massive transit center.
- I like the trees and public seating. The performance stage would highlight the character of our streets. Public bathrooms would be crucial especially if there are cafes
- Love all the design suggestions
- Love raising Hallidie Plaza
- More trees.
- Raising halide to street level is a key. Distinguish: 1. circulation corridors from2. performance space from 3. event space 9eg. Farmers’ market) for a well-designed plaza that serves many functions.
- Raising Hallidie Plaza looks great
- Raising the level of halide is great
- Remove both fountains, replace with smaller classic fountains like Paris
- The cafés will do wonders. But if you can not or will not address those who exhibit “anti-social behavior” don’t bother
- The fact that it could potentially be better. Plans are great. Consider public safety.
- Why not keep Hallidie at current elevation, change the boot exit to be on Market Street and use the existing Hallidie plaza elevation change and set up as an outdoor performance arena/ amphitheater.
- Wind shelter for late afternoon. Great to bring plaza up to street level
- Would be great to have more vibrant plazas with food/ culture
- I think you need to improve pedestrian congestion on Market in the vicinity of Powell. More sidewalk space would help, as would emphasizing the side, back, and underground entrances to the mall. Need more plaza and sidewalk rec space on side streets, NOT on market.
- If it’s not broken, let’s not fix it.
- It is a great way to emphasize SF diversity of culture and neighborhood.
- really need a stronger emphasis on improvements that address public safety concerns between 5th and 10th, most heavily impacting Tenderloin.
- It helps break up Market St in a way that emphasizes destinations and character, but it makes me feel confused about transportation changes along Market St. I wish I could see how the six districts influence the transportation infrastructure changes.
- ?
- Not sure I understand the concept, or at least the rationale for it. I didn’t see a specific pdf for this proposal so information is lacking.
- I like this approach, though I do still think Market street should have a cohesive character along the corridor.
- I like the six district approach from preservation and conservation of important elements of the Market Street. I would like to see more obvious public spaces in each district where people can gather for lunch or hang out. From practical aspects of redevelopment of Market, I would like to see separated pedestrian, vehicle/transit and bike ways uniformly throughout the street. I think its important to keep and acknowledge the culture of the street in different districts emphasizing the chess player, food and local businesses while making it safer and attractive for pedestrians both resident and tourist to walk and hang out throughout market street.
- Plan for new residents without forgetting those there now
-
- Cycletrack along entire length.
- n/a
- no comment
- Not at all, Market Street is Market Street only one street. Don’t divide people and groups.
- It is simply another unacceptable and unsupported conversion of a major travel thoroughfare to eliminate cars and to make driving more difficult on a major San Francisco street. It has not been put to a vote of the people, and only represents the interests of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition who designed it, and of the 3% of travelers that ride bicycles. It is a bad idea that disserves the entire rest of the traveling public, does not improve transit

service, and creates dangerous, cluttered conditions for pedestrians.

- I think it makes this very big project feel more small-scale and “local.” It also helps incorporate nuance and neighborhood character into the re-designs. I think that each of the Districts represents a unique area of San Francisco and the Streetlife zones and other amenities should reflect that accordingly.
- The scheme Balkanizes the street. It’s one continuous boulevard like the Champs Elyse. The focal point is the Ferry Building at the end where the city meets the bay.
- I get the district thing, but I’m ticked there are only six. What about those of us who live West of Van Ness? Where are our sidewalk and street improvements? Sidewalks here could be widened by removing the useless medians. They aren’t pretty or decorative, they don’t even have pedestrian refuges at the crossings. They seem to exist solely to help divide up east and west traffic. When are you going to give a shit about the rest of Market? In terms of emphasis, the approach seems to be an even distribution of “activating” whatnot along the sidewalk, but districts have centers and edges. Some corners are windy and have nothing worth sticking around for (I’m looking at you Fox Plaza building) and what I’m missing in this is a sense of ebb and flow. I once had a client that jammed every bit of the screen with text, logos and ads saying he didn’t “believe in whitespace” and I feel like there is an effort being made to activate every block when there are several transitional areas. Specifically between 3rd and 4th the maps show a “streetlife hub” in front of Yerba Buena lane, but if you’ve been there you know Market is pretty wide and pretty open since the coffee shops and whatever stands are set up are in the lane itself. The Market Street frontage doesn’t get that used much for anything besides walking and non-profit panhandling and anything that gets put in the streetlife zone as its shown in the map is going to have people coming right through it to get in and out of the subway entrance.Not really motivated by this concept.

What do you like about the “One Street – Six District” approach to Market Street? Are there aspects of any of the Districts that you want to see emphasized?

- “* Love it. Glad you are not taking 1-size fits all approach.
- * Central/mid-Market streetlife zones will be interesting, to say the least, chess, drumming, body oils””, .. Etc.”
- “* Makes sense- the street is not homogenous so need to have different approach.
- * Need to make whole street more vibrant.”
- Allows for greater understanding of segments and identity of zones for such a diverse corridor
- Bring in more retail space/on 4th - 6th; outdoor café/nightlife.
- Can district identify be integrated with bikeshare stations?
- Civic Pride at Civic Center - it should be a showcase of the city.
- Continuity is huge! Materials can be used to accomplish this. Pavers, light styles, copper roves, all can be elevated.
- dedicated cycletrack
- Didn’t catch that stop, sorry
- Distinct districts is great for vibrancy and tourism.
- Financial District seems “harried” As lots of pedestrians on the sidewalk so would like to see more emphasis on this district.
- “Fix mid-Market
- Make digital signage
- Restaurant, bars there to liven the street”
- Food, coffee, cafes
- Good approach but is it flexible for future?
- Good model
- Great idea! Arts distinct especially. That zone, as the Van Ness / Civic Center area are presently very unsavory as in need of cleaning up
- Great to have the city connected by Market street, the city needs that connection! Make it more interesting the journey
- Hallidie - Great idea!
- I am not sure the 6 districts are as distinct as you do.
- I don’t like the separation of them. It should be one!
- I like distinct flavors. Some need more help than others.
- I like it. It makes it more interesting by dividing the street into 6 districts.
- I like the emphasis on making Market St. a place to linger and hand out with a pleasant street life. I like the idea of “promenading”.
- I like the idea since Market Street travel thru so many neighborhoods
- I think it feels a fit false. The retail seems to be the biggest so maybe it could be spread out more.
- I think it is a smart approach, very difficult spaces.
- I think there should be consistency among the 6 districts, but capability to highlight the unique character of each district
- I’d rather see market as a continuous street. Also, I think it should focus more on the economic development.
- If you are going ban cars, keep it east of 5th. Study after study has shown that car bans only work when an area is already thriving, i.e.. NY Times Square has Broadway theaters and Santa Monica’s 3rd Street Promenade has the Pacific Ocean. Van Ness to 5th has none of them.
- Inclusion of increased pedestrian flow
- It creates and defines their individual atmosphere.
- It is a great way to visualize the different types of activities in the different areas.
- It sounds good. No strong opinion.
- It’s a good concept
- It’s fine, I don’t like anything in particular.
- It’s interesting. Haven’t thought much about it.
- It’s ok.
- Its pretty fine- great the goal isn’t to homogenize

- Keep historic landmarks
- Less exclusive and more inclusive amongst the neighborhoods [living]
- Mid Market: Prohibit steel roll down gates on business fronts (deadens the street); Encourage lighting of business facades & towers (Golden Gate Bldg., etc.)
- Mid-market improvements
- More seating where office workers come out for lunch
- Nice concept.
- No opinion
- No opinion
- Not in love with it but probably a great transit move.
- Not terribly important, These differences will appear organically (as they have with the 1970's Market Street design)
- Octavia will be scary regardless. Good choice for groupings.
- Probably same kind of street furniture/ street artwork that depicts each district should be emphasized
- Seems fine
- Seems like you'd have to get opinions / comments from those who actually reside in those districts?
- Somewhat helpful to conceptualize current state of districts, but I am concerned about trying to retain this distinction as the street and city develops.
- The "One Street Six Districts" seems acceptable. Maybe the districts can complete with one another for functionality.
- The approach looks reasonable.
- The plan should take into account all things like a residents driving from the Embarcadero to Geary- Any more traffic on Mission and the 3rd is crazy- I don't see an overall approach
- These are overlaps, some significant/don't know that 6 are needed and how distinct they need to be.
- They do have very different flavors currently, but they need some unity in civic care (safe, vibrant, community)
- This is a good but these neighborhoods already have strong identities. SIGNAGE IMPORTANT.
- Trees/ sidewalk café/ green wave
- Unclear about this.
- Very strong and natural approach
- Waste of effort
- With more condos being built in downtown is there a way to transform market Street with more accessible nightlife? E.g. like Champs-lessees walk able nightlife.
- Won't limit it to 6 districts- there are more.
- ?
- Cycletrack along entire length.
- I get the district thing, but I'm ticked there are only six. What about those of us who live West of Van Ness? Where are our sidewalk and street improvements? Sidewalks here could be widened by removing the useless medians. They aren't pretty or decorative, they don't even have pedestrian refuges at the crossings. They seem to exist solely to help divide up east and west traffic. When are you going to give a shit about the rest of Market? In terms of emphasis, the approach seems to be an even distribution of "activating" whatnot along the sidewalk, but districts have centers and edges. Some corners are windy and have nothing worth sticking around for (I'm looking at you Fox Plaza building) and what I'm missing in this is a sense of ebb and flow. I once had a client that jammed every bit of the screen with text, logos and ads saying he didn't "believe in whitespace" and I feel like there is an effort being made to activate every block when there are several transitional areas. Specifically between 3rd and 4th the maps show a "streetlife hub" in front of Yerba Buena lane, but if you've been there you know Market is pretty wide and pretty open since the coffee shops and whatever stands are set up are in the lane itself. The Market Street frontage doesn't get that used much for anything besides walking and non-profit panhandling and anything that gets put in the streetlife zone as its shown in the map is going to have people coming right through it to get in and out of the subway entrance.
- I like the six district approach from preservation and conservation of important elements of the Market Street. I would like to see more obvious

public spaces in each district where people can gather for lunch or hang out. From practical aspects of redevelopment of Market, I would like to see separated pedestrian, vehicle/transit and bike ways uniformly throughout the street. I think its important to keep and acknowledge the culture of the street in different districts emphasizing the chess player, food and local businesses while making it safer and attractive for pedestrians both resident and tourist to walk and hang out throughout market street.

- I like this approach, though I do still think Market street should have a cohesive character along the corridor.
- I think it makes this very big project feel more small-scale and “local.” It also helps incorporate nuance and neighborhood character into the re-designs. I think that each of the Districts represents a unique area of San Francisco and the Streetlife zones and other amenities should reflect that accordingly.
- I think you need to improve pedestrian congestion on Market in the vicinity of Powell. More sidewalk space would help, as would emphasizing the side, back, and underground entrances to the mall. Need more plaza and sidewalk rec space on side streets, NOT on market.
- If it’s not broken, let’s not fix it.
- It helps break up Market St in a way that emphasizes destinations and character, but it makes me feel confused about transportation changes along Market St. I wish I could see how the six districts influence the transportation infrastructure changes.
- It is a great way to emphasize SF diversity of culture and neighborhood.
- It is simply another unacceptable and unsupported conversion of a major travel thoroughfare to eliminate cars and to make driving more difficult on a major San Francisco street. It has not been put to a vote of the people, and only represents the interests of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition who designed it, and of the 3% of travelers that ride bicycles. It is a bad idea that disserves the entire rest of the traveling public, does not improve transit service, and creates dangerous, cluttered conditions for pedestrians.
- n/a
- no comment
- Not at all, Market Street is Market Street only one street. Don’t divide people and groups.
- Not really motivated by this concept.
- Not sure I understand the concept, or at least the rationale for it. I didn’t see a specific pdf for this proposal so information is lacking.
- Plan for new residents without forgetting those there now
- really need a stronger emphasis on improvements that address public safety concerns between 5th and 10th, most heavily impacting Tenderloin.
- The scheme Balkanizes the street. It’s one continuous boulevard like the Champs Elyse. The focal point is the Ferry Building at the end where the city meets the bay.

What design elements are most appealing to you from any of the options? Any additional comments?

- “* Cycletrack
- * seating
- * Shortened crossing distances at intersections
- * Mid block crossings”
- “* Cycletracks, widen sidewalk areas for seating and streetlife zones
- * Separating uses between market and Mission is intriguing.
- * I think option 3 is the most all encompassing solution for cyclists, pedestrian, transit and vehicles, subject to future traffic, studies to verify levels of service being as high as possible “
- “* I like restricting cars on Market
- * I like fixing up 2 plazas
- * I think the rapid stops should be at the same stop as the local so you can take either if you want”
- “* Mission Street Market separation of bus and auto/ bikes encouraged both places.
- * I do think 2-way bike lane separated from buses on Market. Would be best (fast lane/ slow lane separated within bike ways)”
- “* Need more transit island crosswalk with APS
- * Registration for workshop omitted any form of request of accommodation like ASL. This is a Federal law called ADA”
- “* Option 2- Cycletrack would give market Street a unique, friendly identity
- * Option 3- Safe cycletrack on Mission also helps activate Mission Street. Public life is still enhanced on Market (although I don’t think as much as bikes would do it)
- * Option 1- bring once you see all the other cool stuff in the other options”
- “* Raised cycletrack on Market Street
- * dedicated bus lanes with barriers
- * Restriction on private cars (ban them 24/7)
- *A good half of market Street needs cleaning up- it can no longer be a haven for panhandlers and criminals. “
- “* The streetlife zones need to be activated from the start. They will fail if they are empty seats of concrete for way. So you should be working in concert starting now to find funding and ideas. I am not a fan of “”pop-up”” in the sense of here-and-gone. I think the art/ activities should have semi permanent duration (more so for street furniture, less so for art/ sculpture/events).
- * A concern I have with mission vs. Market plans is how much do you want locals to feel “”at home”” on Market? If you optimize market for slow moving and many dense cyclists, your local commuters are going to want to move to Mission where they can go faster and not deal with lookey-loos. This will affect the types of businesses/activities you source for each street.”
- * What about moving express buses to Mission Street? Then just have 2 transit only lanes on Market and wide sidewalk and cycletrack.
- “* Wide sidewalks
- * More seating
- * Cycletracks on Mission
- * We must implement congestion pricing to make SF safer and less polluted. “
- A separate lane for cyclists from Option 2. More seating and trees from all options.
- Activating alleyways, Increasing bicycles safety
- Allowing bike lanes and widening the street is a great idea. I’m a little concerned about how it will affect pedestrian traffic with streets more narrow, especially parades.
- “Better signage
- maintaining sidewalk width
- pass through between Market and Mission
- Hallidie and UN Plaza changes”
- “Better signage!
- From transit too- no one can see what stop they are at. Look at bigger street view too of surrounding few stores”
- Bike parking areas by or near Market Street.
- Cafes, shops and/or businesses are clattering space. Gardens, fountains, public restrooms, and benches are in great shortage all over.

- Cycletrack! Active alleys. The smooth edge a cycletrack was also cool.
- Cycletracks
- Don't cave in to the car people-limit car access.
- Expanded zones for leisure seating, kiosk, etc.
- Fast efficient biking, healthy, robust tree canopy, streetlife zones, enlivened plazas
- Feel that whereas proposed designs are huge improvement, the design team [pulled] its pinches, i.e. big issues are the north-south cross streets. These will still be fast traffic interruption in the Grand Blvd - wide. Why not consider raised paving at the north-south intersections, if not a cross entire intersection then at least at sidewalk/ crosswalks? Traffic calming is required and these would emphasize vehicles are transiting a pedestrian priority zone.
- Great job to the designers. They are smart and worked really hard. Now let's get this built asap!
- Hard to decide between 2/3. I like the idea of trying something different and quickly. It would seem Mission Street could be started and tested quickly with minimum impact.
- I dislike the focus on streetlife. I think market Street is a travel corridor and always will be. Let's fix the travel usage first. If it looks nice but is still way too congested, you will not have accomplished anything useful. I am particularly interested in seeing solutions for how cyclists can turn on to and off of market Street. Currently, bikes are treated the same as vehicles and are supposed to circle the block in order to turn left at most intersections. There should be bike boxes nest to the crosswalk for cyclists to queue up and wait for the light to change.
- I like cycletrack, Option 2, Improved plazas, streetlife (in that order)
- I like option 2 best
- I love the Mission Street option
- I really like the various aspect of Option 3. I like the cycletrack on Mission and I like the private car traffic restrictions.
- I would like to see Option 2 with Option 3 for more established bike routs on both Market and Mission streets.
- Intrigued by Option 3. Would need to widen the cycletrack by at least a foot. Also you need to appreciate the profound value of bicycles in revitalizing Market. You have a 40 year old policy mandate called transit first. This is not a democratic decision or a political one.
- It all looks good. Exception Sticking to plans not cutting budget. Not going "…" and maintaining and cleaning and rolling .
- It would be beneficial to provide visual, audible, and tactile clues for all users of Market St. (including pedestrians) to indicate how they're requested to use the street esp. in terms of crosswalks, turn lanes and right of way.
- Just make sure the bike obey the law
- Let's increase pedestrian priority signage at all crosswalks so that cyclists in particular are better about yielding to the king of the city streets: the pedestrian!
- "making the street more pedestrian friendly. Suggestions:
- 1. What is the feasibility of removing the cables from Market Street powering the public transportation vehicles without the cables.
- 2. over"
- Market Street cycletracks, please!
- Mission needs to be more inviting with destination locations. The reason Market has more cyclists is because that's where action/work is. No one wants to be diverted to Mission.
- More appealing sidewalk spaces.
- More trees, more livability, more dynamic, more "active" w/restaurants, seating, etc.
- Moving bus stops a bad idea. When buses stop on downstream side, they inevitably stop short and block sidewalk. Making stop longer don't help. You see those all over the city. Wake up.
- Moving bus transit onto Mission Street (Option 3) but still focusing on building a cycletrack on Market Street. If there is room on Mission Street to improve bicycle infrastructure that is great. But improving market Street for pedestrians, BART, Muni underground (and F line) and cyclists should be the experience that one should aim for.
- New transit boarding islands

- Nice blend. Best Solution - Option 1 and 3.
- Option 1 and Option 3 is very good. The rapid bus service is a great idea. Paving over Hallidie Plaza and putting a café on it is a good idea.
- Option 2
- Option 2
- Option 2 and 3, I like the dedicated cycletrack and separation of transit.
- Option 2 best.
- "Option 2 is the strongest plan.
- Option 3 is too drastic and limiting to vehicular traffic in the city. "
- Option 2 will bring the changes to make Market Street the world class thoroughfare and it deserves to be
- Option 2 with the separated bike lanes is by far my favorite choice. We want to encourage cycling in this city and making it safe on Market St. is the best way to do so.
- Option 2, keep bikes on Market
- Option 2.
- Option 3 is best, more inclusive, landscaping more plants, trees, encourage safe biking and walking
- "Overhead cover on BART entrance
- Option 2"
- Painted bikelane
- Pedestrian, streetlife zones, plazas, cycletrack are focusing on pedestrians and cyclists. Concern about crime and loitering in the plazas though- know design doesn't necessarily solve issues but defensive design should be considered.
- Please, please go with Option 2. Market is the destination. You can't tell cyclists to use Mission and then throw them under a bus (literally) for half a block to get to their destination.
- Protected bike lanes. It is better for health, air quality, social interaction, business, smile and if people bike. Do everything in your power to incentivize bike riding.
- Regarding transit, I'd be in favor of separating local and limited lines if it can be shown to significantly reduce waiting and riding times and if next bus signs can be added to most or all of the stations.
- Restrict private auto use! Today! (Also who says taxis are the same as buses?) Taxis not transit
- San Francisco deserves better than to repeat what lesser towns like Fresno already tried and failed. If you're so worried about Market being too narrow to allow cars, then cut the overly large sidewalks back. Which is more expensive? Granite curbs or rising the economy of the historic urban thoroughfare of San Francisco. I also take issue with the survey that found 80% supported a car ban. It only asked those who came to Market by foot or transit. Ask readers of Chronicle!
- Saying buses will be more reliable doesn't make it so -- and this has not been demonstrated. Environmental Analysis needs to address transit reliability - which it consistently avoids.
- "Separation for cyclist
- Streetlife area
- It was very hard to hear in the breakout sessions, need better video/animation"
- "Separation of traffic.
- Streetlife hubs and commerce opportunities"
- Shifting the 14 to Market. Enhancing street life/elements of both Market & Mission. Unbroken bike transit on Mission. Increased new bike ridership (Option 3).
- Streetlife hubs are like bigger parklets. If they can attract businesses, reduce vacant space, create sense of place & happiness, reduce urban blight I would say this Is what I am most looking forward to see.
- Streetlife zone
- The cycletrack from Option2.
- The Mission Street option has a fatal flaw moving 14 and 14L to Market. Between the existing users (who are …)the Transit center District Plan, the Central Corridor Plan, and the enormous south of Market ……. It is cruel to face people to wait until Fulsome or Harrison (thousands of feet away) to find local E.W. bus service. Yerba Buena also, between all the museums, the gardens, and target, has an encounter transit population who suddenly increase over, especially 3rd Street pedestrian traffic.

- The plan should be to beautify not destroy Market Street
- “Trees, more/better urban landscape.
- Also street hub.”
- Wider sidewalks and fewer cars - bikes on Mission - great idea
- With all the streetlife improvements and resulting increased liveliness, relegating the bike to Mission is an even more problematic notion. The synergy of livelier Market and more bikes shouldn’t be impeded
- “Would be nice if there was a mixed canopy of deciduous and evergreen street trees so that its not completely bare in winter.
- Love the idea for UN plaza and Hallidie plaza. Would make it feel more like some of the great plazas in Europe.”
- Yes. Need to have a café in addition to SF Travel. Need to study dynamic of below and above. Need to better connect east & west plazas.
- Your designs seem to be of people that don’t live here. I don’t think you understand the homeless, druggie, begger culture problem this city has.
- “* Auto restrictions- even extending to 9 pm
- * speeding transit service
- * Reducing distance for pedestrian intersection crossing
- * Reducing bus/bike conflicts
- * Street trees + permeable pavements so they can thrive
- * Wayfinding improvements
- * Improving bike experience on Mission Street
- * People need bathroom! We need a solution to that
- * Speed of traffic crossing on Market is a big problem for pedestrian safety. So is blocking the intersection + crosswalks”
- “* Better public transit
- *More livable public spaces”
- “* Better quality street furniture
- * Benches (not concrete slabs)
- * More toilets- SF smells like a urinal, makes me ashamed”
- “* Buffer from traffic for pedestrians.
- * Added art and streetlife zones on Market Street - “”place making””
- * Cycletrack is good on Market, but I prefer the cycletrack on Mission Street/ shared lane on Market. Better to have the Mission Street cycletrack as an option in addition to market street.”
- “* Cycletracks, streetlife zones, hubs, improvement of plazas, rapid transit, iconic shelter design, alley treatment between Market + Mission
- * Consider reducing cabs (shared street approach) in places with light pedestrian activity.”
- “* Hiring a Danish firm means they have biased experience and therefore biased values, In that there is no DDA Danes with disables act. Their lack of planning options for PWD reflects lack of awareness of the ADA American with disabilities Act.
- * Use of stats is flawed- 83% approval from mostly single, able- bodies, adult at night might leave out seniors and P.W.D.S [Persons With Disabilities?]”
- “* Icons to go with explicitly named places used to guide/ orient visitors.
- * More attention to family experiences especially at Civic Plaza which is by library, arts, etc. A water elements kids can play in
- * Add more islands “”noses”” on opposite side of crosswalks. These offer security to pedestrians and define the walk itself “
- “* Incorporating Mission Street appears smart way of increasing capacity/flexibility options
- * Raise Hallidie
- * Critical to consider night/late hours economy needs”
- “* Option 2 is most appealing
- * Option 3: I have concerns that this would work. You would need to study, the effects of having additional transit lines along Market Street. In that, weather market would actually be able to accommodate that many transit lines to maintain headways. Second, I think showing planters on the Mission Street cycletrack is misleading. It wasn’t allowed on the 2nd Street design due to accessibility concerns. I doubt it work politically here. Also even more noise.”
- “* Protected bikeway (put both on Mission and Market)

- * Worry that if we go forward on Mission/ Market option, the bikeway will be chipped away at so that its not the full, currently articulated protected bikeway."
- "* Raised cycletrack
- * Incorporating the alley ways between Market+ Mission and making Mission better too.
- *Wayfinding signs-these look great
- * Making transit stops engaging public spaces
- *Self-enforcing design!"
- "* Raised cycletracks
- * Diverting traffic
- * Bulb outs
- Keeping the 14 on Mission"
- "* Reduced vehicle traffic, transit layers (rapid), separate vehicles/pedestrians via cycletrack
- * Taxi stops
- * Option 3 trial now on Mission Street
- *Market Street as water collection | cistems, filtering
- * How to use space under sidewalks, cycletracks for H2O storage "
- "* Rumble strips at 9th before Market and Polk/ Fell
- * Bike/ pedestrians advanced green lights"
- "* Streetlife zones
- * Auto restrictions"
- a left-turn pocket into someone for bicyclist is very important for many morning F:D: commuters- Sansome is the major north-south bike route in the area but difficult to get to from the west. Many cyclist use the sidewalks here- if there were infrastructure, maybe we could solve the problem. I am a little concerned by the proposal to remove on-street bathrooms- this could worsen existing problems.
- Again greening downtown. If the buses are moved on Mission out/increase Howard and Fulsome
- Areas that are naturally sunny and not windy should have fewer trees.
- As noted earlier, just generally cleaning up and updating the street.
- Between 6th and 7th Street, there is a wonderful organic community of chess players, interracial and intergenerational. I love seeing them. It would be great if the street furniture could encourage that interaction, e.g.. Tables that have chess boards on the top already.
- Cycletrack, shorten crossings, social life/ streetlife areas, [spread] road surface at transit islands, furniture to reflect district character, wayfinding, and raised crosswalk Mission alleys.
- I choose Option 1. It is the cheapest. This presentation expresses an ostrich reality. There is no address of the extreme social reality along. Beautification which is nice without social services and finding of basic vehicular law enforcement is a joke.
- Its professional "construction".
- Longer boarding islands & consolidated transit stops.
- Option 3 has the benefit of fast throughway on Mission, and slower commute /retail riding on Market for bicycles.
- Overall, I am a big fan of the idea of generally improving market for cyclist but having a fully dedicated cycletrack on Mission (Option 3), Provided that the Mission cycletrack is fully separated, without any opportunity fro people to park on it. Otherwise I prefer Option 2. The limited /express bus transit option is great. I love the planned improvement to UN/ Hallidie Plazas.
- Prefer Option 1 from a cost stand point, but I like Option 2 since I think it could speed up public transit. I am concerned Option 3 could cause congestion from too many buses/trains on Market Street.
- Remove the pedestrian islands
- All the lovely designs in the world are not going to fix the street. The population that uses the street has to change and the rest will follow. Stand at Market and Mason and Turk for 10 minutes and see what I mean. The presence of Twitter hasn't changed anything in that part of the world yet. And what plan does the city have to relocate the indigent services and soup kitchens in that area to another? It's a big part of the problem. There's nowhere to go.
- As I said earlier, eliminating pedestrian islands and making intersection crossings much more sane on the north side of Market street would

do wonders for the pedestrian experience on that side of the street. If nothing else is done, this one proposal would still make an immense difference. Also like the pedestrian bulbouts.

- Cycletrack on Market Street.
- Cycletracks are best because they notify pedestrians and vehicles where bikes are and alert bikes where they are supposed to be and to stay there.
- Cycletracks. Greening. LIFE options on the sidewalk.
- Have you considered directionally pairing Market and Mission for bus transit to prioritize bus flow in one or the other direction? Are bikes considered in signal timing? Much nicer when a sedate bike speed is encourage with minimal stops.
- I think I've said everything I want to say in the answers to previous questions.
- Let's make San Francisco a forward thinking city while encouraging safer, slower activity. I trust that there are enough intelligent minds in this city to make it happen.
- Love adding trees!
- Market Street between Stuart and The Embarcadero needs to be reclaimed!!!
- None.
- None. It is a plan to remove cars from a major street in San Francisco that will not improve transit, and will create dangerous conditions for pedestrians by promoting and rewarded illegal, irresponsible behavior by bicyclists who will never comprise a significant proportion of travelers. The removal of sidewalk space makes pedestrian travel unpleasant, congested, and dangerous. The removal of cars on Market and then further removing the ability for car travel on Mission are despicable and do not serve or represent the preferred travel modes of the vast majority of travelers in San Francisco.
- Option 2 is most appealing because it's the design that we need for Market. We need dedicated bike lanes, we need prioritized transit lanes, we need sidewalk enhancements to improve the pedestrian experience. I think that expanding the project to include Mission at this point is a missed opportunity to really "get it right" on Market Street. Let's make Market Street Better. Then let's shift to Mission and all of the other streets in the City and improve them. We have the opportunity to make Market Street an even grander boulevard than it already is. Let's make it truly multi-modal, livable, and beautiful while we have the chance.
- Overall, the Mission Street bikeway is what appeals to me most because I'm most frequently riding my bike on Market to get somewhere in SOMA so this allows me to avoid Market entirely east of Van Ness - and I hope the cycletrack will start at 11th so I can turn off market before having to cross the F-line wye track - while improved shared lanes still improves things when I do need to use Market. I'm glad the brick sidewalks are going to be replaced and the crossings shortened and the sunken pit at Powell Station is going. Car restrictions. Trees and the new greenery with the planters. There was mention of restoring the "path of gold" street lights, but I didn't get to ask if that meant a new coat of paint for the existing streetlights and replacing the hideous sodium lighting with a nice golden colored light or if there was an older style of lights being brought back.
- Poor people are not the problem. Services must be provided so folks don't have to live on the street. Service provision is key.
- Streamlined MUNI service and more active public spaces. Please also do this relatively quickly. I see too many good San Francisco plans take way too long to implement. I'm still waiting for Geary Rapid Transit a decade later. Thank you for allowing my input but I expect it to be 2040 before this is ever completed.
- That image of mission sty with the buffered cycletrack makes me feel very excited. I also love raising the BART area at Hallidie.

C. Workshops Station Discussion Notes

Wednesday July 17, 2013

Station 1a. Three options and transit alternatives

1. Question: How are transit stops moving? How are local and express stops being managed?
    a. Answer: Mix and match
    b. Projections for data counts
    c. Car restrictions are a possibility
    d. Taxis are always allowed
2. Question: How to negotiate F-line?
    a. Answer: traffic analysis during ER
    b. Left turn
3. Question: Isn't there conflict any conflict built-in like NYC bike lanes which are horrible?
    a. Answer: Center islands, designs are possible
4. Question: designs don't work, bikes are vehicles and don't stop
    a. Answer: bikes move. They are mostly the 8am-8pm crowds and some tourists
5. Question: What are the costs?
    a. Answer: costs are not driving design but might express itself in trees, etc.
6. Question: What is environmental review
    a. Answer: before large capital projects, city has to prove that they are not any large environmental conflicts
7. Question: Costs?
    a. Answer: not concern
8. Question: where does the cycle track stop?
    a. Answer: transitions back to mixed zone
9. Question: Option 3 sounds good but what if Mission is built?
    a. Answer: all mission buses move to Market, trade temporarily but get protected bike lane in Mission
10. Question: how to board buses?
    a. Answer: cross to wait, negotiate with all your facilities better with median.
11. Question: Turning component? 8th, 9th and 10th right turn?
    a. Answer: Preserve both turn and pedestrian safety improves (starred per Peg)
12. Question: Is the bike network shared?
    a. Answer: green arrows
    b. Environment review will develop the analysis more
    c. Signalized change of materials for mode mixing area
13. Question: APS?
    a. Answer: Accessible median improvements (starred per Peg)
14. Question: Option 3 cycletrack? Bikes need to follow ped rules and not "jaywalk"
    a. Answer: better facilities for bikes and all around less conflicts if bikes have own facilities
15. Question: walk across bike lane safe?
    a. Answer: exists at Duboce and Church. Less conflict because cars and buses are not included as well.
16. Question: Auto restrictions?
    a. Answer: no it is an option
17. Question: don't need 2-way on 12th. (Tom email) 1 way and 2 way dumping onto Market?
    a. Answer:n/a
18. Question: car restrictions?
    a. Answer: we have tried it and no one died.
    b. Extensive environmental review.
    c. Can do short term projects
19. Question: Local versus rapid buses?
    a. Answer: mid islands stops
    b. Mission st bike alt more to Market
20. Question: Modeling for bus flow options
    a. Answer:yes for current traffic and 20 year change in demand and original orientation
21. Question: More Mission bus load to market?
    a. Answer: not looked at it.
    b. Mission only has one lane in one direction. 15 ft sidewalks
    c. BART entrances on Market (destina-

tions)

22. Question: Streetlife areas? Who? Businesses? Gardens? Permeable?
    a. Answer: start with areas already active, moveable chairs, charging stations,
    b. Flexible space
23. Question: **Turning restrictions at Gough better than turning at Van Ness (Starred per Peg)**
    a. Answer: n/a
24. Question: Rapid option faster?
    a. Answer: rapid? Yes faster.
    b. One and a half block – skip stop
    c. Skip stop not good today because too much merging of lanes
25. Question: keep wideth large, not narrow?
    a. Answer: in that section, busy
26. Question: Fresno and Sacramento are restoring cars because decimated downtown against auto restrictions. Is this why there are boarded up businesses on Market?
    a. Answer: we will look block by block
27. Question: Market St to 7th and McAllister backs up so I have to go through market. Can cyclists go on Mission/Market destinations?
    a. Answer:
28. Question: What is the streetlife on option 1?
    a. Answer: doesn't go away in option 2.
29. Question: less elements? More biking?
    a. Answer:depends on the side of the street/block. Flexible zone.
30. Question: attract people? Analysis for existing space/use/size. Economic impacts?
31. Question: option 3 best attracts more new riders. Might need more buses.
32. Comment: Numbers are hard to see
33. Comment: Raised bike lane?
34. Question: Mission more expensive
    a. Ease of use, space, buffer

Station 1b. Three options and transit alternatives

1. Discussion Point – Participant (owner of Showdogs) believes it is important to reduce the number of trees on Market so it is easier to see store fronts.
2. Discussion Point – Participant is supporter of Rapid Core transit Improvements
3. Why haven't we changed the transit options sooner? Can you explain?
    a. Transit stop spacing is wider with the Rapid option. New destinations would require a shift, length of islands, etc. It is very difficult to make these changes now because it requires relocating or reconstructing island stops.
4. Discussion Point – Participant expressed interest in the Rapid Core Transit Improvement if it makes transit faster overall
5. Would either Core Transit Option remove all cars?
    a. There are layers within all three Market Street options. Car restrictions would be affected by each layer. (Specific exceptions for passenger loading, taxis, accessibilities, etc.)
6. How do you mitigate the F Line?
    a. With the proposed Core Transit Improvements, the F line would need to make the same boarding stops within the center boarding islands. For Example, in the Rapid Transit option, the F line would follow a 'Rapid' line with farther spaced stop spacing, which would improve time.
7. Discussion Point – Participant likes ticket vending machines as a transit improvement because it would improve boarding time. Expressed dislike for the existing F line.
8. How much more expensive would it be to move the existing F line?
    a. A very ballpark estimate would be $200 – 300 million. Moving the F line would require moving the tracks, which is a very expensive process. However, with these Market Street Core Transit Options and transit improvement ideas, there are many options.
9. Can we do transit skip stops?
    a. We've researched this option but transit busses need to be able to merge into lanes without conflict.
10. How effective is the enforcement of a transit only painted lane?
    a. The Church Street transit only painted lanes can give us a lot of

information (5% reduction). Paint alone can improve compliance (from a psychological perspective). Another option for Market Street Transit improvements is the consideration of barriers.

11. Is there a preference for the Rapid Option?
    a. We have mixed preferences and opinions. It will be important to relay the message for where to wait and provide real time information for the types of busses coming. Technology can be a solution to help us.
12. How would barriers affect Emergency Service Vehicles?
    a. The Emergency Service Vehicles have specific requirements for street widths. Will need discussions for alternatives such as using curb. Ultimately, it is necessary to work with the Emergency Service Providers on this project.
13. Which Transit Option would have increase transit the fastest?
    a. The Rapid option would have the highest time improvements, yet there are tradeoffs with further spaced stops.
14. Will these transit improvements connect to other lines off Market?
    a. In some cases yes.
15. What are the proposed auto restrictions compared to what exists today?
    a. Autos will be restricted entirely in certain areas for certain times of the day (exceptions for deliveries, taxis, etc.)
16. Are they going to synchronize the lights and timing for transit on Market?
    a. On Market, we are looking at timing the lights and Signal Priority is something we are looking at city wide.
17. Is it possible to look into more auto restrictions on Market?
    a. This is an idea that would need to be proposed to the Board of Supervisors to look at. The project would need to have more information. If you are interested in increasing auto restrictions, people should request consideration.
18. Can you describe the difference between the Local Enhanced and Rapid options?
    a. The key difference between the two is separation and location of stops. The local enhanced will have more frequent stops; the rapid will stop at BART stations. Both options will continue to have four lanes with center boarding islands.
19. Has there been modeling about a pushing transit from Mission to Market?
    a. There are preliminary figures only. This will require further traffic analysis, which may affect the Option 3 proposal. Moving transit from Mission to Market will slow transit, but in exchange there will be the highest proposed auto restriction, creating a balance between the two.
20. Is it possible to even the transit line load between Market and Mission?
    a. Mission has some bus size restrictions and sidewalk restrictions. The demands for people riding transit between the two streets are different. There are different locations for transit facilities.
21. Does separating the limited and local lines in the Rapid option cause dangerous crossing situations?
    a. The biggest solution to resolving this issue to relay where people need to wait. We need to provide reliable information for people to utilize when making choosing which line to use. Improvements in technology can help us.
22. Discussion Point – Participant would prefer the Local Enhanced route, but be willing to deal with the Rapid option for improved transit times.
23. Will transit be faster?
    a. Yes, with the Rapid option, you will have fewer stops at different boarding islands, improving transit times.
24. Why aren't auto restrictions all day?
    a. Auto restrictions are dependent on car volume. For example late at night there are fewer cars on the

road.

25. What is the logic between having the Limited lines in the Rapid Option share Metro stops?
    a. With this Rapid Option, you can still maintain an improved travel time. Metro stops are an easy population transfer stop (with BART).
26. Discussion Point – Participant believes smaller, local stops are key. Separating the Limited lines in the Rapid option will require provisions for some people.

Station 2. Aerial

I. <u>Group # (District choices)</u>

A. District

1. Group Key Characteristic words
2. ….
3. ….
    a. Expanded discussion on word

→Group consensus/discussion + summary about district

I. <u>Group One (Octavia + Mid-Market)</u>

A. Octavia

1. Residential
2. Residential
3. Alleys
    a. Because of living alleys project
4. Crossroads
    a. Market & Van Ness
    b. 101 & Market
    c. Major challenge in area, needs to be a destination
    d. Huge backbones in the city, needs to be more central

→ Lots of people are living in this area

→ How are alleys and crossroads utilized to bring people together?

B. Mid-Market

1. Historic
2. Classic SF
3. Arts
4. Arts
5. Entertainment
    a. Very clear consensus of entertainment
    b. Lots of visual attractions

II. <u>Group Two (Financial + Civic Center)</u>

A. Financial

1. Night Time
    a. Missing nightlife
2. Entertainment
    a. Needs more energy!
3. Stylish & Cosmopolitan
4. Creative
5. Innovation
6. Emerging
    a. More internationally diverse
7. Coffee

B. Civic Center

1. Tech Tourism
    a. Engagement & Industry
2. Nonprofit Hub
3. Citizen Engagement
4. “Funky”
5. Classic
    a. (Aesthetics)
6. Food
    a. Tourism, food focus
7. Wind Power!
    c. Capture it! Very windy (overarching theme)

→ Citizen Engagement

III. <u>Group Three (Embarcadero, Octavia, Mid-Market)</u>

A. Embarcadero

1. Gateway
2. Open
3. Maritime
4. Waterfront
    a. Public access to waterfront
6. Welcome

→ Arrival Point

→ Celebrates Waterfront

→ Gateway to the city

B. Octavia

1. Transition
2. Transition
3. Growth
4. Local
5. Developing
6. Activated

→Least tourist of "districts"
→Changing neighborhood
→ Needs activation
→ Neighborhood feeling
→Scale is totally different than the rest of market, needs to be treated uniquely

C. Mid-Market

1. Diversity
2. Homeless
3. Artsy
    a. Galleries, theatres
4. History
5. Entertainment
6. Walkable Plazas
7. Theatre

→Arts/Theatre
→Cultural entertainment district
→People, diverse cultures coexisting
→Cross-over in districts, not very structured

IV. <u>Group Four (Civic Center + Retail)</u>

A. Civic Center

1. Pride
2. Windy, cold, dirty
3. Activation
4. Dirty
5. Grand
6. Diverse
7. Vibrant
8. Culture
9. Liveability
10. Pedestrian
11. Engagement
12. Art

→ Diverse, culture, interactive, liveability
→ Fixing challenges
→What diversity is there to keep and activate?
→ Wants to be iconic and grand!
→ More inclusive environment [livability and housing]

B. Retail

1. Crowded
2. International
3. Local businesses
4. Tourism
5. Crowded, confused, construction
6. Welcome
7. Urban
8. Street vendors

→Destination
→Focal point for everyone

V. <u>Group Five (Embarcadero + Mid-Market)</u>

A. Embarcadero
    1. Connected
        a. Water, east bay, "gateway" to the city
    2. Financial
    3. Retail

→Entry
→No clear use
→Constantly changing (ex/stadiums,..)
→Sports/entertainment focus
→Flexible uses
→Ferry building as "gateway" but needs to be more

Q: Is there a plan to replace the trees?
A: Yes!....

B. Mid-Market
    1. Activate street retail encentives
    2. Social
    3. Artistic
    4. Rebirth
    5. Potential

→Give Mid-Market more opportunity
→Can they all be one? We hope!
→Places for socializing
→History of the theatre district, bring back in the 21st century style

Q: Is there any consideration to the business side of mid-market? Ex/ the metal grates that close down at night make it seem very scary/ abandon. Have you contacted any of

these businesses?

A: Not this project.. We are trying to figure out how to activate the area even while the businesses are closed.. ex/introducing more light, etc.

→ Is there an opportunity to revitalize with new light technology/signage (ex/fancy LED lights,..?)

VI. <u>Group Six (Civic Center + Financial)</u>

A. Civic Center

1. Dirty
2. Windy
    a. Needs to be harnessed and used.
3. Hive (of activity)
4. Cross-sections
5. Activation
6. Connected
7. Multi-cultural

→Cultural identify that needs to be showcased

→Concerned for people living on the streets

→What will happen to them?

→What will the furniture be like there? This is their living room.

B. Financial

1. Pedestrian Safety
2. Dangerous
3. Crowded
4. Corporate
5. Boring
6. Cavernous
7. Dark
8. Congestion
9. Busy
10. Work

→Challenging area

→Needs help for more diversity

→Needs to focus on pedestrians and bikes

→Busy during the day, dead at night

→Needs more of a nightlife

VII. <u>Group Seven (Civic Center + Retail)</u>

A. Civic Center

1. Gathering
2. Culture

→Theatres

→Cultures coming together

B. Retail

1. Busy
2. Transformation HUB
3. Commercial HUB
4. Glamour
5. Romance

Q: Is there an opportunity to connect with local businesses?

A: Working with stakeholders to take them through the process and get feedback…

Q: There should be some kind of group to have for all of the tech industry. Some ki nd of "tech hub".

Station 3. 1st St to 2nd St

1. Concerns of transit on the impact to auto traffic and bike lanes.
    a. Answer
2. If bike lanes are on Mission, why are they also being built on Market?
    a. Market is heavily used – different types of cyclists on Market and Mission.
3. Need markings and wayfinding signs to help identify new bus stops/routes.
4. Why is there an option 1 if option 3 includes option 1? Changes to option 1 are unclear.
5. Where does funding come from?
    a. Impact fees, Prop K, other various federal, state, and local sources.
6. Perhaps you can segregate bikes to Market (community preference for this option) and cars to Mission.
    a. There will be a degree of car restriction on all streets.
7. At the choke point between 5th Street and 3rd Street (where pedestrian activity is at capacity, is the bike path being rerouted to Mission in this segment?
8. Bike connectivity and network – how would we get from East Market to the Stockton Tunnel by bike?
9. What is the guarantee that if you can do op-

tion 1 that you can also do option 3?
10. What is the money/budget difference between option 3 and option 2?
11. What will this plan mean regarding connectivity to SamTrans, Golden Gate transit, and the Transbay terminal?
12. Address bike connectivity issues from South Market to North Market around 3rd going inbound
13. Mission St connectivity may not be sufficient to reach all destinations, especially those North of Market St.
14. Turn Mission St. into an "express" bike lane
15. What is the loading zone? A free loading zone for the whole city?
16. Is the width of the sidewalk enough?
17. People are excited for the connectivity potential via the alleyways and connecting streets.
18. Option 1 connects bikes to Market St more than option 3, which option 3 provides more bike concentration.
19. There is a concern of auto-restriction, especially for deliveries and hotels.
20. Glad to see buses off Mission St., and concentrated onto Market Street.
21. Why is there current bike infrastructure building on Market Street if there will be a cycle track on Mission Street.
22. Will the options account for the different bike users? Mission St bike riders may be more commuters, while Market St bike riders may be more tourists.
23. Bikers are more concerned with sharing lanes with pedestrians.
24. Consistency in the cycle track is necessary – the zig-zag nature of the design may not be the safest.
25. When a cycle track enters the intersection, how does it level into it?
26. Gradual slope into the grade of the intersection.
27. Interesting idea to add left turns on Mission that is currently not allowed.
28. Add mid-block crossings
    a. Mid-block crossings add more delay to buses and the current number of crossings is sufficient.
29. In option 2, can bikes pull into the cycle track?
    a. The sides of the four-inch raised cycle track will also be domed, allowing for mid-track
30. How will the streetscape impact the private gate access on 1st and Market Street?
31. What is the impact of the existing and new trees and the butterfly habitat?
32. What is the level of auto traffic restriction?
33. Does the auto-restriction include the hotels? Will there be a toll road to Market? ("better not")
34. How will the cars cross Market Street?
35. What type of vehicles will be restricted?
    a. Private automobiles only, not taxis, paratransit, emergency vehicles, and public transportation
36. What are people working at One Bush going to do?
37. The placement of transit hubs and traffic restriction may cause "dark alleys" of no activity – leading to economic loss.
38. Will Howard Street take on more traffic due to the changes?
39. How is this plan integrating with housing and other city plans?
40. Will the plazas and bulb-outs impact paratransit? (the design of the space to ADA compliance)
41. Some parts of the sidewalk are at capacity, while others are not. Is the width too much or too little?
42. Suggestion – use curb-cuts that already exist for mid-block crossings.
43. Can Mission Street be a transit corridor instead of Market?
44. Would moving transit to Market Street increase capacity?
45. It would be difficult to convince cyclists to get off Market Street.
46. Do we have too many buses?
47. Are the proposed bike lanes enough?
48. Suggestion – get Google to change the map routes so that specific traffic routes around Market Street and not through it.
49. Having fewer bus stops and routing bike lanes away may hurt businesses and the disabled and elderly may have more difficulty navigating around.
50. Bus stop spacing is too far for people with disabilities.
51. Add a "donut" to right-turn curbs for bikes to guard them from being edged out by

vehicles.

52. Suggestion: consolidate all buses onto boarding islands, make the islands longer, and reduce the number of buses/bus routes.
53. What is the solution for connectivity with SamTrans and Golden Gate Transit?

Station 4. 3rd St to 4th St

Question: Can you clarify the biking options between option 1 and 2

Answer: The Cycle track between 3rd and Grant Streets

Q: How will automobiles be managed in the three options?

A: Limitations are set between 5th and 3rd Streets, although taxis and paratransit is allowed to use Market

Q: How does this compare to the car ban in Sacramento (2011), which was a failure?

A: Comparing SF to Sacramento is difficult because both have very different priorities, populations, etc. Similar bike bans have been successful in Europe and a good American model is Santa Monica. It's a question of priorities. Here, 85% of motorists on Market are simply crossing.

(One attendant was really concerned about parking issues on Mission but it was difficult to hear and no question was framed.)

Q: option 3 seems too messy, can you clarify the restrictions?

A: Review of where car will be led off of Market, that no parking exists on Market currently and garages are available on Mission, the benefits of access to Mission Street amenities

Q: Narrow intersections "suck" for cyclists.

A: Areas where intersections are narrowed aren't primary cycling arteries

Q: Is the sidewalk being reduced in option 2?

A: Red dashes are where current sidewalks are located. Some areas are being reduced to facilitate other elements of the plan.

Q: It seems like you're allowing transit to take over. Can we increase MUNIs underground capacity?

A: MUNI is currently at capacity underground but there is long term potential to increase service.

Q: Can the J-Church be brought to ground level on Market?

A: Not presently

Q: what are the proposed vehicle limitations? Would they be 24-hrs?

A: 7 am – 7pm to reflect level of bike and bus traffic decreases

Q: Can MUNI buy longer underground cars?

Q: How will the auto ban be enforced?

A: PCO, labor is prohibitively expensive. Muni will be installing cameras that will generate license number to issue tickets to

Q: Can similar restrictions (auto ban) be enforced on a broader scope?

Q: It looks like plans involve moving the sidewalk and planting new trees. Can you explain the cost, timing and implementation?

A: Present trees were planted 40 yrs ago, soil is compacted and health isn't ideal. New trees would be planted according to new standards to ensure greater longevity.

Response: Restructuring the plantings would be a big improvement.

Response: If trees need to be purchased quickly (to mature), decisions need to be made quickly.

Q: Which option is most parking/auto restrictive?

A: hard to say, 2 and 3 are restrictive in different ways

Q: How do you enforce auto restrictions?

A: Required right turns at 6th and 10th streets.

Response: 6th lacks design queues. Enforcement will be needed.

Q: Is there a way to ticket offending drivers with photos? Ticketing would "make them learn"

Q:I need to bike to the Stockton Tunnel. Connections are really important.

A: We are considering left turns and Copenhagen boxes.

Q: When would implementation begin and end?

A: Can't say when it would be finished but ground is slated to be broken 2017

Q: I live on 5th and Market, you're designing for activity. How will these effect issues of homelessness and drug use? How will it support diversity?

Q: Is there funding for this?

A: Streets need to be repaved – public

funds; Some federal funding.
Q: Can you clarify private vehicle restrictions?
Q: The cycle track is too inconsistent – I would just avert it and ride in the street. (Others agreed that "bike just to what they want")
Q: Will some sidewalks be repaved? What will happen to brick?

A: Brick isn't ADA compliant. Private property owners have the option to repave is wanted but new pavers would be installed for consistency and accessibility.

Q: the North/South connection needs to be improved on 4th Street.

A: Implied in new bike plans.

Q: What is the current sidewalk depth now? (red dashed line)
Q: Will the street be mixed use (traffic) from Grant to 5th in Option 2? Are there separate bike lanes?

A: Yes, Same as option 1 b/c of spatial limitations.

Q: Are auto restrictions the same in all options?
Q: Why is Ellis Plaza being closed off?

A: Small volume of traffic, important connections, complicated intersection.

Q: Will the BART entrance at Apple reopen?

A: Unsure of current plans

Q: Is there currently a bike line north of 3rd St? Can they turn right on red?
Q: Stockton Cross walk is uncomfortably large.
Q: Will 4th/5th Street cross walks be scrambles?
Q: Will the monument at Kearny be relocated?
Q: Cutting off vehicular traffic is known to kill street life.

A: Boulder is a good example of success. Model of effect.

Q: What makes a sharrow super?

A: Size

Q: I'm worried about conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians at the cycle track.
Q: Does cycle track prevent bikes from going onto the street? I'd avert it, esp. during high volume hours.
Q: As a bike commuter, I like inviting more cyclists to the street. What are the advantages of 2 over 3?

A: Option 3 creates a new safe/physical buffer for less experienced riders.

Q: What are the limitations other than money for cycle tracks on option 3?

Q: What is a street life hub? Would it be in the side walk?
Q: Why no cycletrack from Grant to 5th?
Q: Cyclists don't pay attention to the shifting bike lanes at 2nd and Geary and block off busses. They are too wreckless. Would that happen here?
Q: I'd love to see Hallidie as a sunken "relaxation garden," I hope this is done with class.
Q: What about loading alleys?

Station 5. Hallidie Plaza and Wayfinding

Questions:

1. Only 1 Bart entrance? If so, will create a bottleneck (Response: there are 3 total, can add or change locations as idea is studied) (3 questions)
2. How does "Bart" feel about this concept of filling the hole?
3. Where are the escalators located?
4. Is a handicap elevator being included? (Yes)
5. How does the cross traffic affect the design and surface treatment?
6. Is there bike parking (yes)
7. Would we still have access to 4th street?
8. If you elevate the plaza, what happens on the existing lower levels? (3 questions)
9. It's a unique space: what activities are planned for it?
10. Can restaurateurs use the new plaza space?
11. Can you involve a major artist or architect to create something special as an object or structure?
12. Can you create more of a Paris type situation?
13. Have you looked at the Clarke Quay plaza canopy in Singapore?
14. Is it windy? Does it need protection?
15. How do you keep homeless of stadium

seating?

16. Can you use the presence of existing security guards, which are already there at the banks, to deter bad behavior?
17. Is this still a conceptual design? (Yes)
18. Can I have the sketch-up file to play with the design? (No, the City of SF owns these files)
19. What would the canopy material be made of? How would you clean it?
20. Where is the money to maintain it coming from?
21. What is timeline? (2 questions)
22. What is the cost?
23. When will the boards be on the website?

Comments:

1. Keep Eddy 2 way – bike lanes to 5th street and skinny down the traffic to make a shorter crossing difference and help connect these 2 spaces
2. Orient the Bart stations to what's happening underground
3. Compare the above space and circulation and relate it to what's happening below.
4. Add a bulb out at Eddy and narrow this crossing to help connect the spaces. Shorten the crosswalks.
5. Have you thoughts of having 2 levels with a skywalk? It could be lit up and also transparent between the levels
6. Like it to be bi-level plazas
7. Like it as 3 dimensional space with multi-levels and a part open plaza
8. Like the idea of a multi-layer area with green space in the sunny area
9. Like the differing vantage points to sit and observe while people watching – exactly like the rendering is showing it (landscape plan rendering)
10. Use the High Line amphitheatre, NY as an example
11. Have we checked out the underground in Seattle? We can have it be lit, dance location and music and hold events there.
12. I find the "downstairs" as it exists now confusing.
13. Create seating: stadium seating for various events or uses
14. Why not have an amphitheatre? (3 comments)
15. Like the idea of public seating
16. Want a mix of public versus café seating. I want to be able to stop and sit without having to make a purchase.
17. Love the idea of activating this plaza
18. Street life zones are hard to do (activate), a plaza is easier to activate
19. Refine the plaza and remove the planters
20. Nice paving would be good – no plants
21. We have too many plazas now: why not have a mixed use 10 story building instead?
22. Make it a sunken garden with waterfalls falling down into it from above
23. Utilize the sun aspect of it
24. Can you bring down a slot of sunlight downstairs to Bart? Like a mirror heliostat?
25. Like a tourist information location: it's now hard to find and full of homeless people
26. Put showers for the homeless in the lower level
27. I live close by and see fighting in that strip that is a dead zone at the escalators
28. Be sure and accommodate tree and plants to support the path of the existing butterfly migration in the location
29. How about having bike parking and or car share below?
30. Bikes will use the restaurants if there's parking. When I see a group of bikes parked by a restaurant, then I usually try it.
31. Block off Cyril Magnum or design it to slow down cars so you can unite the 2 parts of the plaza
32. Need a prominent entry way to plaza
33. How about adding vertical elements?
34. Need a type of 3 dimensional marking to designate this as an important space that people can see from a long way off
35. Need visual notation: art / architectural element/ lighting
36. Need an exclamation point to punctuate this location

37. It's an important connector to other places
38. If you raise the plaza, you must create a connection to the new Mint Plaza
39. That one piece that is separate feels like an orphan
40. Can you connect it with pavers or?
41. The other existing small plaza is forgettable at present – must improve and connect it to the "main" plaza
42. The plaza would be a nice buffer to traffic
43. Happy to see the plaza at above ground level
44. Think it's great
45. Filling in the dirt is a great improvement
46. This is a great idea
47. The "hole" has got to go….
48. This is a wonderful plan
49. Like the idea
50. Going in the right direction
51. Good job in presentation

Station 6. 6th St to 7th St

1. Concerned about bicycle traffic light and how people safely ride their bikes.
    a. There will be bicycle traffic light
2. Concerned about North-South circulation and connections in Option 3 and if we looked at them
    a. Yes, we looked at the circulation and connections
3. Question on the goal of pulling out bicyclist from Market and leading them to Mission
    a. We are not pulling out the cyclists; we are providing the options for them. If they feel they like to ride their bike on the shared lane they can continue on Market, but if they prefer to ride on cycletrack they have the Mission option. But, in Option 3, we will pull out the transit from Mission to Market.
4. Concerned about the fact that 14th Mission is a long block to Market
    a. It is, but there is always an option to turn to Market from shorter block
5. Will we still have F-line on Market?
    a. Yes, we will.
6. What is your idea about options and which option do you think is safer for cyclist?
    a. There are trade-offs between mobility of different modes and streetlife zone, ..
7. What about FedEx guys on Mission?
    a. There are loading zones on Mission and we are working on the best locations for these loading zones.
8. What about the shelters? Are they going to be like the existing wavy ones? They do not work well in windy and rainy days.
9. In Option 3, have you considered that there will be too many buses on Marker Street?
    a. Yes, we have. Auto restriction will make the bus circulation easier.
10. If the problem of Market is being narrow, why not chopping up the sidewalk and add to the width of the street?
    a. It is not just about being narrow; it is about including different activities. Also the design has the flexibility of expanding or shrinking the streetlife zone depending on the usage.
11. Is it possible to combine Option 2 and 3?
12. Will the next bus info be available when people can use both local and rapid transit?
13. On Option 2, why the transit shelter is by the sidewalk rather than transit island? Then the pedestrian should cross the cycletrak, it doesn't make sense.
    a. People wait too long for transit. We wanted to have the shelter closer to the streelife zone and stores. Also

there will be paving change closer to this part of cycletrack that indicates there is something happening.

14. Will be speed limitation for bikes on shared lane?
    a. Yes.
15. On Option 2, will the different paving be used for cycletrack and sidewalk? You have to look at different paving for these 2 zones.
    a. Yes kind of. The cycletrack will have paving closer to sidewalk rather than street.
16. Have you guys looked at changes on one way on Market and one way on Mission?
    a. We don't want to dictate to people which way to go. Also it is not a good practice to activate and improve just one side of a street.
17. As a driver on Market and frustrated with having my way blocked by pedestrians, how you can improve that everyone with different modes of transportation, be aware of what they are doing, such as pedestrians not blocking vehicles.
    a. It's all about culture. Some improvement will help and guide them.
18. Why not to give space for each mode?
    a. Mobility is all about freedom (and responsibility)

Station 7. UN Plaza

1. Is seating flexible? What is lighting going to be like?
    a. There will be adequate lighting that is comfortable and will activate the space. The café tables and chairs will be movable.
2. Have you talked about removing the fountain?
    a. It has been discussed. We want to activate it.
3. Could the BART entrance be reorganized?
    a. The BART entrance would be slightly shifted to be in the new café structure.
4. What is that bar code on the wayfinding map?
    a. We want people to use their phones to scan the code to create their own maps.
5. What will be the uses of the surrounding buildings?
    a. I am not sure what they will be in the long term. We want uses that are engaging and spill out onto the sidewalk. The federal building is going to be renovated and will create a lot of activity.
6. Will the café be privately operated?
    a. This is up for discussion and it depends on market conditions.
7. Will the restaurant spaces be civic built spaces that will bring tenants?
    a. The structure would be provided for tenants.
8. Is the design compatible with the current farmers' market/Off the Grid?
    a. Yes, we will keep a space for that integration.
9. I want more detail on wayfinding.
    a. It will come.
10. Have you thought about the homeless issue?
    a. We want to design for all people and want more people to come to make this space more successful. There are many different plaza users and we want to be supportive of them. The design does not exclude anyone.
11. How will wind conditions be addressed?
    a. We added trees to the design but need to think more about those issues.
12. What is going to happen to the dead space around the buildings in the plaza and next to the BART entrance?
    a. It is hard to know because we do not know what the buildings are going to be made into; they are being renovated.
13. I do not see a focal point in this design.
    a. This is a rough draft. I understand

that you want something singular/ iconic.

14. Could we integrate the fountain into the design?
    a. It could make the design stronger.
15. The current seating is near places that are wet. What can be done about that?
    a. This is a management question. I do not know who is in charge of turning the valves off.
16. The fountain used to swell and now it is just jets. Trees get killed by the chlorine because they get splashed by the fountain.
17. Does the design incorporate the farmers' market? I want a space that brings them in more.
    a. We want to provide a space where they could happen. We want to highlight farmers over food trucks.
18. The place does not have things that will attract a lot of people. I just want to get out of the area when I walk by. Do you really think seating will make people stay?
    a. We need the right type of seating—something appropriate. We know that there is a lack of people but hope that the development going in will invite more activity.
19. There is a huge homeless camping.
    a. If we open up space it is more inviting, like Union Square.
20. There are a few homeless people using up all the space. They are blocking space. More places for people to sit will make it a more useful space.
    a. It is a multifaceted space.
21. Can we use the wind to power something?
    a. Maybe a public art thing to power things by wind.
22. When you put things/art in the middle of the sidewalk it obstructs flow.
    a. We are aware of the type and placement of art.
23. I feel unsafe.
    a. Lighting is important.
24. I heard there was talk about getting rid of the fountain.
    a. We have not studied that possibility.
25. I want something more, not just a café. I want more things in other places in the area.
26. What is democratic access?
    a. Market St. is a democratic/people street.
27. We should prevent the plaza from having bums lying around.
    a. Our design is for people and it is democratic. This along with other developments will create catalysts to bring more people to the area.
28. I agree as long as it is not a dead space.
29. I avoid walking through there.
30. Are there restrictions on what you can do in the area? Can you remove the fountain?
    a. We are keeping the fountain and flagpoles because we are sensitive to historic preservation in the area.
31. Who is going to run the café?
    a. That is to be determined. We could look at Union Square and come up with something like that.
32. You have to walk through a desert to get to the Opera and City Hall. After the Opera, we walked to get food and the area was dead.
33. Is there anything planned for the Union Plaza building? It is a dead building.
    a. It will be opening and it remains federal.
34. I have not seen grand gestures in the renderings. There are no monuments or arches that reinforce Market St. as a grand street. It is very weak. In Los Angeles, an intersection of Sepulveda Blvd. has white towers and it looks monumental.
35. There are opportunities for connection to City Hall but there is parking there. How can you make a connection? If you want to activate the space you need to connect it.
    a. We have begun studying this.
36. We should think bigger about the open space. We could have a 20' by 30' stage. It is a small space right now. The fountain seems a theater-like space. We also need to take acoustics into consideration.
37. The major stage should have wind protection. It is too windy for performers.
38. Also consider the direction of the stage; where do you want people to look?
    a. We will consider that.
39. San Francisco needs to consider public/private partnerships. We need private money.
40. We do not need three-dimensional architecture on the sidewalk/public space. We could

have a video installation outside the building that does not impact the current architecture. Look at Corcoran Gallery in Washington D.C.

41. How is the café going to adapt to the slope of the area?
    a. We would move the configuration.
42. We can keep the slope. The roof can be sloped in, too.
43. How are you going to put the trees in the plaza?
    a. We put a pit in and maybe paving on top. It could be a porous system.
44. People get splashed from the fountain and the wind tunnels.
    a. The trees could help.
45. I like how in the Powell St. cable car stop they extended the seating area.
    a. Those are called parklets.
46. I want more of those. There are too many parking spaces in the City. People should not have to drive; there is so much public transit. We should not allow cars at all in the City. More and more people are bicycling, too.
47. These places are dead without something that caters, like a café.
    a. The BART entrance will be integrated underneath the café.
48. Does the edge of the plaza have more opportunities depending on the three options?
    a. The transit options in the three options do not impact the plaza all that much. We are putting the center islands nearby to help activate the plaza.
49. Do we have to maintain the corridor to City Hall?
    a. Yes, we are keeping a lot of the original elements.
50. Do we have the flexibility to move the BART escalators?
    a. Our proposal is a small change: a small enough move.
51. Did you look at options other than a café that are not retail/commercial, like art/theater or like Union Square plaza? What was your process that led to choosing a café?
    a. This is a great climate to have a café. We want a structure that is flexible and that looks nice.
52. I like to linger/observe. The plaza is a break in the view, which is important/rewarding. An opening in the urban fabric. But it has a kind of urban desert-like quality to it. It is a gateway opportunity.
53. It should be a café but also an arts type center or for tourism, like a staffed wayfinding center.
54. I love that you are breaking up the huge space with a café structure but what is happening to the dead space behind the fountain? It can be scary/dangerous.
    a. That space is under construction. We need more analysis to connect all the spaces together.
55. You should program the space to let people charge their phones, play with the fountain water, etc. It should be activated even when it is late at night.
    a. The café and furniture accommodates different activities.
56. The fountain is good. It pumps water out so that City Hall and those buildings do not flood. It is a historic waterway from Hayes Valley.
57. I avoid the areas that are always shaded. There could be something that encourages people to hang out there.
    a. It is worth doing shade studies.
58. The fountain granite is not going to be touched?
    a. No.
59. So there is nothing you can do to rearrange the fountain?
    a. No, it is historic preservation.

Station 8. 9th St to 10th St

1. Question: What is the difference between Option 1 and Option 2? Is it that the width of the cycle track changes between them?
    a. Answer: The difference is small, but the curb line changes a bit in option two to give the cycle lane a little more room.
2. Question: How do paratransit vehicles unload their passengers with the bike lane running along the curb?
    a. Answer: There will be designated loading zones.

3. How wide will the transit islands be?
    a. 9 feet
4. How does the cycle track cross intersections? What will the grade be?
    a. We're stilling investigating our options, but it's likely that the cycle track will go back to street level or both the cycle track and sidewalk could maintain their grade through the intersection.
5. How wide is the space between the median and the sidewalk?
    a. 15 ft. There will be room for a bike lane.
6. Why not put a midblock crossing at the end of the long median in order to formalize what already exists with transit passengers jaywalking across the curbside lane?
    a. In some blocks, that will exist because they already have established midblock crossings. But good point.
7. What happens to Market if you put bike facilities on Mission?
    a. Option 1 remains.
8. With option 3, is there still a bike improvement done on Market?
    a. Not very much in this section of Market because there is already bike infrastructure. You could maybe raise the grade of the bike lane.
9. Do you envision more novice bicyclists using Mission? And then the bike messengers continue to use Market?
    a. That's the million dollar question. We'll be studying it closely. We're looking at San Francisco bicyclist preferences for facilities, etc.
10. What are the negative to the cycle track besides cost?
    a. Not very much on this block. For other blocks there is a sidewalk space tradeoff.
11. Doesn't not having a cycle track around 5th defeat the purpose of having a cycle track anywhere?
    a. That's what the Mission St option is for. It's the only option that provides a continuous cycle track.
12. Why isn't 11th Street analyzed for BMS? I feel like 11th would be a good option for bike movement from Market to Mission. Lots of cars are on 10th and 9th – 11th is a calmer street.
    a. 11th will certainly be looked at if we go with option 3. The downside of 11th is that there is a no left turn onto Market.
13. Which option moves transit fastest?
    a. Answer: We're not 100% sure, but getting cyclists out of the way will improve transit times.
    b. Comment: But there will still be cyclists on Market. Building Option 3 might not improve transit speed.
14. Did you look at putting street life up against the buildings? Why are the tables and chairs so close to the street? I don't buy into this streetlife zone/hub.
    a. The streetlife is along the curb so that a pedestrian through zone remains where pedestrians can easily walk.
15. Are you considering transit signal priority?
    a. Yes.
16. The blocks in this area are huge. How will there be seamless connections for bicyclists between Market and Mission when the streets are one-way? Any possibility for a contraflow bike lane?
    a. We haven't thought through every permutation, but if we choose option 3 we'll definitely look at it.
17. How do you choose the option to build? How do we ensure feasibility?
    a. We'll do a lot of user focus groups to make sure that the chosen option works.
18. Have you thought of doing pilot cycle tracks? We could test them out so that people would see how they would improve the roadway?
    a. Good suggestion.
19. Have you thought of continuing the bike lane through right turns? Basically, it would help designate a bicycle turning space so that they wouldn't be cut off by cars. (The man referred to this as a bicycle donut.)
    a. Interesting suggestion – haven't heard of that.
20. What's the difference between the cycle track in Option 1 and Option 2?
    a. The curb line changes a bit in

option2.

21. Is there one station here that talks specifically about the streetlife?
    a. Station 1 might. Talk to Neil.
22. What is the process for populating the sidewalk?
    a. Answer: We're not at that level of detail yet.
    b. Follow-Up Question: So when this is initially built out, then there might not be anything really happening along the sidewalk.
    c. Answer: Correct.
23. Why is the seating area near the curb? It seems more natural to be close to the building.
    a. The area will be changing. People will actually start spending time here. Curbside seating allows for continuous flow of pedestrian traffic.
24. The trees are all new, yes?
    a. Yes, there will be a lot of new trees.
25. Will the red brick sidewalk be torn out?
    a. I think they're keeping the brick sidewalks.
26. The movie about Market Street mentions the noise of 9th and 10th street. Are you thinking of this and trying to calm the traffic a bit?
    a. We're putting in curb bulb outs, etc. This should calm traffic. We're also getting rid of the pork chop islands so that crosswalks are shorter and more convenient.
27. When thinking about streetlife, do you have any idea what businesses will move into these vacant spaces? Will they be able to activate the space?
    a. Good point. We're looking at test out temporary activities that will attract people, tenants.
28. Is option 3 considered the safest for cyclists?
    a. We think it's safe and that it will attract the 8-80 age range. Option 3 appeals to new cyclists.
29. Is a buffered cycle track preferred over a raised one?
    a. Europeans prefer a grade change. Can't speak to the safety of one versus the other. The problem with buffers is that they take up more space.
30. Can you create a buffer for bikes and cars and build storm water management improvements in these buffers?
    a. That's definitely possible. You should talk with the people here from the PUC.
31. What's the difference between option 1 and 2?
    a. Sidewalk cut back a bit in option 2. They're pretty similar along this portion of Market.
32. Is this block restricted to cars?
    a. What we have today will definitely remain.
33. Why the car restrictions?
    a. To help transit and bikes move more smoothly. There's a significant transit benefit to getting cars off Market.
34. Doesn't slowness of transit have to do with the lights?
    a. One car in the wrong space can mess up transit signal timing.
35. Comment: People in the outer avenues will always drive unless transit is faster.
36. Comment: This section of Market is windy, right? Maybe a streetlife feature could be urban windmills.
37. Comment: As a pedestrian, I want cycle tracks separate from pedestrians. Keep those bicyclists away! Also, I think it's important to remember that pedestrians are also transit users.
38. Comment: You need to look at the whole SOMA area – not just a street by street analysis.
39. Comments from the open question, "which option do you prefer?"
    a. Prefers Mission St option
    b. Doesn't like Option 3. Market is the natural bike corridor. People were biking on Market before bike lanes. Pulling bikes off Market takes vitality out of the area. Wants Option 2.
    c. Bike lanes = safety
    d. I don't think we've maxed out Market for cyclists. It's going to want to happen naturally. What street do you want to ride down if you're experiencing San Francisco? Market

is our grand boulevard. Mission is industrial.

e. Mission Street (option 3). Market can be scary. Not having to negotiate with buses is key. It would be neat to try to improve alley life between the two streets.
f. I think the cycle track is a great option for newer cyclists. Biking without buses is preferred. Hopefully designated bike spaces will help formalize zones. Change has definitely happened on Market over the past few years with the installation of the cycle track along these blocks. Could also happen for the rest of the street.

Saturday July 20, 2013

Station 1a. Three options and transit alternatives

1. If we choose Option 3, when Option 1 and 3 are combined, does that mean that there is no separated bike lane on Market Street (Option 1)?
    a. Yes
2. Pedestrians and cyclists are typically compatible and coexist well together, but there is no way to stop bikes from veering off course or cutting people off!
    a. Then Option 2 would work better for you – it has a designated bike lane, since Option 1 is a shared bike lane with transit.
3. Can we mix and match between options?
    a. Yes
4. Is it necessary to move all the buses on Mission Street in Option 3?
    a. Yes, the streets on Mission Street are not exceptionally wide at all to accommodate the buses even now.
5. In Option 2, where do the people board buses?
    a. On the boarding islands.
6. In Option 1, is the boarding island directly on the other side? In other words, are boarding islands directly next to each other all down Market Street?
    a. Boarding islands are in different places, they are offset from each other to not have boarding islands lining up in that fashion.
7. Are ads going to be removed?
    a. Yes.
8. I wouldn't be comfortable riding a bike in a shared bike lane (Option 1).
9. Would pedestrians on smaller streets have a greater grade?
    a. Only Mission Street (Option 3) will have that.
10. I'm interested in multi-modal sustainability.
11. My main question is about bikes, but I'm struggling with promoting cycling. The shared lanes just don't seem to be changing very much, from a safety standpoint this is a concern. Option 2 could be a bit overwhelming because cyclists could be whizzing by!
    a. It really varies between different speeds.
12. Do you believe that bikes are going to go for some self-selection? For example, are faster bikers going to go with Option 3 (Mission Street)?
    a. Ultimately it's really going to depend on where they're going.
13. Is this generally accepted that separated bike lanes are safer in other countries?

    a. Yes
14. I believe that it's more important to focus on the improvements pertaining to Market Street because that is the focus of this whole redesign.
15. Painting isn't really going to do anything. Bicyclists just see bike lanes as spaces with paint on the ground, and they don't see it as a full commitment from the city.
    a. Options 2 and 3 will be making that commitment.
16. I don't see anything about culture getting factored into these design decisions – what actually works for people – and are you aware that this opens up opportunities to just gentrify the area more?
    a. We are evaluating each individual district as its own entity, but yes, we are aware that it could become an issue and we are trying to address that.
    b. I think it's best to use the Persona Approach, since there has been a long history of gentrification in the area.
17. Why do you need to reduce the number of lanes? Why not have two lanes when it's closer to the water?
    a. It is necessary to improve transit.
18. I like separated bike lanes, but why not design everything all the way? (reference to Option 2)
    a. That is why we have Option 3 available.
19. Will there be new buses?
    a. Yes.
20. Will these new buses fit?
    a. Yes.
21. What happened to the loading and unloading of private vehicles on Market?
    a. Paratransit and taxis are always allowed. Loading is a part of the design.
22. Is it really realistic to move bikes to Mission Street?
    a. We encourage it but we know that it ultimately depends on where the cyclist is going.
23. Option 2 isn't a good idea – it'll create traps for cyclists
24. I think Option 2 will probably be best? I'm not sure.
25. What about ADA?
    a. We're adding curb ramps, widening the islands, raised loading, replacing bricks with another materials for a smoother ride.
26. I have strong support for Option 2, particularly because of the separated bike lanes.
27. Are the improvements going to be occurring at the same time for Option 1 and 3?
    a. We need to do Market improvements before Mission because of transit accommodations.
28. I think you would need to do all Market Street improvements before Mission Street.
29. As a cyclist, Option 3 would be ideal if I were in a hurry.
30. **We think that Option 2 and 3 would be the best combination. It's better to have investments made on both streets.**
31. Will there be a physical barrier with cars in Option 1?
    a. No, but improvements include better street markings.
32. Is Option 3 the only chance there is to make improvements on Mission Street?
    a. Yes, but Mission Street will be going through another repaving cycling in a few years and we could revisit the conversation again then.
33. Mission Street is terrifying to ride a bicycle on, so I feel that it would be best to have Mission Street improved as soon as possible.
34. What about delivery trucks parking in bike lanes?
    a. In design we can think about how to prevent double parking.
35. I think it's fantastic to give San Franciscans a way to give feedback!

Station 1b. Three options and transit alternatives

1. Question – Where do people board in Option 2?
    a. Answer – There are mid-street boarding islands (will have to cross a cycle track. There are two types of boarding islands, curbside and center boarding islands. Boarding stop locations dependent on local enhanced and rapid transit options which can be applied to all three dif-

ferent Options.

2. Question – Will people have problems j-walking across the street?
    a. Answer – At some point it will be necessary for people to cross traffic, but instead it may be bike traffic rather than autos.
3. Question – Where are the boarding islands in Option 1?
    a. Answer – The Boarding island stops may be placed curbside and in the center travel lanes, dependent on destination and limited or local line chosen. Boarding stop locations dependent on local enhanced and rapid transit options, which can be applied to all three different Options.
4. Discussion Point – Participant believes separating the Local and Express lines may be problematic as people go back and forth to catch a bus. Example Caltrans station.
    a. Answer – This is an issue we are aware of. We are activity researching the use of Next Muni to provide future stop information. We need to plan for this occurrence if it occurs with a transit improvement in the future. We may use technology as a solution.
5. Discussion Point – Participant believes Montgomery to Kearny is appropriate stop spacing.
    a. We have done research on stop spacing, currently traveling at 5 – 6 mph. We are trying to address and improve this issue.
6. Question – Doesn't fewer stops create more waiting in line for busses?
    a. Answer – We are researching and implementing feasible transit improvements such as all door boarding or ticket vending machines that will increase the boarding times.
7. Question – Which transit option will be the fastest?
    a. Answer - The Rapid option will has the fastest project time increase from what exists today. However, there are trade offs such as a separated local and limited line boarding islands. It will be necessary to choose a line and you may walk farther for a rapid bus stop.
8. Question – If there were more busses, wouldn't we be better off?
    a. Answer - This is a separate effort we are addressing with the Transit Effectiveness Project. Lines such as the 38L 5L 71L 9L 14L and possible rerouting are options created to provide more L's and improve reliability while reducing travel time throughout the City.
9. Discussion Point – Participant believes in more Limited lines for people living in Sunset. Participant prefers Rapid option to lean toward streamlining. It will be important for people to be aware of when both lines are coming.
10. Discussion Point – Participant wishes for locations of buses and buses arriving with few blocks to be presented in bigger, more legible signage so people aren't squinting.
11. Discussion Point – Participant believes current boarding islands on Market Street are not equipped for all wheelchairs. Would prefer curbside stops than stop ramps. There are ramp issues that occur based on where bus stops.
    a. Answer – All boarding islands in the center lane will be widened to 8.5 feet, have mini-highs and become ADA compatible. One major objective of project and transit improvements is to be accessible for all. Working with the MUNI Accessibility group.
12. Question – What do you mean when you say 'Local'?
    a. Answer - Local – bus route that stops on every block of street. This is what currently exists today. Limited – bus route that stops on major transit points.
13. Question – Have you explored how much farther people will have to walk from Mission to Market with the Option 3 proposal?
    a. Answer - Research is still necessary. However there are only a few blocks between two corridors. For some people it may be closer to their

destination route as Market is the center of the City.

14. Question – When do they change or replace transit shelters?
    a. Answer - The Red transit shelters are relatively new, the shelters themselves are not expensive to produce through privatization. What is most expensive is the pouring of concrete within construction costs.
15. Question – How much faster will the new lines improve transit? What is the difference between Rapid and Local Enhancement time improvements?
    a. Answer - The projected time increase can be found on the three different Options Boards. Each Option has a transit scenario comparison that displays the percentage. On average the percent increase is 15-22%.
16. Question – What can make transit faster?
    a. There are many different options to increase transit. For example, restricting cars, appropriately interacting with cyclists and bicycle facilities to prevent conflict, improving ADA accessibility, and consolidating stops.
17. Question – Would the F line be treated like a Limited with the new transit improvements?
    a. Answer – Yes, because we can not move the tracks, the F line will continue to operate in the center. However with the new transit options, we can make the F line more reliable and have done research into transit improvements that can reduce wait time, such as ticket vending machines.
18. Question – How well can SF Police enforce proposed transit only lanes?
    a. Answer – the best way to improve enforcement is to build through design. Similar to Church Street, we can use paint, cameras, auto restrictions, barriers or multiple ideas together to improve enforcement.
19. Discussion Point – Participant believed separating the Limited and Local lines through the Rapid Transit Option can be compatible for Market, as long as people are provided with enough information about future lines and times.
20. Question - Will it be possible to change the signage? Participant has difficulty reading the sign and understanding where buses are coming and going on MUNI maps.
    a. Answer – Part of our research is to address how to best display new information and way finding for the public. This will also affect how people decide and board transit.
21. Question - Do transit improvement options differ from Street Options for Market?
    a. Answer – No the local enhancement and rapid transit options may be applied to all three options.
22. Question – Will Option 3 slow transit on Market if all buses from Mission move?
    a. Answer – It will slow transit somewhat, a slight percentage decrease. There are only 2 lines and a Golden Gate transit line, which is a manageable process. However, there is a trade off by greatly improving connectivity for cyclists.
23. Discussion Point – Participant would like to know when new busses come into system and make sure clipper cards are functioning because it impacts those with disabilities.
    a. Answer – Indicated new buses are slowly arriving and are equipped with flip out ramps. The Better Market Street Project has a focus to help increase accessibility and become ADA compliant on all transit boarding island improvements.
24. Discussion Point – Participant believes the current Limited Lines on Market are not truly limited. Would prefer the Rapid options because it creates fewer stops and reduces travel time.
25. Question - Would there be an issue with moving busses from Market to Mission?
    a. Answer - Mission has limited lane space to equip all busses. Market is an important connection to major population transfer hubs (BART).

Station 3. 1st St to 2nd St

1. Asked for clarification on the construction and form of the raised cycle track – wants construction documents of what they look like
2. The left turns on Market St are key bike routes, especially for North/South bike routes.
3. Concerning the raised cycle track on Mission St. – parking enforcement is poor and vehicles, including police and delivery vehicles, park on the bike lanes. Physical barriers would be better, as well as better enforcement.
4. Please plan for new ways to better enforce the street.
5. How would you enforce private vehicles from not driving on Market?
    a. We are currently juggling a few ideas –the solution is not solidified.
6. Will there be better enforcement of crosswalk violations?
    a. Working on it, but it is difficult with a duo-grid alignment of the street.
7. Has the effect of the Transbay Terminal on transit been looked at?
    a. Yes, which also factors into why auto restrictions may start on Fremont?
8. What is dedicated and shared space/lane used for?
9. How will intersections work with auto restrictions
10. What effect will auto restrictions have on Mission St.?
11. Do all options have auto restrictions?
12. How much does each option cost?
13. Will all islands be ADA accessible? (wide ramps)
14. There needs to be more wayfinding and signage on Mission St for these concepts.
15. Will taxis be allowed on Market St?
    a. Yes
16. Will there be timed signalization or signalization priority for cyclists?
17. What is the cost of the painted buffers?
18. Why is there not an option 2 and option 3?
    a. Financial restrictions.
19. Suggestion to do Mission St. first and start with bike lane painting.
20. Will there still be bulb-outs?
21. These options restrict auto traffic right?
    a. All to varying degrees.
22. Are the areas that only go to two lanes on Market St?
23. The misalignment of bike lanes forces cyclists to swear and make it more difficult.
24. Is the reason for lane changes - so that bikes can go across the Muni?
25. Will there be a conflict for tourists getting to bus stops crossing onto the bike lane?
    a. Working on using signage and paving to alert pedestrians.
26. Is paving treatment part of the plan?
27. Are you pushing bikes off Market St? (Option 3)
28. I don't like including Mission, but having right and left turns make it better.
29. Wants more political power behind auto restriction/management.
30. Will auto-restrictions affect deliveries?
31. What is the new bike lane network and connection to the Wiggle?
32. When will construction start and what are the phases?
33. How are we going to address the ads on bus stops and new ads appearing while the plan is being executed? Are they part of the concept?
34. Are all street trees being replaced?
35. Will bike lanes go or stay in option 1 if there is an option 3?
36. A fan of option 2 – most like the current behaviors of Market St.
37. What is the transition between bus stop islands and the sidewalk like?
38. Is the concept plan diluting the efforts on Market with focus on Mission?
39. Who ultimately makes the decision on the concepts?
40. Need more wayfinding and signage.
41. Will there be push back by drivers to Market St.?
42. Any cool ideas for street furniture and plazas?
43. Cars will be upset with the Market St. changes.
44. Are you trying to make everything look like a garden?
45. Why the plan? It all costs a lot of money.
46. We are getting greedy – shouldn't we be talking about God?

47. Streets are filthy – put money into cleaning what is already there and stop putting money into big projects.
48. Market Street is trying to fix or mend the diagonal of the grid.
49. Did you consider signalized mid-block crossings?
50. Will you add signalized timing? (for cars and/or transit)
51. How many alleys would be used as connectors?
52. Are there any concept designs that are looking into the side streets?
53. What is the extent of changes onto alleyways and connecting streets?
54. What are the possibilities for the flexible space?
55. I don't see left turns on any of these plans.
    a. They are not on every block.
56. You should have one consistent design for one (Market) street – bring continuity to the street.
    a. Some segments have higher capacities of certain modes and those need to be addressed.
57. Are you taking into account left-turns for bikes?
58. How optimistic are you about the bike turn pocket?
    a. We are trying to provide bikes with a legal way to turn. We cannot plan for illegal actions.
59. Why not add a direct bike lain intersection with signalized lighting?
60. Add bike lights? These are seen in other countries.
61. How does BMS align with the bike share plan and Mission St and Transbay plans?
62. Pedestrian and cyclist conflict make it less appealing for cyclists. How will this be mediated?
63. What are the loading pockets for?
64. Is the curb on Mission St. going to be changed to allow bikes to get onto the sidewalk?
65. What are we doing about streets that feed into the bay bridge?
66. How do you see Mission St. bike routes in the bike network? The North/South connection is important.
67. 1st and Market St intersection may need more bike amenities.
68. What are the reasons to add option 3?
69. Can you combine option 2 and option 3? It would lower the bike and pedestrian collision.
70. What is the cost of the project and the cycle track?
71. What is the cost of moving the trees?
72. What are optional concepts?
73. Add bike route maps at bike share stations.
74. Are the boards and materials online?
75. Which option is safer for cyclists? Option 2 may be perceived as safe.

Station 4. 3rd St to 4th St

1. Which option has the least number of deaths?
    a. Intersection distance is the same east to west, but differs north to south between the different options. Private vehicle restrictions and intersection improvements will help. No analysis has been done to determine the difference in deaths between options, and would be statistically unsound if it were tried.
2. Has there been a change in pedestrian injuries since forced right turns?
    a. Yes, to the east.
3. Does the cycle track versus the sharrow affect transit times?
    a. Yes, mode separation will improve times for both modes.
4. The media is portraying option 3 as a way to push cyclists off of Market. Better information about the value of option 3 needs to be shared.
5. How do we implement construction?
    a. Phased, discrete blocks at a time with near term trials.
6. Will bus routes be redesigned to accommodate new Transbay passengers?
    a. Buses will be on Mission for 1 block.
7. What is the path of Gold?
    a. A historical landmark
8. How will transit islands affect bikers?
    a. We need to design the surface

between the sidewalk and transit islands to slow down cyclists and reduce conflicts.

9. How much longer are the transit islands?
    a. Two to three times longer
10. Longer transit islands could exacerbate the jaywalking problem.
    a. The paving between transit islands and the sidewalk will signal to buses and bikes that it's a pedestrian zone.
11. Did you consider transit crossing for a whole block?
    a. We considered it, but there were transit conflicts. There is room to think about that in the future.
12. Can we have options 2 and 3?
    a. Yes, we could over time.
13. Is the change in paving in all options?
    a. Yes, the current paving system is bumpy and uncomfortable for people with disabilities. We need to put in new soils and better aeration for the trees.
14. Has there been any collaboration with Friends of the Urban Forest and will it be possible to have community planting days?
    a. We will be planting trees that are too large to be moved without large machinery.
15. Can we change the color of the sharrow graphics?
    a. Yes, we can try out different colors.
16. How quickly could Mission Street be improved?
    a. Actually faster than option 2.
17. Is Mission going to be restriped?
    a. Not sure who would be in charge, probably Department of Public Works.
18. What is a street life zone?
    a. It's an area with high performance furnishing, lighting, wayfinding. We are also trying to incorporate more local zones. We have found that public/private partnerships work well.
19. Can Hotdog carts be there?
    a. Probably not, maybe food kiosks that are moveable.
20. What about the homeless population?
    a. There is a lot of clutter that needs to get put back in an organized way.
    b. We need to address the human defecation on the sidewalk problem.
    c. San Francisco is in the process of improving access to very low income housing.
21. Can we convince BART to open bathrooms in stations?
    a. No Response.
22. I'm concerned about the safety of the Option 3 cycle track versus Option 2
    a. Option 3 has a buffer zone that has proven to be safe in other cities and is cheaper to implement than the raised cycle track design for option 2.
23. Is there a plan for past Octavia?
    a. No Response
24. I love the short crossing distance.
25. What is considered best practice for bike lanes?
    a. Separate facilities have proven to increase the number of cyclists and are the safest.
    b. Ideally in the long run we would only have transit in the center lanes and eliminate conflict between cyclists and transit on the side lanes.
26. The connections between Market and Mission aren't very bike friendly. Is there a plan to enhance these connections?
    a. Yes, it's in the bike plan. Every other street will have a bike lane between Market and Mission.
27. More buses on Market might not work
    a. Auto restrictions will help reduce traffic and longer stops will be able to accommodate more buses.
28. Noise on Market Street is a problem.
    a. We need hybrid electric garbage trucks.
29. What is the advantage of wider sidewalks on Mission?
    a. To accommodate increased pedestrian volumes.
30. What are the differences in pedestrian features between options?
    a. They are the same east to west, but differ in sidewalk width north to south.
31. I'm concerned about bicycle and pedestrian

conflicts.

32. Why not stripe a bike lane even if it's actually a sharrow?
    a. We are still figuring out how to deal with mode conflicts.
33. What happens to streets between Market and Mission?
    a. We are going to add bicycle facilities between them.
34. What about bike share?
    a. There are a few stations located on Market.
35. How do trucks and city services work in the plan?
    a. We will strive to eliminate conflicts with loading time restrictions. Also, many of the blocks have back alley access.
36. European cities have breaks in cycle facilities so option 2 is not unprecedented.
37. We should think more about having all of Market Street at the same grade.

Station 5. Hallidie Plaza and Wayfinding

1. How will it affect vehicular traffic?
2. Will this (vehicular traffic) issue be brought up and thought about? (yes)
3. Can you "fix" Cyril Magnum? It's a disaster for pedestrians as it is now.
4. Can you stop the traffic on Eddy or Cyril Magnum?
5. Where would the Bart entrances be located? (4)
6. Is the Bart entry big enough?
7. What do you arrive in the plaza if you take Bart?
8. What about having a bike valet?
9. What about cost and engineering?
10. Is there any sense of the cost?
11. How can you connect the 2 spaces?
12. Is there a way you can express the "connection" to the 2 plazas? Such as crossing the street treatment? Or wide crossings?
13. What happens below?
14. Now the upper and lower spaces don't interact and they also have pinch points for pedestrian flow. Now it's a resting space versus moving space- how can you keep both resting and moving spaces if only 1 level?
15. Any ideas on how to use the sunken area?
16. How about a reservoir to catch the already dripping water?
17. How would the proposed retail / café space work?
18. Can you make the space an amphitheatre?
19. It's very windy late in the day – can the buildings be configured to help block the wind?
20. Why do we need to keep the tourist center?
21. Is there anything you can do to make the trees get bigger and healthier with larger canopies?
22. Have you gotten any feedback on this concept from business owners about the proposed trees in front of their buildings?
23. Love Time Square, NY and Lincoln Center, NY – can we make a representation of them just for SF?
24. Can we do an open competition for this space for SF?

Comments:

1. Way finding: want to use similar hybrid map such as Muni for familiarity
2. Way finding: make it for people who walk "slow" (how far things are)
3. Way finding: it would help to put up mileage markers.
4. Sounds wonderful
5. Like the concept (3)
6. All for the concept!
7. Love the rethinking of the space
8. Great idea
9. Transit riders below don't use the space, it's not maintained, not a good space below at this time.
10. Currently, not enough space above
11. Must add bike racks
12. Would like bike parking along the street or below
13. Bike riders always like to have their bikes as close as possible to their destination
14. Would like lots of activity there
15. Keep activity at both levels
16. Activity which occurs at street level add below
17. Now the upper and lower spaces don't interact and they also have pinch points for pedestrian flow. Now it's a resting space ver-

sus moving space- how can you keep both resting and moving spaces if only 1 level?
18. How about adding sky lights to below and makes it a smaller space, but keep it. Maybe a continuation of the mall and restaurants down there.
19. Build as a 2 story: similar above to below
20. Keep some retailers at the lower level
21. The above is already retail rich – use as a performance space or?
22. Like Time Square – multi-level seating
23. Like the current small pedestrian zone by the cable car: it's very active
24. It could become like a great European pedestrian zone
25. Like the canopy for weather protection
26. It's very windy late in the day – can the buildings be configured to help block the wind?
27. We have a wind issue: need shelter that doesn't block the sun
28. Extend the plaza to connect the 2 shopping areas
29. Like the Seville Spain image, but do it for wind protection, not sun
30. It's a sunny space, good you are using the sun in the concept
31. Like the concept of raising the plaza
32. It's good to raise up the plaza to help with the large expected pedestrian circulation in the future
33. Like how you show circulation
34. I'd like to suggest an oval shaped building
35. The existing facades are Edwardian, should keep the same style
36. The café setup makes it too private: it will keep people away who only just want to sit.
37. Too much of the City has become privatized
38. Need more public seating
39. Like the existing brick in the cable car turn around
40. We need iconic designs that are recognizable by all for Market street, yet special for this plaza area
41. We need visual references

Station 6. 6th St to 7th St

1. By auto restrictions, how are frequent users unload huge stuff when they want to use their own car?
    a. There will be access and connectivity from alleys and back of the building. Also they can do that before or after auto restriction hours.
2. Looking at Market Street, there is a reason behind the fact that people don't want to walk on some blocks, which is mainly related to demographic aspects of those areas. The design by itself will not change the fundamental reason behind it.
    a.
3. We definitely prefer to share lane with cars rather than buses. I think Option 1 is much safer.
4. On Mission Street, the cycletrack by the parking is unsafe when people open the car door.
    a. There is 4 feet space between parking and cycletrack, which makes it safer.
5. On Option 3, don't you think when people trying to find parking space try to loop around to find space?
    a. This is a parking space that exists right now. I don't think it will be an issue.
6. The cycletrack at Golden Gate is not safe right now. Will it be the same?
    a. The difference between Golden Gate and Market and Mission is the median will be painted/ planted, and then people will have the better understanding about the differences between different lanes.
7. How wide the cycletrack is and how many cyclists it could accommodate? What if the number of cyclists exceeds capacity? Don't you think they start to bike on car lanes?
    a. The cycletrack is about 6-7 feet wide and accommodates 2-3 cyclists. Copenhagen has more cyclists (about

65,000) and this width works well there.

8. Has Option 1 developed because of cost?
    a. Kind of, but there are still opportunities to pick different pieces together.
9. This is going to be an issue when people crossing the cycletrack from transit shelter to transit island.
    a. This is international/Copenhagen model and it works well there. The paving change will let cyclists know there is something happening there. It also needs educating people.
10. Tell more about streetlife zone? Is it where people playing chess right now? Will the furniture/tables be permanent?
11. Is there a big learning curve for raised cycletrack?
12. One of the big differences between San Francisco and European countries is they are flat. This makes a difference in how fast cyclists can ride and the dynamic of movement.
    a. That is correct but this part of San Francisco is pretty much flat.
13. These are more conceptual designs; I hope there will be more study on topography.
14. Will the cycletrack stop on van Ness? When I am biking suddenly I feel the infrastructure is changing.
    a. The cycletack towards west of 8th Street will continue off and on.
15. Tell about economic activation?
    a. Other parts of the City are working on it.
16. I don't believe in combination of Option 1 and 3. There shouldn't be exclusive bike facilities on Mission. What if combining Option 2 and 3?
    a. It is definitely a possibility. They can be done gradually, starting with Option 1 and 3 and gradually changing Option 1 to 2. There are always trade-offs.
17. What if in Option 1 having different paving every where?
18. What about the new news about having the post offices closed and putting post boxes along the street?
    a. I am not sure there will be on Market.
19. I am a big fan of bike lane and my ideal is Option 2 and 3, even if starting with Option 2, learning from Market and gradually developing Option 3 on Mission. I believe the Better Market Street should concentrate on Market Street.

Station 7. UN Plaza

1. Do outreach to communities specifically. Communities in 5th and 6th streets may need different outreach from communities in UN Plaza.
    a. We acknowledge that. We did flyering about these community meetings.
2. I do not see any black people here (at this workshop), but UN Plaza is 90% black. You should do more targeted outreach.
3. Are you going to have signage for bicyclists?
    a. Any signage that is cyclist specific will be along the cycle track. The wayfinding map that Sarah Dunn from Kate Keating Associates is presenting today is about the pedestrian/transit experience.
4. But cyclists may want to hop on transit.
5. What is happening to the farmers' market?
    a. We are providing space for them.
6. No one will be attracted to UN Plaza if it is just a big space. You need an attraction/retail or meeting space with Wi-Fi. A social hub would be good and it will attract people.
7. We need to think about eliminating parking north of Hyde St.
8. You need to think about the direction of where you want the speakers to project and

people to stand on the stage. Provide the environment; do not leave it too ambiguous.

9. On the maps we need to make it clear where BART stops are, especially because Van Ness Ave. is not a BART stop.
10. What kind of improvements will let the elderly and the disabled participate in the new plaza?
    a. The elevator will be moved to near the café. Also, the transit stops on Market St. are close to the plaza and will bring people into the public space.
11. What about distance versus minutes for wayfinding?
12. The café should also serve beer and wine.
    a. The seating can have a barrier around the café for it to serve alcohol.
13. Servers cannot bring alcohol to people sitting in parklets. I would like service at the café.
14. Where do bikes park? I want to bike to the farmers' market.
    a. Yes, we would look into that.
15. If the area and buildings around the plaza do not function, then how do you activate the area?
    a. The plaza will be a catalyst to activation.
16. I want more than just a café.
    a. The Office of Economic Development is making sure that the surrounding buildings have retail.
17. Get rid of the fountain. A lot of moms with children get chlorinated water on their faces. It will undermine the plaza.
18. The area needs benches because there is nowhere to sit.
19. What wind studies were done? You can build something but it will not make it sunny.
    a. It needs further study as the project evolves. We have not looked at it scientifically. Soil and tree studies will be done to see what kind of landscaping to do.
20. The café idea and the wind do not go well. Barcelona has distinct café architecture. The architecture of this café could be used again and again along Market St. so that it is iconic to Market St. and the streetscape design. You need a rendering of the café to draw people in.
21. Homelessness conflicts with how the space can be designed.
    a. We want to design for everyone. If there are more people then there is more activity. We want the area to feel busy and the new development will help.
22. This area is what it is, but it might evolve.
23. Are the signs going to have an arrow pointing to where the streets are? The grid can be confusing.
    a. Specific messaging is a good idea.
24. What will be this design's impact on the farmers' market?
    a. This plan provides space for that.
25. What is the democratic axis on the board?
    a. Market St. is a street for people.
26. I want trees because the area is so bare.
27. What about permeable pavement?
    a. It is being discussed.
28. Will they be repaving?
    a. Yes.
29. On the board, what does "fountain is too exposed" mean?
    a. We are putting trees around it.
30. The Art Academy can also build something there or put an exhibit, since the space near the fountain is right outside the Art Academy.
31. I am interested in keeping the trees alive without the chlorine water spraying them.
32. You should provide bathrooms for the homeless people.
33. Munich got rid of all public toilets in the street, so businesses had to provide them.
34. Atlanta has installed more public bathrooms.
35. The wayfinding sign should say up top what neighborhood/area you are in.
    a. The sign is not final. You have to think about what kind of information you want to see up close and far away.
36. The map should be oriented in the direction I am walking. It would eliminate the cognitive barrier.
37. Could the fountain be replaced?
    a. No, it is staying put.
38. Kids love water. Out of all the Better Market Street zones, this is the most parent-child

friendly with the museums, plaza and library. So provide a water event/park where they can run around.

39. Kids like rocks and they should be able to interact with the fountain. For example, the fountain could have rocks that kids can pick up.
40. Since we have a lot of civic buildings in the area, could the café play off of that architecture?
    a. Yes, good point.
41. How will the farmers' market access this area?
    a. The café takes up the area of the BART portal, so the farmers' market will still have space.
42. You should provide Wi-Fi in the area.
43. This is the ugliest fountain I have ever seen. It attracts seagulls that poop on you. It is a clunky fountain. Redesign the fountain or get a fountain from Paris.
44. I want to be safe, but if you do all that you are proposing and crime is still happening then I am not going to use the space. Get rid of the behavior in the area.
45. The café should be open late so that the area feels safe late at night. After the Civic Center government buildings close there is nothing to do. This is a problem in every downtown.
46. You need to get people out of their environments, make them have outdoor conferences, especially if there is Wi-Fi.
47. If the area is heavily car-oriented you are not going to feel safe. On a bike it feels safer.
    a. Safety and lighting are important components.
48. Is there bike parking in this area?
    a. Yes, there will be secure and visible bike parking along Market St.
49. How does the Central Subway play into the bike parking? Will your design have to change?
50. Spacing bus stops farther apart is not a good idea. You can take the subway if you want to go fast on transit. Separating local from regional stops is confusing.
51. Move the café somewhere else and have a space that is more inviting. The farmers' market is a little more removed so it would be great if it could be more visible from the street.
52. I would like to see public art.
    a. We could utilize the café wall to put some art.
53. We could project something onto the wall.
54. There are similar maps to this wayfinding map at Civic Center, for example, that are not attractive. I like this one. You can see it from far. I wonder if it is showing too much, however. I just want to orient myself around the surrounding area. Have a more zoomed in map.
55. This is the worst/ugliest fountain ever built. It just sprays.
56. I like the rethinking of the space with seating. It is more attractive. When I think of how to make it more exciting visually and architecturally I always think of the TKTS steps in Times Square night and day. The renderings of this proposal are not inviting. I would like to go bold with the design and have more design elements out of the box. Clean up the space and make it more engaging. I like the seating. Folks are currently forced to sit on the grass and places one is not supposed to sit on. I would like going full steam with the seating.
57. Would tables be there at nighttime?
    a. They are part of the café.
58. Where is BART/Muni access?
    a. Same spot but instead a little shifted.
59. I like the sightline to City Hall. Could seating be reoriented to take advantage of the great view?
    a. Yes, people could have the option to sit there to get the view.
60. It is a cool fountain but it seems like it is doing nothing there.
61. The streets between Market St. and the civic buildings are so ugly and windy. They are voids with hostile sidewalk spaces. Open up the sidewalk spaces to make them more attractive.

Station 8. 9th St to 10th St

1. Question: I'm worried about bicyclists. I want to tame them/make them responsible. I'm concerned about my safety as a pedestrian, especially as I grow older. I want more bicyclist education and think bicyclists should be on Mission Street.
    a. Answer: Good point that we should encourage good bicycle behavior. Hopefully this will create less conflict among modes.
2. Question: What's the difference between Option 1 and 2? Also, I love the pedestrian curb extensions. The shorter crosswalks are also great.
    a. Answer: Curb line changes.
3. How are delivery trucks/paratransit vehicles accessing the sidewalk?
    a. Paratransit will always have access. Delivery trucks shouldn't unload during the peak.
4. Have you looked at other cities with intersections that have roads branching out at 45 degree angles?
    a. Yes, we're looking at it.
5. What is the continuous sidewalk shown in Option 3?
    a. It keeps the grade at sidewalk level for the crosswalk across the alleys.
6. Are no private automobiles allowed on Market?
    a. There's currently a forced right turn on 10th Street. The impact of cars on transit is much lower in this section. We plan to keep the current restrictions.
7. There seems to be no real way to enforce auto restrictions. Maybe use design cues to make people turn right?
    a. You're right – it's a challenge. Having design cues in a good idea.
8. What are those green boxes on the street?
    a. They are bike boxes that provide a waiting space for bicyclists to turn left from Market onto the side streets.
9. What's the difference between the island stops and the curb stops?
    a. Under the rapid plan, the island between 10th and 9th would be removed. We want to pair easy transfers, but sometimes bus stops might be a little farther apart. Wayfinding will definitely come into play to designate stops.
10. When talking about transfers, are you discussing North-South or East-West transfers?
    a. Actually, we're normally talking about underground to street transfers.
11. What sort of analysis is being done with local versus rapid transit? What's the tradeoff?
    a. The advantage of Market is that it has four lanes for transit. We'll look at the number of people on each route and determine whether they are doing short term or long haul rides.
12. Why isn't there a protective median section for pedestrians on the intersection side of a crosswalk? In other words, why isn't the transit median extended past the crosswalk and a little farther into the intersection?
    a. Good point
13. Will no right turn be allowed from Market onto Larkin?
    a. We haven't decided. There aren't many people who make this turn. At this intersection, we decided it was best to give pedestrians priority.
14. Buses will be moved from Mission to Market. How will that affect auto traffic on Market?
    a. There are about 14 buses an hour on Mission. They shouldn't affect traffic on Market very much.
15. Is there space on Market for additional buses?
    a. The proposed islands will be 3 buses long. If Option 3 is chosen, we'll definitely analyze it more to make sure that Market can handle the transit demand.
16. Have you thought of preemptive bike signals?
    a. We definitely will look into it.
17. Why are you taking the buses off Mission in Option 3?
    a. The bike lanes are taking the existing bus transit lane.
18. In the financial district area of Market, the

north side crossings seemed narrowed a lot more than they are for these blocks. It still feels like these crosswalks are really long.
    a. Good point. We're looking at the SOMA streets to try to calm traffic before it even gets to Market. Hopefully that'll make crosswalk the roads a bit more comfortable.
19. People should be compelled to not drive.
    a. We're looking into congestion pricing.
20. Is option 3 our only chance to improve Mission St?
    a. This would definitely be a transformative project for Mission.
21. Does Mission St include traffic signals for bicyclists?
    a. Those will definitely be considered.
22. How do we prevent cars from parking in the bike lane? This happens on Valencia all the time.
    a. We need to get into using self-enforcing designs so that we don't need cops enforcing the rules.
23. Is this going to happen within our lifetime?
    a. I hope so.
24. Comment: I'm inclined to support biking on Market. Biking down Market is a wonderful experience.
25. Comment: Widen the crosswalk across Market at 10th and Fell. Currently the one to the west is far from the intersection.
26. Comment: I like the pedestrian improvements, specifically the curb extensions.
27. Comment: I'm not thrilled with the crosswalk at Hayes and Larkin. That's kind of dangerous for pedestrians. The islands that are currently there give visual cues to the drivers to slow down. I think removing them would send a bad signal to drivers.
28. Comment: Pedestrian refuge islands should always be included.
29. Comment: I love the waiting space for bicyclists who are turning left from Market.
30. Comment: I want a continuous bike lane on Market. Market is my preferred road.
31. Comment: 9th and 10th streets feel like you're crossing a freeway, the cars move so fast.
32. Comment: If traffic is going slower, it feels safer. It allows you to survive if you get hit.
33. Comment: Valencia is timed at 13 MPH, but I still see cars speed up and stop, speed up and stop. (Comment made in response to statement about green wave slowing cars on Mission.)
34. Comment: Mission Street is scary right now for bikes. Sometimes you have to bike in the center lane.
35. Comment: Market Street is more direct. There's more going on.
36. Comment: I think it's all tremendous.
37. Comment: I think bringing bikes to Mission is a great idea.
38. Comment: I think you should phase construction of the project so that Mission is done first. That way, bicyclists will move to Mission while Market is under construction.
39. Comment: I want both – option 2 and 3.
40. Comment: Market provides easier access for bikes. And Mission is less interesting.
41. Comment: I will only ride in a protected bike lane.
42. Comment: Mission has big office buildings that aren't interesting at street level. There is no change in building style.
43. Comment: The plans for Mission show the parking gone. At the very last minute, the city always makes you keep the parking in. I don't know if I can trust that Option 3 would happen as currently shown.
44. Comment: Businesses in downtown SF need to realize that their customers take transit or walk to get there.
45. Comment: I love the curb extensions for pedestrians.

D. Online Comments

July 16, 2013:

•I plan to attend the July 17 workshop to learn more about this exciting project. Thanks!

•I really hope some kind of effort can be made to encourage small local business growth. Me and many others don't want any more Starbucks, McDonalds, Carl's and other type businesses around anymore. They are unhealthy for local businesses, unhealthy for the people who consume their products, and unhealthy for the environment at large. Restrictions on any more businesses like this would be great.

•Please do not make Market Street more inviting to homeless junkies and drug dealers. I attended that workshop at Parc 55 hotel and it seems a lot of the guys working on this project don't even live in San Francisco. WE have a serious problem of junkies and panhandlers. We need solutions! I'm not saying we should turn it into Disneyland either... Everyone knows what Time Square in NYC turned into after Mayer Gulianni and his (mob boss attitude) turned that city upside down. Just have some realistic sense of the spirit of this city.

•I'm writing as a citizen, not a government employee. I attended the workshop tonight - lots of great thinking. Except! Removing local Muni service from Mission is a serious mistake unless (somehow) 2-way local service were instituted on Howard. With existing ridership, plus the TCDP, Central Corridor, all the Mid-Market developments, 5M, etc, it would be criminal to remove E/W local buses between Market and Folsom/Harrison -- over 2,500 feet, or half a mile -- particularly for people with disabilities (including people like me who do not appear to have disabilities but have serious joint pain) and rely exclusively on public transportation to live in this wonderful City. Don't make the mistake of promising the Mission Street alternative without an EIR or at least some further transit analysis. Thanks.

•My name is Alan Ashbaugh, and I work at Fitbit at 160 Spear St. I'm writing to urge you to support separated bike lanes on Market St. I believe strongly that separated bike lanes on Market St. is the best path forward to make our city more bike-friendly, and I know many of my Fitbit colleagues and other young professionals in the many tech firms along Market St. feel the same way. I live in Oakland, and I'm in San Francisco every day with my bicycle. My bicycle is my primary form of transportation, and I do not own a car, like a number of my Fitbit colleagues. I bike down Market Street 2-3 days a week heading to the Mission and my friend's office (HackReactor) near Powell. The recent improvements for bicycles on Market St. (more separated bike lanes, painted green) have improved my travel from work to social engagements elsewhere in San Francisco. The improvements have made me feel much, much safer on Market St. I have told coworkers who do not bicycle in the city (due to safety concerns) about the improvements in hopes of convincing them to commute to work via bicycle, as many live in the Mission. However, biking on Market St. is still too scary for the average young city person, it turns out. It doesn't have to be this way! I believe that separated bike lanes on Market St. will 1) encourage a whole new wave of bike commuters (who previously thought it too dangerous) traveling to the many tech companies and startups in Fi-Di and in the Powell/Civic Center area. I also think it will 2) provide a safe route into the heart of San Francisco for tourists who rent bicycles, who are currently relegated to the embarcadero, and have nowhere else to go that they feel safe, and no way to safely bike to the shops/tourist destinations along Market St. I ask you to please do what you can to make biking, walking and transit an inviting and comfortable option on Market Street. The safety improvements for people biking on Market Street cannot wait any longer. Please ensure the Better Market Street project includes bicycle improvements to Market Street and ensure that the city continues to make near-term improvements by repairing and upgrading the existing bikeway between 8th Street and Octavia, installing dense green sharrows on Market Street between 8th Street and the Embarcadero, and retiming lights to better serve transit, bicycling and walking throughout the corridor. Sincerely, Alan Ashbaugh Website Producer, Fitbit

•Market Street needs to be having affordable housings.

July 18, 2013:

•I think that the private car bans should be 24/7. Drivers waiting until 7p to speed home on Market is a scary thought. What possible urban design or safety goal does a working hours only van serve?

•Bike lanes and wider sidewalks are a must for all streetscape designs going forward. People in wheelchairs also benefit from wider sidewalks too.

•We need to make Market St a desirable destination for people to go and spend time in. Use "The Magnificant Mile" on Michigan Ave in Chicago as a model. It is a beautiful, vibrate, desirable street to walk, sightsee, and shop.

•Please do add some wind breaks, especially at the intersections of Market/Van Ness and Market/10th Street. The wind tunnels sometimes stop me in my tracks, and I cannot breathe without cupping my hands over my mouth. Not sure what you can do about the strongest winds in the middle of a crosswalk, though.

•Whatever scenario you decide on I would maximize the pedestrian experience over the bike experience & definitely over the auto experience.

•I participated in last night's workshop and I need to email my survey. The person at registration it was also on this site as well. What would be the best email address to send this to? Thanks, Paul Valdez

•Looking to stay informed on all of the above! Thanks.

•During commute hours cars always run red lights and block crosswalks on Van Ness and Market, and Hyde and Market. Measures need to be taken to protect pedestrians and calm traffic.

•I walk down Market Street everyday and the amount of public urination and defecation that occurs is out of control. Whole blocks of Market Street smell like open sewers. Public bathrooms need to be added to any Market Street improvement plan. No one will ever want to voluntarily walk down market to go shopping or participate in leisure activities as long as large portions Market Street are filthy.

July 19, 2013:

•My FACEBOOK STATUS TODAY: This morning's commute was tough. Many service trucks were blocking the bike lane on Market Street, causing cyclists to veer left, dangerously crossing over the MUNI tracks and in MUNI's path. The cyclist in front me got her tires caught in the tracks and she fell pretty hard. To my surprise, no one stopped to see if she was alright. So I did. I immediately stopped the MUNI bus that was rapidly heading our way to help her up. She was pretty shaken up, so I told her to rest on the curb as I looked at and fixed her bike as well. I sat and talked with her and ended up walking with her for the rest of the way until she was calm. I hope the rest of her day goes ok...

•The first part of any plan for a Better Market must start with "No Cars On Market Street" between Octavia and Embarcadero. Does anyone know how many people currently reside on Market between Octavia and the Embarcadero? What % of them are low-income long-time residents who will be displaced by these plans? Low-income housing and a couple of full-service food cooperatives are needed in these neighborhoods. How could anyone dream of putting more bus traffic on Market St.? In fact, all lines should turn around at Market, and the "F" line expanded to handle the traffic. Howard and Folsom are the natural alternatives for rerouted vehicular traffic. Pedestrians and cyclists need toilets and water in those "street life zones." If you want an urban forest, plant one. All landscaping should be native trees, shrubs, and plants. Civic Center Plaza should be turned into a demonstration organic food and native plant garden with a year-round farmers and crafts marketplace. This will free up the UN and Justin Herman/Ferry Plaza's for their intended purpose: pedestrian walkways. I like the idea

of demonstration organic food and native plant garden with a year-round farmers and crafts marketplace. This will free up the UN and Justin Herman/Ferry Plaza's for their intended purpose: pedestrian walkways. I like the idea of bringing Hallidae Plaza to Street level, as well as making Mission Street a bike highway.

•Hi There! I just want to say that from my experience, biking on Market Street is made most difficult by the busses and tracks. The buses are pretty wide so it is very hard to get around them and you can't easily pass them in another lane as there are tracks down the center of the street. I believe the best solution is for a separated cycle track on Mission. 11th street can be utilized as a way for cyclists to get back onto Market near Van Ness and continue west on Market where it's much less chaotic. Cyclists can also use 11th street to access the Mission and points south as well. All that's needed is a way for cyclists to get onto 11th street from Market when they are heading east. Banning car traffic from Van Ness to Embarcadero during commuting times should help should cyclists choose to take Market street but Mission is a much more straightforward ride and the lights could be timed so it would actually be quicker. Thanks for your consideration.

•The workshop was useful. The following will be my scoping type comments (instead of filling out your form) as Better Market moves on to Environmental review, along with a few suggestions while the basic planning proceeds: 1) Transit First Market Street: It is important that every change to transit service actually result in faster rides, which reduce Muni operating cost or allow Muni to provide additional service where needed while providing riders with an improved transit experience. a) The project should study impacts on each line with additional service ie shorter headways based on Muni's projected 50% increase in ridership and San Francisco's expected population increases, even though projects and funding have not been identified. The study should consider that as head ways are decreased that a queuing theory analyst may indicate the possibility of severe bunching and reduced reliability. I am aware that EIRs are generally only based on expected future impacts on the environment but Market Street is major component of SF Transit and it will be conservative to base this study on probable future transit developments based on: demographic trends; climate change requirement; growth; congestion avoidance and other issues. At a minimum, the impacts of maximum transit should be studied in parallel with expected transit levels. b) The study should consider the possibility of some riders transferring and that every line doesn't have to run the entire length of Market Street or even to the Bus Terminal. This may be a method to reduce costs and a requirement to improve reliability during peak hours. This may require that the Market Street project provide a method for a bus to easily leave Market Street or even stop just short of Market while meeting the requirements below. The study for this project should be mindful of the Metro "melt down" and that headway and service time problems on the surface cannot be solved with better automatic train control and that automatic driving controls with not be capable of meeting the demands of Muni and Muni riders on Market Street for many generations. Muni surface riders should have to struggle with melt down service. c) The increased distance between Limited Line center running stops can be a good way to increase speed, but the first stop, on Market, for every inbound line should be near a Metro entrance to facilitate riders transferring to Metro to go outbound or going down to BART. Every Limited stop need not be adjacent to a Metro stop. This should allow for optimum stop locations for the other Limited stops. d) Shorter distances between Local side running stops will be necessary for those who may have difficulty walking long distances. A Local stop should located near the first Limited Line stop on Market to allow near "cross platform" transfers for those who find it most convenient to come downtown on a Limited but have difficulty walking long distances to their destination. e) The project should provide an additional "cross walk" to long boarding islands, through bicycle and mixed traffic

and rider convenience with a designated "J walking" zone. f) The reliability impacts of shifting the Mission Street Lines to Market, Option 3, should be studied similar to b) above. If the study shows that the additional buses will have an impact on the reliability of the existing and/or probable increased bus service on Market than Option 3 should be considered as having a Fatal Flaw and be dropped from further consideration. g) The boarding islands and side running waiting areas should have signs showing which bus will come to which position on the island so that riders can move genteelly to their bus. The street near stops and the stops should have next bus information to help out bound riders select where they will wait when either a Local or Limited will useful for them. Other riders may choose to walk if the wait is too long. 2) Other Amenities: a) The project should consider improvements beyond Market Street at UN Plaza and Van Ness. Here, transit users exiting by the main escalator from the Civic Center Metro/BART Station heading toward the Opera House or Symphony will have no opportunity to eat or drink until they reach their destination. Those who exit at Grove Street will have a good choice while those exiting the Van Ness Station can purchase a Subway sandwich. This is not appropriate for a world class City. Meanwhile those who drive to the area will have many choices in the reenergized area created when we tore down the freeway. It should be possible to provide some food and drink sites between Market and the Opera House without building permanent structures in public open space. A small part of the many public buildings in the Civic Center might be better used to generate some income for the City while ser

•Market Street: The sidewalks, particularly between 4th and 5th, are wide and used heavily. The best buffer from motor traffic would be dedicated narrow bike lines near the sidewalks. Throughout the city I see the dedicated bike lanes to be most effective and easiest to understand by motorists and bikers alike. Certain ideas are still in flux but the reworking of the section of Market east of Van Ness to 10th street makes more sense now though it can still be nerve racking with the bicycle cross over lane. Mission Street: Leave the 14/14L the way it is. Again, dedicated bike lines make everything easier for motorists and bikers. The section between 4th and 5th will be tricky. The south side sidewalk is a bit narrow and needs to be expanded. The entrance to the parking garage can cause further issues. The parking garage entrance should be moved to the back alley. Once that is achieved the dedicated bike lane on the south, going east, would work well for all. I have more ideas but these are two to add to your review.

<u>July 20, 2013:</u>

•You should ask the people who play chess on Market if they would like permanent tables and solicit suggestions for how they should look...poor and working class people should not be an afterthought of a "better" Market Street plan. Thanks.

•Please keep Market St. as our major bike thoroughfare. Please do not route us to Mission St. Thanks.

•Good presentation today. Incorporating Mission Street (Option 3) seems best to me. It is critical to consider transportation needs of evening/nighttime arts/hospitality economy, which will be growing dramatically over the coming years. In general this may entail accommodating more cars than in the daytime economy. UN Plaza fountain is a disaster and should be removed. Otherwise it will undermine all other efforts to reinvent this public space. There should not be a "canopy" tree effect as was referenced in today's presentation. Mid-Market will get a height-increase. Adding a canopy will result in further darkening a problematically menacing street. There should be clear sight lines with tree species selection and planting schemes tending toward minimalism. Lastly, the current double row scheme creates a sense of chaos and is a public safety liability.

<u>July 21, 2013:</u>

•Why can't the mission street option (#3) be combined with option #2 on Market Street?

•Market St is the front yard for many elderly and disabled people who live along the street or in the Tenderloin. The notion of decreasing the number of Muni stops on Market St will have a very negative effect on these people. Many cannot walk the additional distance to catch a bus or trolley; in fact, many only ride a block or so, and if the number of Muni stops is decreased, they will not be able to ride the bus at all. To decrease the number of stops, if the buses come more frequently, is to discriminate against the elderly and disabled. Does SF really want to get itself into law suit after law suit on this issue?

July 22, 2013:

•Am a long-time resident of the Tenderloin, and would like to see the entire area made much, much, much more human-centric and not based on automobiles and the shitty inhumanity of sheer capitalism.

•Failure to address the pedestrian safety at intersections of 8th, 6, 4 & 1rst Streets w/ Market in unethical. The omission of raised crosswalks for pedestrians is negligence that opens SF to lawsuits. The act of bias of SFMTA, DPW & Dept of Planning for not considering accommodations in the workshops nor the 3 options to PWD as pedestrians in plan is unethical.

July 23, 2013:

•Hope you'll look to Berlin, a great example of a city where they've integrated bicycling into the city and culture very recently and at relatively low cost. I especially like how the bicycles there are often to the right of cars so that they don't have as much interaction, are raised up on the curb next to the pedestrians rather than the cars, and have colored sections of the sidewalk with a small divider to make it clear where the bikes belong vs. where the people belong. Really I'd prefer to see all car traffic rerouted to Mission St. And while we're at it, how about a few beer gardens and outdoor cafes with deep, extensive outdoor seating?

July 26, 2013:

•It is insane to allow any cars on Market St. between Van Ness and the Embarcadero. We must do more to make our citizens (including me) less dependent on cars. Have you not heard of global warming?

July 27, 2013:

•I received a link to the July materials for Market Street, but do not see how to complete the survey. I'm sending this to let you know that I strongly prefer option number three. Thanks

July 28, 2013:

•Dear Planners, I am impressed that all three options aim to improve the experience for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders by reducing the number of private automobiles. Thank you for your forward-thinking plans!
I prefer Option 3, that is, Option1 plus Mission St separated bikeway. Option 3 enables more bike traffic to absorb future demand. It would be awesome to have a fully separated bikeway along Mission St for fast bike through traffic. Market St. would remain as a good alternative for those needing to be on Market or for people who prefer to ride more slowly. Option 3/1 includes improvements on Market that would make passing buses easier than today. Naturally it would be great to have a separated bikeway on Market St, too, but I see problems with Option 2 as it stands today: 1. It narrows the sidewalks. 2. The larger bus medians have pedestrian crosswalks mid-block that cross the bike lane. This will slow down bike traffic and could lead to bike/pedestrian conflicts. 3. There is a dangerous gap in the separated bikeway around 4th St (one area where the sidewalks won't be narrowed).
4. For those who want to go fast, they'll be forced into narrow lanes with buses (unlike Option 3/1 where the lanes are five feet wider than today). Thank you for your outreach to the public and for accepting public input. Best regards, Shirley Johnson, PhD

August 2, 2013:

•Make Market Street one-way going toward the Bay. Eliminate on-street parking on one side of the street and use this for a safe bicycle lane. The parking lane on the opposite side of the street is to be used for buses, para-transit, shared taxis, and service vehicles. Retain off-street parking for those whose needs are not met through public transport or alternatives. Gradually replicate this process citywide and include bike boulevards. Transform some garages into bicycle parking facilities. The public is ready and asking for shared ride alternatives.

August 10, 2013:

•Please work with the Art-Ecology people to bring more knowledge of natural habitats to Market Street. Make the Western Tiger Swallowtail a natural tourist attraction and support its habitat. Adaptation as a symbol of urban renewal. Thanks.

August 12, 2013:

•Biking regularly on both Mission and Market, I can really say this isn't an either/or scenario. Market is the primary corridor and really needs the protected cycle tracks that it's importance would make one expect. Mission, on the other hand, should provide a separated, shared bus/bike lane in either direction â€" this would provide a safe, protected place for bikes, and better unencumbered movement for transit.

August 15, 2013:

•Concerned transit user

August 18, 2013:

•The poor factors of accessibility to people with disabilities in the complete lack of APS and the narrow width of the cycletrack is reprehensible. The 3 bike focused plans will subject you to class-action lawsuits from the Disability Rights Advocates. They represented a plaintiff with a disability & won a unanimous ruling of the Supreme Court against the state of Illinois in 1996 for the bias against people with disabilities.

E. Agenda

Agenda

	Parc 55	Main Library
Open house	6 - 6:15pm	10 - 10:15am
Presentation	6:15 - 7:00pm	10:15 - 11am
Exhibit stations review & comments	7 - 8:20pm	11am - 12:20pm
Meeting close	8:20 - 8:30pm	12:20 - 12:30pm

Program

Station 1: Three options and OWLs
Proposals for three different design and transportation options. The options are also represented in a 3-D viewfinder.

Station 2: Market Street - Six districts
Help us create unique identities for Market Street's six districts - be creative!

Stations 3-8: Representative blocks & plazas
Conceptual designs for four blocks of Market and Mission Streets, illustrating the three design options, two plazas and two examples of proposed wayfinding signage.

3 - 1st Street to 2nd Street
4 - 3rd Street to 4th Street
5 - Hallidie Plaza & wayfinding at Stockton and Market
6 - 6th Street to 7th Street & 5th Street to 6th Street
7 - UN Plaza & wayfinding at Larkin Street and Market Street
8 - 9th Street to 10th Street

F. Workshop flyer

BETTER MARKET STREET

more inviting. more inclusive. more livable.

You told us what you wanted for a better Market Street. Now we want to know what you think about different options to transform the way we spend time and move along this important street and the surrounding districts.

Imagine Market Street as a world-class, vibrant public place from Octavia Boulevard all the way to the Embarcadero. Join the conversation.

workshops (pre-registration encouraged)

Wednesday, July 17
6-8:30pm
Parc 55 Hotel, Ballroom, 4th floor
55 Cyril Magnin St @ 5th & Market

Saturday, July 20
10am-12:30pm
Main Library, Koret Auditorium
100 Larkin Street

webinar

Thursday, July 18
12-1:00pm
Register at:
bettermarketstreetsf.org

bettermarketstreetsf.org

The meeting location is accessible to persons using wheelchairs and others with disabilities. Assistive listening devices, materials in alternative formats, American Sign Language interpreters and other accommodations can be made available upon request by calling (415) 554-4829 at least 72 hours in advance.

SFMTA · SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT · SAN FRANCISCO

311 Free language assistance