

1 [Bicycle Plan adoption and related General Plan amendments.]

2
3 **Ordinance re-adopting the 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Transportation Plan; rescinding**
4 **Ordinance No. 0109-05 in its entirety; amending the San Francisco General Plan in**
5 **connection with the San Francisco Bicycle Plan; adopting modified environmental**
6 **findings and findings that the General Plan amendment is consistent with the General**
7 **Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1; and authorizing official**
8 **acts in connection thereto.**

9 NOTE: Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman;
10 deletions are ~~strike-through italics Times New Roman~~.
11 Board amendment additions are double-underlined;
12 Board amendment deletions are ~~strike-through normal~~.

12 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

13 Section 1. General Findings and Purpose. The Board of Supervisors of the City and
14 County of San Francisco hereby finds and determines that:

15 (a) In June 2005, the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and San Francisco
16 Municipal Transportation Agency took various actions related to the Bicycle Plan: A Policy
17 Framework ("2005 Bicycle Plan"). Those actions were successfully challenged in California
18 Superior Court Case No. 505509 on environmental grounds and the Superior Court issued an
19 injunction prohibiting the City from undertaking a variety of actions related to the 2005 Bicycle
20 Plan and bicycle facilities and directed the City to perform adequate environmental analysis
21 on the 2005 Bicycle Plan in accordance with the requirements of California Public Resources
22 Code Sections 21000 et seq. ("CEQA").

23 (b) On February 3, 2005, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public
24 hearing on the proposed amendments to the General Plan in relation to the 2005 Bicycle
25 Plan. Following such hearing, the Planning Commission, by Resolution No. 16942 and

1 Motion No. 16943 found such amendments to the General Plan to be consistent with the
2 Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 and with the General Plan as it was proposed
3 for amendment, approved such General Plan amendments, and recommended such
4 amendments for approval by the Board of Supervisors. Such resolution and motion are on file
5 with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 050349.

6 (c) On June 25, 2009, in Resolution No 17914, the Planning Commission rescinded
7 Resolution No. 16942 and Motion No. 16943.

8 (d) On June 25, 2009, in Resolution 17912, the Planning Commission certified an
9 environmental impact report prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality
10 Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq., which certification was affirmed
11 by the Board of Supervisors in Motion M09-136. Also on June 25, 2009, the Planning
12 Commission, in Resolution 17914, recommended the adoption of General Plan Amendments
13 related to the 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Plan, and in Resolution 17913, adopted
14 environmental findings and a statement of overriding consideration in support of the General
15 Plan Amendments.

16 (e) On June 26, 2009, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, in
17 Resolution 09-105, adopted the 2009 Bicycle Plan and adopted environmental findings
18 including a statement of overriding considerations.

19 (e) On August 12, 2009, the Mayor of San Francisco signed into law Ordinance 188-
20 09, which adopted the General Plan Amendments recommended by the Planning
21 Commission in Resolution 17914, and incorporated by reference the environmental findings
22 and statement of overriding considerations adopted in Planning Commission Resolution
23 17913 and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Director's Resolution 09-
24 105.

1 (f) On January 14, 2013, in *Anderson v. City and County of San Francisco*, A129910,
2 the California Court of Appeal found that the environmental impact report for the 2009 Bicycle
3 Plan complied with CEQA in all respects. However, the Court also found that the City failed to
4 make a handful of environmental findings required by CEQA relating to the infeasibility of
5 alternatives and significant environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated.

6 (g) The purpose of this Ordinance is to adopt environmental findings modified to
7 address the Court of Appeal's concerns, and in doing so re-adopt the 2009 Bicycle Plan and
8 the General Plan Amendments previously adopted in Ordinance 188-09.

9 Section 2. Environmental Findings. In accordance with the actions contemplated
10 herein, this Board adopts as its own the modified environmental findings of the San Francisco
11 Municipal Transportation Agency in Resolution 13-054, and the Planning Commission in
12 Resolution _____, including a statement of overriding benefits and a mitigation
13 monitoring and reporting program, pursuant to CEQA. Said findings are on file with the Clerk
14 of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____ and are incorporated by reference herein.

15 Section 3. General Plan Findings.

16 (a) City Charter Section 4.105 requires that the San Francisco Planning Commission
17 (the "Planning Commission") consider any proposed amendments to the City's General Plan
18 and make a recommendation for approval or rejection to the Board of Supervisors before the
19 Board of Supervisors acts on the proposed amendments.

20 (b) The 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Plan ("2009 Bicycle Plan") proposes text
21 amendments and map amendments to the Transportation Element and Downtown Plan of the
22 City and County of San Francisco General Plan. The General Plan text amendments and
23 description of the General Plan map amendments, which were previously adopted in
24 Ordinance 188-09, are contained in this Ordinance for their re-adoption. The General Plan
25 maps proposed for amendment are attached to this Ordinance and incorporated herein by

1 reference. Copies of said maps are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File
2 No. _____ and are incorporated herein by reference.

3 (c) The Board of Supervisors finds that this Ordinance is in conformity with the Priority
4 Policies of Section 101.1 of the Planning Code and, on balance, consistent with the General
5 Plan as it is proposed for amendment herein, and hereby adopts the findings set forth in
6 Planning Commission Resolution No. _____ and incorporates such findings by
7 reference as if fully set forth herein.

8 (d) This Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, finds that this
9 ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in
10 Planning Commission Resolution No. _____.

11 Section 4. Findings concerning the 2009 Bicycle Transportation Plan. The Board of
12 Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby further finds and determines that:

13 (a) California Streets and Highways Code Sections 890 et seq. is known as the
14 California Bicycle Transportation Act (the "Bicycle Transportation Act"). Section 891.2 of
15 Bicycle Transportation Act provides for the preparation or update of a bicycle transportation
16 plan by a city or county in accordance with certain criteria.

17 (b) Section 891.4 of the Bicycle Transportation Act establishes a process for a city or
18 county to obtain funding from the State Bicycle Transportation Account for complying bicycle
19 transportation plans. In order to be eligible to apply for such funds and many other funds and
20 grants, cities and counties must have an approved bicycle plan or certify that an existing plan
21 has been updated.

22 (c) The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) prepared the 2009
23 Bicycle Plan in compliance with the requirements of the abovementioned Bicycle
24 Transportation Act. The 2009 Bicycle Plan is on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No.
25 090868 and is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth herein.

1 (d) On June 26, 2009, at a duly noticed public hearing, the MTA Board of Directors
2 adopted Resolution No. 09-105, which, among other actions, approved the 2009 Bicycle Plan
3 and recommend approval to this Board of Supervisors. Said Resolution is on file with the
4 Clerk of the Board in File No. 090868 and is incorporated herein by reference as though fully
5 set forth herein. On May 7, 2013, the MTA Board of Directors adopted Resolution No. 13-
6 054, which, among other actions, re-approved the 2009 Bicycle Plan with environmental
7 findings as modified to address the California Court of Appeal's concerns as expressed in
8 *Anderson v. City and County of San Francisco*, A129910. Said Resolution is on file with the
9 Clerk of the Board in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by reference as though
10 fully set forth herein.

11 Section 5. Rescission of Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 0109-05. The Board of
12 Supervisors hereby rescinds in its entirety Ordinance No. 0109-05, Clerk of the Board of
13 Supervisors File No. 050349.

14 Section 6. Amendments to the General Plan. Sections, objectives, policies, and maps
15 of the Transportation Element of the San Francisco General Plan are hereby amended to read
16 as follows:

17 **TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT**

18 **HISTORY OF TRANSPORTATION IN SAN FRANCISCO**

19 The Freeway Revolt and "Transit First" (1960-1989)

20 City residents and politicians protested the proposed 1948 Trafficways Plan, fearing
21 that it would destroy the city's livability and character. This response, known as the "Freeway
22 Revolt", led to the deletion of the Western, Park Presidio and Crosstown freeways and, in
23 1959, the suspension in mid-construction of both the Embarcadero and Central Freeways.
24 The ugliness and intrusiveness of these freeways, and the increased automobile traffic they
25 attracted, encouraged the Board of Supervisors to further reject new alternatives in 1966 for

1 cross-town freeway connections, permitting only the construction of the Southern Freeway
2 (I-280).

3 Instead of relying on freeways to meet its transportation needs, the city sought to place
4 greater emphasis on mass transportation. In 1973, the San Francisco City Planning
5 Commission and Board of Supervisors adopted the "Transit First Policy", giving top priority to
6 public transit investments as the centerpiece of the city's transportation policy and adopting
7 street capacity and parking policies to discourage increases in automobile traffic. This policy
8 encourages multi-modalism, including the use of transit and other transportation choices, including
9 bicycling and walking, rather than the continued use of the single-occupant vehicle.

10 Regional and local mass transit diversified and expanded during the 1970's and
11 1980's. Proposed in 1957, the Bay Area Rapid Transit System (BART) began East Bay and
12 West Bay service in 1972-3, and transbay service in 1974. Commuter ferry service was
13 reinstated between Marin County and San Francisco in 1970. The Golden Gate Bridge
14 Highway and Transit District and SamTrans took over and expanded the Greyhound
15 commuter bus operations in the North Bay (1972) and on the Peninsula (1974), respectively.
16 In 1980, the California Department of Transportation took over the Southern Pacific commuter
17 rail service on the Peninsula (and renamed it CalTrain), and in 1992 the operation of CalTrain
18 was assumed by a Joint Powers Board representing San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa
19 Clara Counties. The San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) upgraded its surface streetcar
20 operation to a surface and subway light-rail network in 1979. By the time of the 1989 Loma
21 Prieta Earthquake, public transportation in San Francisco was a diverse, though not
22 seamlessly coordinated, system of regional and local bus service, electric trolley buses,
23 ferries, commuter trains, heavy and light rail transit, and cable cars. After decades of poor
24 coordination and large service gaps between different transit systems, great strides were
25 made in linking and facilitating transfers between local and regional transit services. Muni and

1 BART introduced the "Fast Pass" allowing unlimited trips and free transfers between the two
2 systems for trips made in San Francisco during one month. Plans were drawn for the Muni
3 Metro extension to Mission Bay, connecting CalTrain to Muni Metro and BART, and for the F-
4 line connection between BART/Muni Metro, Upper Market, the Northern Waterfront, the
5 Transbay Terminal and the Ferry Building.

6 Nevertheless, decentralization of the Bay Area continued, making it difficult for mass
7 transit to meet the needs of residents and commuters traveling to the outlying, suburban parts
8 of the region. Manufacturing continued to diminish in importance as a sector of San
9 Francisco's economy, which was becoming more dominated by such office sectors as
10 finance, administration and service. Much of the growth in the industrial and manufacturing
11 sectors of the Bay Area's economy occurred in the East and South Bay. The Port of Oakland,
12 already at an advantage because of its proximity to multiple railheads and servers, assumed a
13 greater share of the Bay Area's waterfront traffic after it had adapted to cargo containerization,
14 and the Port of San Francisco's Belt Line Railroad became obsolete and was eventually
15 dismantled."

16 **GENERAL**

17 POLICY 1.6: Ensure choices among modes of travel and accommodate each mode
18 when and where it is most appropriate.

19 San Francisco and the Bay Area have various means of travel: automobile, bus,
20 streetcar, walking, taxi, cable car, ferry, railroad, BART and bicycling. Flying is occasionally
21 used as a means of intra-regional travel. Each mode of travel has special advantages or
22 disadvantages for certain types of trips and for certain origins and destinations. The least
23 costly or most convenient means to satisfy travel demand is not necessarily the best
24 investment in the context of comprehensive planning: cost or convenience must usually be
25 balanced against effects on the environment and impact on land use and development

1 patterns. However, it should be remembered that some modes such as walking and bicycling can be
2 utilized on many streets with minimal environmental and land use impact.

3 The following conditions listed under each mode choice are not mutually exclusive, and
4 may apply to more than one travel mode, especially when the modes are compatible with
5 each other:

6 Mass transit should be given priority for the following kinds of trips and/or in the
7 described areas:

8 For work trips generally within and to San Francisco, and to other densely
9 developed parts of the region, especially to all major employment centers.

10 For intercity trips between core areas of major cities and for travel to core areas
11 in general.

12 For trips occurring generally during periods of high travel demands.

13 Where demand for travel between any two or more relatively compact or
14 densely developed areas is high.

15 In areas and around institutions where large numbers of people with limited
16 means or low automobile ownership reside or arrive at a destination.

17 Where travel demand exceeds the capacity of an area to absorb more vehicular
18 traffic without substantial environmental damage or where further capacity for automobile
19 movement or storage is very costly.

20 Where required or useful to stimulate development.

21 For trips to major recreation areas and to sports, cultural and other heavily
22 attended events.

23 For trips to neighborhood commercial districts, especially those that do not
24 contain many automobile-oriented uses.

1 Automobiles should be accommodated for making the following kinds of trips and/or in
2 the described areas:

3 For trips occurring when and where transit is not well-suited for the purpose,
4 such as shopping for oversized or bulk items (as an alternative, retail delivery services should
5 be encouraged.)

6 For intra-regional trips outside the major cities and for intercity trips between
7 non-core areas of the major cities.

8 Where business travel requires the use of an automobile for short-term and
9 intermittent trips.

10 On streets having the capacity to absorb additional vehicular traffic as an
11 alternative to freeway construction without substantial environmental damage or conflict with
12 land uses.

13 Walking should be given priority for the following kinds of trips and/or in the specified
14 areas:

15 In parks, on trails and in other recreational areas, and where the enjoyment of
16 slow movement and the preservation of the natural environment would be severely
17 compromised by automobile traffic.

18 For work trips generally within San Francisco, especially the downtown area.

19 Where concentration of activity is high, particularly where streets are narrow and
20 the intervening distances are short, that more convenient access among interrelated activities
21 may be achieved by walking or limited distance people-movers than by other modes.

22 In areas and around institutions where large numbers of people with limited
23 means or low automobile ownership reside or arrive as a destination.

1 Where travel demand exceeds the capacity of an area to absorb more vehicular
2 traffic without substantial environmental damage or where further capacity for automobile
3 movement or storage is very costly.

4 In neighborhood commercial districts, and where cultural and recreational
5 facilities are clustered.

6 Surrounding transit centers and along transit preferential streets, where the
7 facilitation of pedestrian traffic is necessary to successful and safe transit operation.

8 Bicycling should be given priority for the following kinds of trips and/or in the specified
9 areas:

10 In parks, on trails, on roads of particular scenic beauty, and in other recreational
11 areas, and where the enjoyment of slow movement and the preservation of the natural
12 environment would be severely compromised by automobile traffic.

13 For work trips generally within San Francisco, especially the downtown and other
14 dense areas, where automobile parking is scarce.

15 Where concentration of activity is high, particularly where streets are narrow and
16 the intervening distances are short, that more convenient access among interrelated activities
17 may be achieved by bicycling.

18 ~~In areas and around institutions where~~ Where large numbers of people with limited
19 means or low automobile ownership reside or arrive as a destination.

20 ~~Where travel demand exceeds the capacity of an area to absorb more vehicular traffic~~
21 ~~without substantial environmental damage or where further capacity for automobile movement or~~
22 ~~storage is very costly.~~

23 In neighborhood commercial districts, and where cultural and recreational facilities are
24 clustered.

25 For trips to sports, cultural and other heavily attended events.

1 As a connector to and from transit, especially regional transit.

2 Along the alignment of the regional Bay Trail network linking shoreline recreational
3 destinations.

4 Taxis, water taxis, paratransit services and shuttles should be accommodated for the
5 following kinds of trips and/or in the specified areas:

6 Where there are concentrations of off-peak, nighttime commercial, recreational
7 and cultural activity, particularly where that activity attracts a large proportion of tourists and is
8 within a 5-minute taxi ride from Downtown.

9 Shopping trips where the volume of purchased goods would make the use of
10 public transit inconvenient or difficult.

11 In residential areas, or near facilities and institutions where the facilitation of
12 door-to-door trips is an absolute priority.

13 Adjacent to regional transit connection points.

14 Where the mode, such as a water taxi, affords a trip of special scenic quality.

15 Freight carriers and delivery vehicles should be accommodated for making the
16 following kinds of trips and/or in the described areas:

17 Where there are concentrations of industrial and manufacturing facilities that
18 depend on the processing, delivery and/or shipment of large quantities of goods and freight.

19 For the bulk movement of refuse and other materials which would become a
20 nuisance and health hazard if stored or accumulated on site.

21 For the loading and unloading of goods and freight at retail and commercial
22 establishments.

23 At the transfer points where bulk equipment, goods and freight exchange modes
24 of travel, such as where land and water freight traffic interface.

1 □ Along rail or truck routes specifically needed to accommodate the movement,
2 both local and inter-regional, of the activities described above.

3 In areas suited for the storage of bulk equipment, goods and freight.

4 **REGIONAL**

5 POLICY 3.1: The existing capacity of the bridges, highways and freeways entering the
6 city should not be increased for single-occupant vehicles, and should be reduced where
7 possible. Changes, retrofits, or replacements to existing bridges and highways should include
8 dedicated priority for high-occupancy vehicles and transit, and all bridges, where feasible, should
9 feature access for bicyclists and pedestrians.

10 Much of the existing street infrastructure and parking facilities within San Francisco are
11 at capacity and cannot accommodate significant increases in automobile traffic. Managing the
12 future transportation demand requires a balancing of travel modes, including a greater
13 emphasis on public transit, ride-sharing, and other alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles.
14 Congestion pricing on key freeways and bridges should be implemented to help achieve this
15 end.

16 POLICY 4.6: Facilitate transfers between different transit modes and services by
17 establishing simplified and coordinated fares and schedules, *and by* employing design and
18 technology features to make transferring more convenient, and increasing accommodation of
19 bicycles on transit.

20 Examples include providing links between transit platforms so that connections can be
21 made directly, with a minimum of walking and entry/exit of fare areas. Monitors that announce
22 arrivals, departures and the progress of transit vehicles and orientation maps should be
23 installed to ease the uncertainty and anxiety of waiting passengers.

1 Expanded peak-hour bicycle capacity and reduced peak-hour bicycle time restrictions would
2 encourage bicycling to and from transit at one or both ends of the transit trip – an attractive choice to
3 driving alone. This extends the range and convenience of both the transit and the bicycle modes.

4 POLICY 6.1: Designate expeditious routes for freight trucks between industrial and
5 commercial areas and the regional and state freeway system to minimize conflicts with
6 automobile traffic and bicycles and incompatibility with other land uses.

7 It is very important to coordinate truck route and Bicycle Route Network planning. Trucks and
8 bicycles should be routed to separate streets where possible. Trucks' greater width and length,
9 obstructed rear sight lines, large turning radius, and the tendency for rear wheels to follow a smaller
10 circle than front wheels all present special concerns to cyclists.

11 OBJECTIVE 8: MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE REGIONAL PEDESTRIAN ~~AND~~, HIKING,
12 AND BICYCLE ACCESS TO THE COAST, BAY AND RIDGE TRAILS.

13 In addition to pedestrian continuity along all of these trails, continuous bicycle access should be
14 facilitated along the Bay, Ridge, and Coast Trails, which are important regional recreational and
15 touristic facilities.

16 POLICY 8.2: Clearly identify the citywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Network~~s~~ where ~~it~~ they
17 intersect with the Coast, Bay and Ridge Trails.

18 POLICY 9.1: ~~Allow~~ Accommodate bicycles on regional transit ~~vehicles~~ facilities and
19 important regional transportation links, such as ~~trains and ferries~~ the City's light rail vehicles,
20 wherever and whenever practically feasible.

21 Many commuters to San Francisco work outside of downtown and drive alone, contributing to
22 peak hour congestion. If regional transit expanded peak-hour bicycle capacity and reduced peak hour
23 bicycle time restrictions, these commuters could bicycle to and from transit at one or both end of their
24 transit trip – an attractive choice to driving alone. This would also reduce parking demand at BART
25 and Caltrain stations, ferry terminals, and park-and-ride lots.

1 **CONGESTION MANAGEMENT**

2 POLICY 14.1: Reduce road congestion on arterials through the implementation of
3 traffic control strategies, such as traffic signal~~light~~ synchronization (consistent with posted speed
4 limits) and turn controls, that improve vehicular flow without impeding movement for
5 pedestrians and bicyclists.

6 The roadway space needed by bicyclists varies between four and six feet depending on the
7 presence of parked cars. The needs of bicyclists should be considered wherever lane widths, especially
8 curb lanes, are proposed to be changed. Multiple turn lanes, designed to reduce congestion for autos,
9 can be confusing and difficult to negotiate for cyclists and pedestrians, and should not be used if
10 feasible.

11 POLICY 14.4: Reduce congestion by encouraging alternatives to the single occupant
12 auto through the reservation of right-of-way and enhancement of other facilities dedicated to
13 multiple modes of transportation.

14 Creating necessary and appropriate facilities for transit, bicycles, carpools, pedestrians, and
15 other modes often requires eliminating general traffic lanes and reducing capacity for single occupant
16 autos. This trade-off is often necessary to create attractive and efficient facilities to ensure safety,
17 reduce congestion, improve neighborhood livability, and accommodate growth consistent with the
18 Transit First policy.

19 **VEHICLE CIRCULATION**

20 POLICY 18.2: Design streets for a level of traffic that serves, but will not cause a
21 detrimental impact on adjacent land uses nor eliminate the efficient and safe movement of transit
22 vehicles and bicycles.

23 The need for traffic carriers must be balanced against the adverse effects of heavy
24 traffic on the use of adjacent land and the quality of the environment. The needs of residents
25 for peace and quiet, safety from harm, and useful open space must be given consideration.

1 Each area and each street of the city have different characteristics which determine the level
2 of traffic which can be absorbed without serious adverse impacts. The following factors should
3 be the basis for a judgment on the acceptable levels of traffic on a specific street:

4 The predominance of land uses fronting the street;

5 The distance between the curb and building line established by sidewalk width or
6 setback;

7 The presence or absence of buffering between street and building in the form of
8 landscaping, change in elevation, or similar condition;

9 The level of pedestrian and bicycle traffic;

10 The proportion of the street which is residential in land use;

11 Whether residences face the street;

12 The presence of hospitals, schools, parks, or similar facilities on or near the street.

13 The widening of streets at the expense of sidewalks or of setbacks should not occur
14 where space is necessary for pedestrian movement, buffering from noise, useful open space
15 and landscaping. This is especially true in densely populated neighborhoods with little public
16 or private open space. No additional sidewalk narrowings, tow-away zones and one-way
17 streets should be instituted in a residential neighborhood if it would compromise the safety
18 and comfort of the pedestrian resident. Existing tow - away lanes should be phased out if they
19 present a hazard to pedestrian safety. In addition, widening of streets should not occur at the
20 expense of bicycle travel. The roadway space needed by bicyclists, whether between the line
21 of traffic and the curb or the line of on-street parking, varies between four and six feet. The
22 needs of bicyclists must be considered wherever the curb lane is proposed to be narrowed.
23 Street restripings and widenings may be appropriate in industrial areas where access for
24 oversize freight vehicles is important, but these projects should not reduce or eliminate the
25 efficient movement of transit vehicles and bicycles.

1 POLICY 18.3: The existing single-occupant vehicular capacity of the bridges,
2 highways and freeways entering the city should not be increased and should be reduced if
3 needed to increase the capacity for high-occupancy vehicles, transit and other alternative
4 means of commuting, and for the safe and efficient movement of freight trucks. Changes,
5 retrofits, or replacements to existing bridges and highways should include dedicated priority for high-
6 occupancy vehicles and transit, and all bridges, where feasible, should feature access for bicyclists and
7 pedestrians.

8 It is recognized that provision for further vehicular access into the city would conflict
9 with the environmental objectives of the city, overload the city street system, and jeopardize
10 the city's commitment to mass transit. This policy allows for the introduction of exclusive
11 transit, bike and carpool/vanpool lanes on bridges, highways and freeways where these lanes
12 are compatible with the overall transportation system's needs.

13 POLICY 19.2: Promote increased traffic safety, with special attention to hazards that
14 could cause personal injury.

15 Various measures can be taken to reduce ~~accidents~~collisions, especially those involving
16 serious personal injury. Particular attention needs to be given to improving bicyclists' safety since
17 conditions that may be inconsequential to automobiles can be disruptive, disabling, or even life
18 threatening to bicyclists, and are the cause of many bicyclist collisions. In some cases redesign of
19 the roadway and of intersections to reduce conflicts between vehicles, bicyclists and
20 pedestrians is required; in others all that is necessary is to improve clarity of signs and of
21 routing so that there is less driver uncertainty and hesitation.

22 **MASS TRANSIT**

23 POLICY 21.7: Make convenient transfers between transit lines, systems and modes
24 possible by establishing common or closely located terminals for local and regional transit
25

1 ~~systems and~~, by coordinating fares and schedules, and by providing bicycle access and secure bicycle
2 parking.

3 POLICY 21.9: Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.

4 Pedestrian access to and from major destinations and the serving transit facility should
5 be direct and uncomplicated. Bicyclists should be accommodated on regional and trunkline
6 transit vehicles - including light rail vehicles - wherever feasible, and at stations through the
7 provision of storage lockers and/or secured bicycle parking.

8 **BICYCLES**

9 MAP 13 (Bicycle Route Map) shall be amended to reflect the bicycle network as
10 proposed in the Bicycle Plan and introductory text shall be amended as follows:

11 The bicycle is a desirable alternative to the automobile as a means of urban
12 transportation in San Francisco. It can successfully be used for most transportation needs,
13 including commuting, shopping, errands, and recreation. Active encouragement of bicycle use
14 as an alternative to automobile use, whenever possible, is essential in light of the continually
15 increasing traffic congestion caused by motorized vehicles which aggravates air pollution,
16 increases noise levels and consumes valuable urban space. The bicycle is a practical and
17 economical transportation alternative which produces no emissions or noise. In addition, each
18 bicycle user enjoys health benefits through increased physical activity.

19 To enable a large number of San Franciscans to use the bicycle as a transportation
20 option, several significant needs must be met. The needs include, among others, safe and
21 comfortable space on the roadway for bicyclists, a system of identifiable bicycle routes that
22 will direct bicyclists to major destinations, safe and secure bicycle parking, enforcement of laws
23 protecting and regulating cyclists' rights, safety, and responsibilities, and education of both the
24 bicyclists and motorists about the safe sharing of the roadways.

