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Plan Views: Alternatives I, I & III
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ANNOTATED PLAN VIEW: Alternative II

- **Corner Bulb Outs**
  - Reduce street crossing distances and improve pedestrian visibility
  - Create space for sidewalk amenities and potential station entrances

- **‘Flex’ Lanes for Parking & Cafe/Restaurant Seating**
  - Design Plan
    - Trees, movable bollards, & planters define café area
    - Removable platforms accommodate tables & chairs
    - Allow more space for pedestrians
  - Example:
    - Castro Street, Mountain View

- **CROSS SECTIONS**
  - Existing
  - Proposed

- **Diagonal Crosswalks**
  - Reduces length of pedestrian crossing at large intersection
  - Includes pedestrian refuge

- **Potential Station Entrances**
  - Southern entrances to potential future Muni Central Subway station at Union St.
  - Located on corner bulb-outs

- **Bus Stop Bulb Outs**
  - Reduce conflicts between pedestrians and waiting passengers
  - Provide more space for shelters & stop amenities

- **Alternative 2: Benefits and Tradeoffs**
  - Increased pedestrian safety and comfort
  - Optional expanded space for restaurant seating
  - Space created for potential subway entrances
  - Reduced bus loading/unloading delays
  - Improved bicycle safety
  - Somewhat increased delays for drivers
  - Somewhat reduced circulation options - no left turns from Columbus through travel on Green allowed
  - Community maintenance required for ‘flex’ lane
APPENDIX B

Summary: June 2007 Stakeholder Workshop
COLUMBUS AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Stakeholder Meeting Summary

Date: June 27, 2007
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Location: Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Center

Purpose of the Meeting
The neighborhood transportation study planning process includes a series of meetings with community stakeholders to identify transportation priorities and develop solutions. The objective is to work with all stakeholders to develop solutions to address each of the priority areas. In addition to the stakeholder’s meetings, the general public will be invited to provide input at several workshops to be scheduled at key points in the study process.

At this first meeting, stakeholders were invited to share and exchange views on transportation priorities and issues that should be included in the study. Based on the priorities identified, the study team will determine the necessary data to be collected and analysis conducted in the next phase.

Meeting Publicity
Announcements about the meeting were made through several mediums: stakeholders were individually invited and a letter was posted on the study website a month before the date. Additionally, calls were made to each of the invitees a few days before the event. Meeting information was also posted on the project’s website.

Workshop Structure and Materials

Agenda

6:30pm 1. Welcome
6:31pm 2. About the Study & How to Participate
6:45pm 3. Your Transportation Priorities
7:15pm 4. Relevant Ideas from Past Studies, Parallel Efforts, and Other Cities
7:30pm 5. Prioritization of Transportation Issues
8:25pm 6. Next Steps
Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation Study

Presentation and Exercise Boards
Jeff Tumlin of Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates facilitated the meeting, leading the discussion on transportation priorities. He also gave a presentation on street treatments that San Francisco as well as other cities in the Bay Area have implemented to improve pedestrian conditions and commercial enterprise. Examples of treatments mentioned in the presentation include situating trees in the parking lane, allowing merchants to rent parking spaces to place outdoor seating, landscaped medians and pedestrian amenities.

After the presentation, participants engaged in a trade-offs and mapping exercise. The exercises were mounted on boards on which dots could be placed to indicate transportation priorities and problem areas along the corridor.

Findings
About the Participants
Workshop participants represented stakeholder groups from the study area, including the National Park Service, SPUR, Chinatown Community Development Corporation, Community Educational Services and neighborhood groups. Fifteen stakeholders attended with an additional five participants representing RENEW SF.

Absent from the meeting were representatives of the North Beach Merchant's Association, the Telegraph Hill Dwellers and the Chamber of Commerce of both Chinatown and North Beach. Input from these organizations is valuable in prioritizing the merchant's concerns in addition those of residents as their priorities and answers to the interactive exercises may differ. Additional strategies will be incorporated into the Outreach Plan to solicit input from the merchant organizations in the study area.

Concerns
To start off the meeting, each participant introduced themselves and presented their top three transportation priorities. All participants listed pedestrian safety and circulation as one of their top priorities. Other priorities repeated by the majority of participants include:

- Enhancing pedestrian culture
- Improving Muni access, quality and connectivity
- Connecting cultural and institutional centers to transit
- Developing wayfinding and placemaking features
- Incorporating the Central Subway project into the planning of Columbus Avenue

A summary of each participant's comments are given in Appendix A.

Exercise Outcomes
In addition to stating their top three priorities, the participants engaged in two interactive exercises that further identified the transportation priorities and concerns in the study area. The first exercise consisted of a series of trade-offs developed by the project team and the participants. The second exercise asked participants to place dots on aerial photographs of Columbus Avenue between the Transamerica Pyramid and the waterfront to indicate favorite places and problem areas. The results of the exercises are given in the following sections.
**Trade-Off Exercise**

Since the number of transportation improvements that can be implemented along Columbus Avenue is limited due to physical constraints, the trade-off exercise was designed to determine where the balance should be achieved between two priorities. The trade-offs were compiled from findings of existing studies and input from the study team. Paired priorities were placed on either side of a continuum, with numerical values along the continuum being 2, 1, 0, 1, 2, from left to right. A generic continuum is diagramed below:

![Diagram of continuum with values 2, 1, 0, 1, 2 from left to right.](image)

**Trade-Off #1: Reduce Driving Delays vs. Reduce Transit Delays**

Participants overwhelmingly favored reducing transit delays over driving delays. Close to 90 percent strongly favored reducing transit delays, with one participant specifying that Muni needs to increase frequencies and better space their vehicles. Two participants remained neutral between the two priorities.

*Figure 1. Trade-Off #1*
Trade-Off #2: More Median Space vs. More Sidewalk Space
With the majority of stakeholders expressing concern about pedestrian circulation and safety, it is not surprising that the results of this trade-off are strongly in favor of more sidewalk space. Close to 85 percent of participants favored more sidewalk space, though three participants were either neutral or moderately in favor of more median space.

Trade-Off #3: Open Space vs. Parking Space
The results of this trade-off favored open space over parking. Seventy-five percent of those who placed a dot on the trade-off bar favored open space while 17 percent preferred parking space. One of the participants who favored parking wrote directly on the board: “We need more/better managed parking off Columbus Ave.” Another comment was also written on the board from a participant who was moderately in favor of open space: “a few regional robotic parking garages for residents and valet/business parking would help. The northeast quadrant has heavy out-of-town visitors which should be encouraged.”

Trade-Off #4: Easier to Drive vs. Easier to Bicycle
For the most part, participants remained neutral when asked to prioritize between driving and biking. Three participants had strong convictions towards improving driving conditions over those for bicycles. One comment received from a participant who was moderately in favor for bicycling stated: “even Copenhagen at one time was not a bicycle town. Now there is a clearly delineated bicycle culture with well designed pedestrian realms.”

Trade-Off #5: Easier to Drive vs. Easier to Walk
Again, with the highest priority being pedestrian access and circulation, the participants chose improvements to walking over driving. Only one participant favored driving over walking.
Trade-Off #6: Ease of Walking vs. Ease of Parking
Though participants are clearly in favor of pedestrian improvements, parking is still an important concern, as shown by the placement of dots along the trade-off bar. **Seventy percent favored better walking conditions while ten percent remained neutral on the subject.** Only one participant had a stronger position on improving parking conditions. One of the participants who remained neutral on the topic commented: “there are many residents who circle for hours to park their car on certain days of the week. For many, every parking space is of prime importance.”

Trade-Off #7: Available Parking vs. Free Parking
The dot placement for this trade-off was scattered along the trade-off bar showing the need for more focused parking solutions in the area. Just under half of the participants were strongly in favor of available parking while another third were moderately in favor of available parking. Only one participant indicated strong preference for free parking, while another participant showed moderate preference for free parking. Another participant remained neutral on the matter.
Trade-Off #8: Quality vs. Functionality
Trade-off #8 was suggested by John Sanger, a member of the San Francisco Art Institute Board of Trustees, who expressed concern over the trade-off exercise in general, stating that the choices are too limiting. He added a general trade-off, Quality vs. Functionality, to understand the type of improvements desired by the community. **Most participants, 65 percent, were either strongly or moderately in favor of quality over functionality,** 23 percent remained neutral and another twelve percent were strongly in favor of functionality.
**Mapping Exercise**

The second interactive exercise consisted of a set of aerial photographs stitched together to form the entire corridor. Participants were asked to place green dots on spots they favored and red dots on areas they considered to be problematic. Since some areas had both red and green dots, participants were asked to write comments on the maps to explain why they designated the area one way or the other. The results are presented below by Columbus Avenue segment.

**Segment 1: From the Transamerica Pyramid to Kearny Street**

At the base of the Transamerica Pyramid is the Jackson Square Historic District. Participants indicated that they liked the area but were concerned with the lack of information indicating that the area is part of the Barbary Coast, or any wayfinding or placemaking features to explain that the Transamerica Pyramid is the transition point between North Beach and the Financial District. Comments written on the maps included creating a historical or cultural narrative with pavement markers or signs to indicate the historic elements, perhaps locating some markers in the “underutilized” Transamerica Plaza. Three participants indicated that one of their favorite spots was Francis Ford Coppola’s restaurant, Cafe Zoetrope, in the historic Sentinel Building, but added that it needed a better presence as it indicates an entry point to North Beach for northbound Kearny traffic.

**Intersection comments:** Five red dots were placed on the three way intersection of Washington Street, Montgomery Street and Columbus Avenue. Three red dots were placed on the three way intersection of Kearny Street, Pacific Street and Columbus Avenue.

*Figure 6. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from the Transamerica Pyramid to Kearny Street*
Segment 2: From Kearny Street to Stockton Street
The stretch between Kearny Street and Stockton Street is where the majority of the commercial and historical uses that define North Beach are located. City Lights Bookstore, the National Shrine of St. Francis de Assisi, the red light district, many restaurant and cafes and several banks are all situated along Columbus, within this segment. Seven participants indicated that one of their favorite places along this stretch was City Lights Bookstore. Other favorite places include restaurants and cafes and generally the atmosphere of Green Street and Grant Avenue.

Intersection comments: Seven red dots were placed on the Grant Avenue, Broadway and Columbus Avenue intersection. Throughout the meeting, participants repeatedly mentioned the lack of continuity of Grant Avenue from Chinatown to North Beach. The comments written on the board define it as the most confusing intersection but with potential in becoming a world class piazza. The Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue intersection (see the following segment summary for more comments on this intersection) contained four red dots with a comment that read “disfunctioning intersection, maybe a fountain [roundabout] is needed?” The intersection of Broadway and Columbus Avenue did not have red dots placed on top of it but had a comment referring to its unsafe pedestrian conditions.

Figure 7. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from Kearny Street to Stockton Street

Segment 3: From Stockton Street to Filbert Street
This two block stretch contains Washington Square Park, numerous outdoor cafes and the Saints Peter and Paul Church. Participants covered the park with green dots and indicated which trees they favored. Other areas indicated in green were cafes and restaurants. The Pagoda Theater was well disliked by the participants.
Intersection comments: As this board also contained the Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue intersection, eight more red dots indicated the problems with the intersection. A comment suggested incorporating a piazza into the intersection. The Union Street and Columbus Avenue intersection got four red dots and a comment stating that it “has no definition and is hard to cross.”

Figure 8. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from Stockton Street to Filbert Street

Segment 4: From Filbert Street to Chestnut Street
Between Filbert Street and Chestnut Street lies Joe DiMaggio Playground, a branch of the San Francisco Public Library and low income housing developments. Participants indicated a fondness for the playground and library as well as for the trees located in the triangle parking lot across from the library. The parking lot itself received three red dots. One participant indicated that the stretch from Taylor Street to Francisco Street is a “dead zone.”

Intersection comments: The intersection of Mason Street, Greenwich Street and Columbus Avenue received six red dots as did the intersection of Chestnut Street, Taylor Street and Columbus Avenue. One comment stated that the intersections could be greatly improved.
Segment 5: From Chestnut Street to Beach Street

Joseph Conrad Square and the Indonesian Consulate were well regarded among the participants though the comments written conveyed a desire to see the Square improved as it is not active enough.

Intersection comments: All the intersections between Chestnut Street and Beach Street were considered problematic, especially the Francisco Street/Columbus Avenue and Jones Street/Bay Street/Columbus Avenue crossings, both receiving six red dots. One participant highlighted the difficulties the residents of the senior housing complex have in crossing Columbus Avenue at Francisco to get to the 30-Stockton bus stop. Another participant called the intersection a “no man’s land” as the space is not defined.
Segment 6: From Beach Street to the Waterfront
Participants indicated that the waterfront especially Aquatic Park and its attractions were some of their favorite spaces along the northern most stretch of the corridor. Spaces that were not favored included the empty office building at North Point Street and Columbus Avenue and the lack of connection from Joseph Conrad Square to the waterfront.

Intersection comments: The intersections in the area did not have many comments. Participants were mainly concerned with improving the connection between the end of Columbus Avenue and the waterfront. One participant suggested closing off Hyde Street between Beach Street and the waterfront and Jefferson Street between Leavenworth Street and Hyde Street to vehicles.
Guidance for Development of Improvements

The feedback received from participants at the stakeholders meeting helps the study team identify the types of transportation improvements for Columbus as well as locations for improvements.

Types of Improvements:
- Pedestrian safety, circulation and culture
- Transit improvements:
  - Short term - Muni access, quality and connectivity
  - Long term - Inclusion of Central Subway into the planning of Columbus Avenue
- Intersection management and enhancement
- Streetscape improvements: use transportation improvements to enhance neighborhood characteristics and ambience

Potential Locations of Improvements (in order of number of red dots received):
- Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue intersection (12 red dots)
- Grant Avenue, Broadway and Columbus Avenue intersection (including pedestrian continuity along Grant Avenue from Chinatown to North Beach) (7 red dots)
- Mason Street, Greenwich Street and Columbus Avenue intersection (6 red dots)
- Chestnut Street, Taylor Street and Columbus Avenue intersection (6 red dots)
- Francisco Street and Columbus Avenue intersection (6 red dots)
- Jones Street, Bay Street and Columbus Avenue intersection (6 red dots)
- Washington Street, Montgomery Street and Columbus Avenue intersection (5 red dots)
- Union Street and Columbus Avenue (4 red dots)
Next Steps

The priorities identified by the stakeholders will be documented to determine the type of analysis and technical data needed to develop potential solutions in the next phase of the study. Since the merchants were not well represented at the meeting, the study team will meet with them at their monthly meetings or may engage in door-to-door interviews to receive their input.

Demonstration projects may also help prioritize the type of improvements implemented if there is interest within the community. These projects may include partnering with a restaurant and taking a parking lane during the lunch hour to place outdoor seating.
### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| John Knoebber, Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Center | 1. Transportation for low income seniors and children east of Columbus Ave.  
2. Pedestrian safety (especially at Washington Square Park)  
3. Pedestrian congestion in Fisherman’s Wharf |
| Jennifer Cano, Community Education Services | 1. Better transit options for children (the elimination of the 15-Third had a large effect on how children traveled to school)  
2. Safe transportation for children home on transit |
| Cathie Lam, Chinatown CDC | 1. Pedestrian safety in Chinatown  
2. Intersection improvements at Kearny St. and Grant Ave. in terms of safety and design improvements  
3. Intersection improvements at Columbus Ave. Pacific Ave. and Kearny St. in terms of pedestrian safety |
| John Sanger, San Francisco Art Institute Board of Trustees | 1. Quality of transit access to Art Institute and north end of Columbus Ave.  
2. Bike access along corridor (many students will be housed at the Hilton Hotel and some will be hiking)  
3. Visible link from the Art Institute to Columbus Ave. |
| Dana Merker, Patri-Merker Architects | 1. Urban design elements along Columbus  
2. Street cleanliness  
3. Ease of access to transit  
4. Neighborhood design – architectural input on buildings |
| Steve Taber, SPUR | 1. SPUR supports the Central Subway and would like to see its plans integrated into the neighborhood study and improvements  
2. Plan improvements to Columbus Ave. keeping in mind that the Central Subway will daylight along the corridor |
| Howard Wong, A Better Chinatown Tomorrow (ABCT) | 1. Street and sidewalk improvements  
2. Delineate bike, transit, pedestrian and vehicle realms  
3. Clear identification of transit hubs  
4. Cleaner, safer, more reliable public transit |
| Wilima Pany, A Better Chinatown Tomorrow (ABCT) | 1. Better system of service to and within Chinatown  
2. Connection of Grant Ave. across Broadway and Columbus to connect Chinatown and North Beach  
3. Mitigate construction impacts of the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Thomas, North Beach Neighbors</td>
<td>1. Central subway should be extended to Washington Square Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Freebairn-Smith, RENEW SF</td>
<td>1. Pedestrian space on Columbus Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Revitalization of existing commerce and visitor commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Invest in street to make it a great world street with transit priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Tree Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Better wayfinding and how to use transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Create a place of celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Lee, SFMTA</td>
<td>1. Better east/west connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pedestrian space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eamon O’Byrne, SF Maritime National Park</td>
<td>1. Coherent connection to Fisherman’s Wharf from Columbus Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russel Massmann, Aquatic Park Neighbors</td>
<td>1. Wider sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Conrad Square as a centerpiece of the corridor, make area into a car-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>piazza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Cullivan, National Park Service</td>
<td>1. Better connections to Aquatic Park from Columbus Ave. Park supposed to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a local park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Halstead</td>
<td>1. Wider sidewalks to improve the pedestrian experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Better coordination of transit planning with better connections to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>north of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Christensen, Friends of Joe DiMaggio PG /Friends of Washington Square</td>
<td>1. Philosophical improvements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian safety and primacy over all other transportation modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public life and improvements to open space (is a neighborhood where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people live in the public space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhance neighborhood character and recognize distinction of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Tactical improvements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better, wider streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safer crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nodes, gateways, indication of different neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Geographical improvements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Columbus Ave./Broadway/Grant Ave intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Columbus Ave/Union St. intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Columbus Ave/Lombard St. intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Whitney, RENEW SF</td>
<td>1. Transit vs. cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pedestrian experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Making great spaces, nodes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Summary:
September 20, 2007
Public Workshop
COLUMBUS AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Public Workshop Summary

Date: September 20, 2007  
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.  
Location: Jean Parker Elementary School

Purpose of the Workshop
The Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation Study includes workshops with the community to share information and obtain input at key points in the process, including identifying transportation priorities and developing solutions.

The first Public workshop was held on September 20th. At this first meeting, community members were invited to share and exchange views on the top transportation priorities for Columbus Avenue, and issues that should be included in the study. The meeting complements the first stakeholder meeting held on June 27, 2007 that also asked leaders from neighborhood organizations to prioritize transportation issues. Based on the priorities identified, the study team will analyze the community’s top priority problems and develop potential improvements.

Meeting Publicity
The Workshop was publicized through existing neighborhood organizations, outreach to the community at large, and through the media. The Study Team contacted the study mailing list a month before the event, followed by a reminder email sent two weeks prior to the event. Fliers were posted on the bus shelters in the study area, and in the windows of participating merchants. Meeting information was also posted on the project’s website. RENEW SF followed up with community members on the mailing list with phone calls and emails and the Mayor’s office helped with outreach for the event. The Study Team published a media advisory to local newspapers, including the Chinese language press on September 17. A Chinese language press conference was held on September 18, 2007.

Workshop Structure and Materials

Agenda

6:30pm  1. Sign In and Open House
6:45pm  2. Welcome and Introduction
6:55pm  3. Large Group Q&A
Presentation and Exercise Boards
RENEW SF welcomed the evening’s participants and described the study background and objectives. Rachel Hiatt of SFCTA and Jeff Tumlin of Nelson\Nygaaard Consulting Associates presented the outreach findings to date and a synopsis of key pedestrian, transit, and streetscape issues identified through preliminary analysis and outreach. The presentation included ideas that San Francisco as well as other cities in the Bay Area have implemented to improve pedestrian conditions and commercial enterprise along corridors with some of the same issues facing Columbus Avenue. Examples of treatments mentioned in the presentation include situating trees in the parking lane, allowing merchants to rent parking spaces to place outdoor seating, landscaped medians and pedestrian amenities.

After the presentation, participants split into five groups including a Chinese speaking group to rotate through five stations. The stations were designed to obtain participant input on 1) transportation issues in the study area, 2) where transportation problems exist along Columbus Avenue, and 3) community preferences for the tradeoffs between different approaches to transportation improvements. A description of the stations is given below:

- **Station #1 – Top Transportation Priorities**
  Each participant listed their top two or three transportation concerns, which were recorded on butcher paper by the station facilitator.

- **Station #2 and #3 – Tradeoffs Sets 1 and 2**
  Participants placed dots on a continuum expressing their preference for addressing often conflicting issues or problems.

- **Station #4 and #5 – Mapping Exercise, North and South Columbus Avenue**
  Six boards, each with an aerial section of Columbus Avenue, gave opportunity for the participants to place dots on locations that they considered to be problematic.

Findings
This section summarizes the comments received from the Workshop participants. The concluding part of this section lists the top transportation concerns and priorities of the Workshop participants.

The Participants
Workshop participants represented community members living and working in the study area. Two dozen community members and members of neighborhood groups attended, plus seven representatives of city agencies. A relatively large number of Chinese language speakers attended the event.
Station #1 – Top Transportation Priorities
The participants ranked their top three priorities for the study area, the highest being better pedestrian safety and circulation, though differences within the priority also emerged. Specifically, many participants suggested widening sidewalks and retiming signals so that the maximum wait time for a pedestrian is 30 seconds. Some participants also identified parking issues as a top priority, suggesting pricing parking to meet demand, or providing easier access to parking for merchants, shoppers and deliveries. Another top priority listed by participants was providing bike lanes in the study area and specifically along Columbus. Pedestrian and parking issues emerged as more urgent priorities than addressing transit service. Other priorities listed include:
- Conrad Square traffic calming
- Public toilets
- Sense of place/identity to Columbus Avenue and North Beach
- Preserve all streets to vehicular traffic for better traffic circulation, emergency response and public transit
- Noise abatement

Other issues mentioned as second priority include:
- Truck delivery times
- Public transit effectiveness
- Crosswalks
- Trees
- Clutter on sidewalks – remove meter stubs

Cafe seating and wider sidewalks in the Conrad Square area took third priority. Additionally, several notes and comments were written on the priority sheets:
- Does valet parking help or hinder?
- Build the central subway transit station in the Pagoda Theater
- Mason Street should not be closed to traffic as it would divert traffic onto Columbus
- Streets like Stockton Street should be closed to traffic
- Administer double parking fines
- Neighborhood permits should not be oversold

Station #2 and #3 – Tradeoffs Set 1 and 2
Since the available street and sidewalk space – as well as funding - for transportation along Columbus Avenue is limited, the trade-off exercise was designed to help understand where the Columbus community would strike a balance among competing priorities. Transportation priorities that are often in conflict, in dense urban areas such as Columbus Avenue, were placed on either side of a continuum, with numerical values along the continuum being 2, 1, 0, 1, 2, from left to right. A generic continuum is diagramed below:
Trade-Off #1: Reduce Driving Delays vs. Reduce Transit Delays
Participants overwhelmingly favored reducing transit delays over driving delays. Close to 90 percent strongly favored reducing transit delays, with one participant commenting that transit service has been slower since the discontinuation of the 15-Third line. Another comment alluded to double parking as being problematic for transit service. Two participants remained neutral between the two priorities and one strongly favored reducing driving delays.

Figure 1. Trade-Off #1

Trade-Off #2: More Median Space vs. More Sidewalk Space
With the majority of stakeholders expressing concern about pedestrian circulation and safety, it is not surprising that everyone was strongly in favor of more sidewalk space as more important than more space in the landscaped median of Columbus Avenue.
Trade-Off #3: Open Space vs. Parking Space
The results of this trade-off were mixed – when deciding how to use available space along Columbus, many workshop participants did not have a strong desire to see that space used to provide more open space versus more parking. The majority, 42 percent, did not see open space or parking space as the most important use, and remained neutral on the issue. Another 34 percent of participants favored open space over parking, while more parking space was strongly favored for 21 percent of respondents.

Figure 2. Trade-Offs #2 and #3

Trade-Off #4: Easier to Drive vs. Easier to Bicycle
Workshop participants’ views on whether to improve driving or to improve bicycling were highly polarized. Participants views were evenly split, either strongly in favor of improving driving, or for improving bicycle access. Only two remained neutral between the two modes and an additional three were moderately in favor of improvements to bicycling.

Trade-Off #5: Easier to Drive vs. Easier to Walk
Again, workshop participants identified improving pedestrian access and circulation as a greater priority than improving driving. Asked to weigh improvements for pedestrians versus improvements for drivers, participants overwhelmingly chose improvements to walking over driving. Only one participant indicated neutrality on the subject.
Trade-Off #6: Ease of Walking vs. Ease of Parking
Though Workshop participants clearly indicated favor for pedestrian improvements, parking still emerged an important concern, as shown by the placement of dots along the trade-off bar. Just over 80 percent favored better walking conditions while thirteen percent remained neutral on whether space for walking or space for parking is more important. Only one participant was strongly in favor of improving parking conditions.

Trade-Off #7: Available Parking vs. Free Parking
Workshop participants prefer to make parking available on Columbus, rather than providing free parking. Just over half of the participants remained neutral between the two options, while another third were in favor of available parking. Only one participant indicated strong preference for free parking.
Station #4 and #5 – Mapping Exercise, North and South Columbus Avenue

These stations involved a set of aerial photographs stitched together to form the entire corridor. The boards included three key bits of information: 1) Muni routes intersecting the area, 2) intersections identified through previous outreach as problematic, and 3) intersections sustaining severe or fatal pedestrian-vehicular injuries as gathered from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) database. Participants were asked to place green dots on favorite spots along Columbus – places along Columbus that work well or have positive street features. Red dots indicate areas considered to be problematic. Since some areas were marked with both red and green dots, participants were asked to write comments on the maps to explain why they designated the area one way or the other. The results are presented below.

Segment 1: Columbus Avenue from the Transamerica Pyramid to Kearny Street

At the base of the Transamerica Pyramid is the Jackson Square Historic District. Participants indicated that they liked the area but were concerned with the lack of pedestrian activity and ill-defined intersections for pedestrians. Participants placed ten red dots on the intersection of Washington Street, Montgomery Street and Columbus Avenue. Comments regarding the intersection included:

- Chaotic intersection and lacks clarity for buses, cars and pedestrians
- Very poor pedestrian crossing with high speed cars merging and poorly marked crosswalks. Important intersection with the Transamerica Pyramid and historic buildings but needs drama at street level. Street trees are inadequate and spotty
The Jackson Street and Columbus Avenue intersection received one red dot with a comment stating that the right-turn lane from Jackson posed a hazard to pedestrians. Two red dots were placed on the intersection of Kearny Street and Columbus Avenue but no comments were written to elaborate on the problems. However, one comment did concern traffic movement on Kearny, between Market and Columbus, stating that the movement is “always stop and go.”

An additional three comments were written on the board that spoke generally to the area between Montgomery and Kearny:

- Lacks of street life
- Three lanes from Montgomery to Kearny
- No bike lane, especially uphill

**Intersection dot summary:**

- Washington Street, Montgomery Street and Columbus Avenue – 10 red dots
- Jackson Street and Columbus Avenue – 1 red dot
- Kearny Street, Pacific Street and Columbus Avenue – 2 red dots

**Figure 6. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from the Transamerica Pyramid to Kearny Street**

**Segment 2: From Kearny Street to Stockton Street**

The stretch between Kearny Street and Stockton Street is where the majority of the commercial and historical uses that define North Beach are located. These uses attract high volumes of pedestrians as well as cars which raise safety concerns, especially at the intersections of Broadway, Grant Avenue and Columbus as well as Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus.
Participants were highly concerned with the intersection of Grant Avenue and Broadway and the movement of pedestrians from Grant onto Columbus. Thirteen red dots were placed on this intersection with comments stating:

- Complicated intersection that is difficult to cross
- Chaotic
- One of the ugliest and dangerous intersections
- Green light too short for pedestrians, bad traffic light
- East-west movement of cars is too fast – like a freeway

One participant drew an “artistic gateway” at Grant and Broadway and another one at upper Grant Avenue to symbolize Chinatown and North Beach respectively. Between the two gateways, he drew a pedestrian link across Columbus.

Though the intersection of Broadway and Columbus is problematic, as indicated by the number of collisions between pedestrians and vehicles in the SWITRS database, it received only one red dot. The comments received for the intersection included:

- Eliminate the southbound right turn lane from Broadway onto Columbus – square the right-turn
- Cars turning right from Broadway onto Columbus often do not see pedestrians

All other intersections along this segment received red dots as well. The Pacific Avenue, Kearny Street and Columbus intersection had two red dots and a comment reading “ugly and dangerous intersection.” Vallejo Street and Columbus received three red dots with comments stating:

- Dangerous intersections for pedestrians and drivers
- Should not allow turn on red
- Pedestrian safety concern

The intersection of Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus received two red dots and comments stating (see the following segment summary for more comments on this intersection):

- Dangerous and unnatural intersection
- Need [signal] lights like financial district, auto green and pedestrian green should not be at the same time. Ticket pedestrians who cross against lights. All traffic lights timed WAY TOO LONG, especially at Green. The result is that pedestrians ignore red lights (so do cars). Max wait: 30 seconds!

Besides the intersections, comments received for the stretch of Columbus between Kearny and Stockton highlighted the narrow sidewalks and the need for more bike racks. One participant commented: “trade-off: wider sidewalks and remove the median (the trees make the sidewalk and street really dark).”

**Intersection dot summary:**

- Pacific Avenue, Kearny Street and Columbus Avenue – 2 red dots
- Broadway and Columbus Avenue – 1 red dot
- Grant Avenue, Broadway and Columbus Avenue – 13 red dots
- Vallejo Street and Columbus Avenue – 3 red dots
- Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue – 2 red dots (more red dots in following segment)

**Figure 7. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from Kearny Street to Stockton Street**

**Segment 3: From Stockton Street to Filbert Street**

This two block stretch contains Washington Square Park (labeled a “public park” by a participant), numerous outdoor cafes and the Saints Peter and Paul Church. Participants placed green dots on the park and indicated which trees they favored (poplars). Other areas indicated in green were Saints Peter and Paul Church (“a symbol of the community”) and the small park across from Washington Square (“peaceful and beautiful”). Other recommendations and comments received for the segment included:

- Remove individual meters and replace with multiple space meters
- Bus and intersection bulb-outs – Yes!
- Narrow sidewalks (x2)
- 21 newsracks take up sidewalk space at the intersection of Union and Columbus (southwest corner), plus 10 more at Filbert, half a block away

As the Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus intersection was also shown in this segment, additional comments were posted regarding its pedestrian safety issues. Six more red dots were placed on the intersections with comments stating:

- Poor layout of crosswalks
- Chaotic intersection for pedestrian safety. Bad traffic light
- Scramble signal needed
- Difficult to cross street
The Union Street and Columbus intersection received three red dots. Again, pedestrian safety was the main concern. One participant commented that cars “should not [be] allow[ed] [to make a] left turn onto Columbus from Union.”

The intersection of Powell Street and Columbus also creates pedestrian safety concerns as cars do not yield to pedestrians or bicyclists when turning from Columbus onto Powell (received one red dot). One participant placed a green dot along Powell between Columbus and Union remarking on its potential for a piazza.

Another red dot was placed on the intersection of Filbert Street and Columbus with a comment indicating that it posed safety issues for pedestrians. Another comment stated, “Filbert at Powell is an important street crossing for street children.” One participant recommended reducing the size of the parking spaces along Columbus in front of the Saints Peter and Paul Church. The final comment posted for Filbert remarked on the traffic jams at Filbert and Stockton.

**Intersection dot summary:**
- Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue – 6 red dots (8 total from both segments)
- Union Street and Columbus Avenue – 3 red dots
- Powell Street and Columbus Avenue – 1 red dot
- Filbert Street and Columbus Avenue – 1 red dot

*Figure 8. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from Stockton Street to Filbert Street*
Segment 4: From Filbert Street to Chestnut Street
Between Filbert Street and Chestnut Street lies Joe DiMaggio Playground, a branch of the San Francisco Public Library and low income housing developments. Mason Street between Columbus and Lombard Street received six red dots and comments mainly recommending to close the street:

- North Beach needs more recreational activity space. Put the library on the triangle with housing above. Best close Mason Street and make intersection a real public space (x2)
- Mason Street is critical to emergency response vehicles, do not close the street to traffic (x2)

The Mason Street and Columbus intersection did receive a red dot, with a comment stating “buses drive through crosswalk to approach bus stop.” This comment is referring to the to the 30-Stockton route in the northbound direction. Bus drivers tend to drive through the t-intersection while the signal is red, creating a hazard for crossing pedestrians, especially children.

The intersection of Lombard Street and Columbus received three red dots with one comment stating “ugly intersection” and other recommending to “keep Lombard Street between the Crooked Street and Coit Tower free flowing.”

An additional three comments concerned the interaction between the cable cars and pedestrians. The cable car route seems problematic for pedestrian and bicyclist safety:

- For two blocks on Columbus, honor the cable cars!
- Narrow space for bikes to ride in between cable car tracks and parked cars
- Cable cars vs. pedestrians at the intersections of Taylor Street and Columbus and Mason Street and Greenwich Street. The signals are confusing and not enforced for cable car operations

The general comment received in this segment that also applies for the entire length of Columbus is that bike lanes need to be added for safety.

Intersection dot summary:
- Mason Street between Columbus and Lombard Street – 6 red dots
- Mason Street and Columbus Avenue – 1 red dot
- Lombard Street and Columbus Avenue – 3 red dots
Segment 5: From Chestnut Street to Beach Street

In this segment, the Francisco Street and Columbus intersection received the most comments. A total of nine red dots were placed on the intersection and comments highlighted the pedestrian safety issues at the intersection:

- No signal
- Very dangerous crossing with no stop sign
- North-south traffic is too fast and dangerous for the pedestrian. Pedestrians often have to dodge cars
- Cars and buses do not yield to pedestrians

The Taylor Street, Chestnut Street and Columbus intersection received three red dots and a comment stating “very dangerous intersection.” The intersection of Bay Street and Columbus received two red dots with a comment highlighting the tendency of cars to run red light proceeding northbound on Columbus or westbound on Bay.

Joseph Conrad Square received two red dots with a lengthy comment: “needs traffic calming, more pedestrian, café crowd, another Belden Place, a soft place to land! We have horse and carriages (stand up scooters), t-shirts stands and bicyclists taking up space. Car, truck and tour bus traffic make it a noisy place. Ripe for the homeless. Help adopt historic Conrad Square” (Additional comments are contained in the following segment).

Other general comments received include:
- Indonesian consulate: nice atmosphere
- Price street parking to match demand, all of North Beach, stop giving it away
Intersection dot summary:

- Taylor Street, Chestnut Street and Columbus Avenue – 3 red dots
- Francisco Street and Columbus Avenue – 9 red dots
- Bay Street and Columbus Avenue – 2 red dots

Figure 10. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from Chestnut Street to Beach Street

Segment 6: From Beach Street to the Waterfront

Participants indicated that the waterfront especially Aquatic Park and its attractions were some of their favorite spaces along the northern stretch of the corridor. North Point Street was highlighted in this segment with two red dots as its intersections are “ugly and dangerous,” and its “triangular intersections are unwelcoming to pedestrians. Use pavers to increase safety.”

Joseph Conrad Square received two additional red dots in this segment with a comment reading “homeless and trash are problems, threatening at night.” The intersection of Hyde Street and Jefferson Street received one red dot and a comment highlighting the conflicts between bicyclists and vehicular traffic. Another red dot was placed on the crossing of Beach Street from the end of Columbus to the Cannery with a comment highlighting the safety issues of the pedestrian crossing.

Other general comments for the segment included:

- Less car parking and more truck parking to stop double parking
- Two traffic lanes north of Bay Street
- Waterfront has unique Maritime history
Intersection dot summary:
- North Point Street and Columbus Avenue – 2 red dots
- Hyde Street and Jefferson Street – 1 red dot
- Crossing of Beach Street from the end of Columbus to the Cannery – 1 red dot

*Figure 11. Mapping Exercise, Columbus Avenue from Beach Street to the Waterfront*

Guidance for Development of Improvements
The feedback received from participants helps the study team identify the types of transportation improvements for Columbus as well as locations for improvements. The participants at the public workshop all stressed the need for improvements to the pedestrian realm in the study area and especially along Columbus Avenue.

Types of Improvements (in priority order based on workshop feedback):
- Pedestrian safety and circulation
- Parking availability
- Bicycle amenities, including lanes and racks
- Reduction of transit delays
- Intersection treatments to manage the flow and speed of vehicles

Potential Locations of Improvements (in order of number of red dots received above three):
- Grant Avenue, Broadway and Columbus Avenue (13 red dots)
- Washington Street, Montgomery Street and Columbus Avenue (10 red dots)
- Francisco Street and Columbus Avenue (9 red dots)
• Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue (8 red dots)
• Mason Street between Columbus and Lombard Street (6 red dots)
• Union Street and Columbus Avenue (3 red dots)
• Lombard Street and Columbus Avenue (3 red dots)
• Taylor Street, Chestnut Street and Columbus Avenue (3 red dots)

Some of the types and locations of improvements overlap with those identified through previous outreach, including the Neighborhood Stakeholder meeting held in July: (the ones that overlap are in **bold**):

**Types of Improvements (Stakeholder Meeting results):**
- **Pedestrian safety, circulation and culture**
- Transit improvements:
  - Short term - Muni access, quality and connectivity
  - Long term - Inclusion of Central Subway into the planning of Columbus Avenue
- **Intersection management and enhancement**
- Streetscape improvements: use transportation improvements to enhance neighborhood characteristics and ambience

**Potential Locations of Improvements (Stakeholder Meeting results):**
- **Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (12 red dots)
- **Grant Avenue, Broadway and Columbus Avenue intersection** (including pedestrian continuity along Grant Avenue from Chinatown to North Beach) (7 red dots)
- **Mason Street, Greenwich Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (6 red dots)
- **Chestnut Street, Taylor Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (6 red dots)
- **Francisco Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (6 red dots)
- **Jones Street, Bay Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (6 red dots)
- **Washington Street, Montgomery Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (5 red dots)
- **Union Street and Columbus Avenue** (4 red dots)
- **Kearny Street, Pacific Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (3 red dots)

All the intersections listed as having safety issues by the public workshop participants are included in the list compiled by the stakeholders, with the exception of Lombard Street and Columbus Avenue which did not receive as many red dots by the stakeholders. From these two lists, the top five intersections are therefore (parenthesis denotes the number of red dots received from both meetings):

1. **Grant Avenue, Broadway and Columbus Avenue intersection** (20 red dots)
2. **Green Street, Stockton Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (20 red dots)
3. **Francisco Street and Columbus Avenue** (15 red dots)
4. **Washington Street, Montgomery Street and Columbus Avenue** (15 red dots)
5. **Mason Street, Greenwich Street and Columbus Avenue intersection** (12 red dots)
Next Steps
The priorities identified by the community members and stakeholders will be documented to determine the type of analysis and technical data needed to develop potential solutions in the next phase of the study. Since the merchants were not well represented at either meeting, the study team will meet with them at their monthly meetings or may engage in door-to-door interviews to receive their input.
APPENDIX D

Summary: December 4, 2008 Public Workshop
COLUMBUS AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Public Workshop Summary

Date: December 4, 2008
Time: 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
Location: San Francisco Italian Athletic Club

Purpose of the Workshop
The Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation Study includes workshops with the community to share information and obtain input at key points in the process, including identifying transportation priorities and developing solutions.

The second Public Workshop was held on December 4th. At this second meeting, community members were invited to comment on three alternative designs for Columbus Avenue as well as tradeoffs posed by specific design elements. The meeting is a follow up to the first stakeholder meeting held on June 27, 2007, and the first public workshop held on September 20, 2007.

Meeting Publicity
The Workshop was publicized by contacting the members of the study mailing list a month before the event, followed by a reminder email sent one week prior to the event. Meeting information was also posted on the project’s website.

Workshop Structure and Materials

Agenda

6:00pm 1. Sign In and Open House
6:15pm 2. Welcome and Introduction
6:20pm 3. Large Group Presentation
6:55pm 4. Large Group Q&A
7:05pm 5. Introduction of Small Group Sessions
7:10pm 6. Small Group Sessions
**Presentation and Exercise Boards**

RENEW SF welcomed the evening’s participants and described how this study relates to other projects going on in North Beach. Rachel Hiatt and Jose Luis Moscovitch of SFCTA described the purpose and agenda for the workshop. Jeff Tumlin of Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates presented the elements of each design alternative as well as a benefits and impacts evaluation. These alternatives include a four lane design with curb and bus bulbs, a two lane design with a flexible use parking lane, and a two lane design which expands the sidewalk to encompass the parking lane, creating a raised flexible use space.

After the presentation, participants split into two groups to provide feedback on their likes and concerns, as well as opinions on a number of tradeoffs posed by the individual design elements including: bus bulbs, trees in the parking lane, the number of travel lanes, the inclusion of a median plaza, and the provision of parking.

**Findings**

This section summarizes the comments received from the Workshop participants.

**The Participants**

Workshop participants represented community members living and working in the study area. Two dozen community members and members of neighborhood groups attended, plus two representatives of city agencies. A handful of Chinese language speakers and members of Chinese press attended the event.

**Likes & Concerns**

The small group session participants were first asked to list their likes and concerns about each alternative.

Regarding Alternative 1, a number of participants liked that Alternative 1 would likely reduce instances of speeding.

Regarding Alternative 2, a participant noted that the expansion of sidewalks would “finally make North Beach normal”. Residents commented that this alternative would increase the appeal of the street for locals who currently avoid it because businesses cater to tourists. Some participants liked the median plaza idea. Concerns about removing traffic lanes included the inevitability of double parking and the fear that cars would be unable to get around buses. Some participants urged the study team to take a more system-wide approach and look at diversions onto other streets.

A number of participants expressed their preference for Alternative 3 because of its wide sidewalks. Many were unfazed by the proposal to eliminate parking on Columbus Avenue, saying, “Who cares about parking? This isn’t a suburb”. However, participants did express concerns about making parking alternatives clear.

Many comments were general or applied to multiple alternatives. Most participants liked the added sidewalk space provided by bulbs and moving trees to the parking lane. One participant expressed a desire for aesthetic sidewalk treatments and another proposed
putting all sidewalk space on one side of the street. Two participants proposed making Grant a pedestrian street. Garage access and high rates were a concern, and participants listed a need for a larger parking management system such as a central valet. One participant proposed working with merchants to publicize parking garages for clients. A number of participants were concerned with the larger picture, citing the need to address a larger area, consider regional access, and think about a future where mode shifts would enable accommodating fewer cars. While some participants called for bike lanes to be striped, other cyclists would rather not have striped lanes as they feel safer riding in the vehicle lane, especially as many bike conflicts are with Muni buses. A couple participants expressed a preference for expanded sidewalks over a median plaza. Two participants wanted the median extended. One participant was opposed to bus bulbs because of the potential delay imposed on vehicles. On the other hand, another participant wrote that bus priority is a must.

**Tradeoffs**

Since the available street and sidewalk space – as well as funding - for transportation along Columbus Avenue is limited, the trade-off exercise was designed to help understand where the Columbus community would strike a balance among competing priorities. For a number of design elements a tradeoff was presented on either side of a continuum, with numerical values along the continuum being 2, 1, 0, 1, 2, from left to right. A generic continuum is diagramed below:

The majority of people were in support of bus bulbs, widening sidewalks, moving trees to the parking lane, creating a plaza, and removing parking.

**Trade-Off A: Bus Bulbs**

Almost all participants were strongly in favor of bus bulbs.
Trade-Off B: Lanes
Almost all participants were strongly in favor of widening sidewalks, while a few preferred maintaining that space in a second vehicle lane.

Trade-Off C: Trees
All participants were in favor of moving trees to the parking lane (or neutral).

Trade-Off D: Median Plaza
A majority of participants were in favor of using the extra road space to provide a median plaza, while a few participants were opposed.
Trade-Off E: Parking
A majority of participants were in favor of removing metered parking, while one participant was opposed.

Next Steps
Additional public input will be collected through a survey (both paper and online). The survey asks about the above tradeoffs as well as general comments and will be available in English and Chinese. Additional efforts will be made to reach out to the business community.
## Appendix A. List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Brandt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcabrandt@yahoo.com">marcabrandt@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>SFBC/ BAC</td>
<td>1150 Clay Street, #7</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td>415.984.1447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vchang@chinatowncdc.org">vchang@chinatowncdc.org</a></td>
<td>CCDC</td>
<td>667 Clay Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alain</td>
<td>Dang</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adang@chinatowncdc.org">adang@chinatowncdc.org</a></td>
<td>CCDC</td>
<td>667 Clay Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Gilens</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tgilens@hotmail.com">tgilens@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>462 Vallejo</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mrgreenberg@gmail.com">mrgreenberg@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>431 Lombard Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Hoff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nhoff@mindspring.com">nhoff@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Hoffer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brianhoffer@gmail.com">brianhoffer@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathie</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clam@chinatowncdc.org">clam@chinatowncdc.org</a></td>
<td>CCDC</td>
<td>2133 Stockton Street, Apt 304B</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td>415.984.1461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Ng</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steve.ng@mingpaosf.com">Steve.ng@mingpaosf.com</a></td>
<td>Ming Pao</td>
<td>667 Clay Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiff</td>
<td>Elton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Elton@chinesenews.com">Elton@chinesenews.com</a></td>
<td>World Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415.609.3558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>Roth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nanroth@attglobal.net">nanroth@attglobal.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>1436 Kearny Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>415.430.8674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy</td>
<td>Till</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jill@chinatowncdc.org">jill@chinatowncdc.org</a></td>
<td>CCDC</td>
<td>1525 Grant Ave</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>415.984.1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1325 Grant Ave</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwu@chinatowncdc.org">cwu@chinatowncdc.org</a></td>
<td>CCDC</td>
<td>New Tang Dynasty TV</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
<td>415.640.3583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Zhen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bill.zhen@ntdtv.com">bill.zhen@ntdtv.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood Organizations

| Carolyn Blair | sfreecouncil@dslextreme.com | SFTC | 2310 Powell, #305 | San Francisco |
| Will Din      | afgantern@aol.com           | NBMA | 1525 Grant Ave    | San Francisco |
| Tony Ganter   | afghanter@sfbglobal.net     | NBMA | 235 Chestnut       | San Francisco |
| Daniel Maccliarim | Danny1mac@sfbglobal.net | NBMA | 1544 Grant Ave    | San Francisco |
| Wilma Pary    | panusiansf@yahoo.com        | ABCT | 958 Jackson St.   | San Francisco |
| P Smith       | pswrkgspce@aol.com          | THD  | 350 Union Street  | San Francisco |
| Keith Snaggers| keithspedicabs@dslextreme.com | SFBC | 2310 Powell, #305 | San Francisco |
| Howard Wong   | wangaia@aol.com             | ABCT | 128 Varennes St.  | San Francisco |
| Joan Wood     | joanwood@earthlink.net      | FWS  | PO 330214         | San Francisco |

### City Agencies

| Helen Kwan | helen.kwan@sfmata.com | MTA | 1 South Van Ness 7th Fl. | San Francisco |

<p>| SFCTA/RENEW SF | 6 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Sallaberry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mike.sallaberry@sfmta.com">Mike.sallaberry@sfmta.com</a></td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 South Van Ness 7th Fl.</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>415.701.4563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Boland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sboland@nelsonnygaard.com">sboland@nelsonnygaard.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson\Nygaard</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudine</td>
<td>Cheng</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claudine@chengassociates.com">claudine@chengassociates.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>RENEW SF</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-608-0968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Freebairn-Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sf-s@f-sc.com">sf-s@f-sc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>RENEW SF</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marv</td>
<td>Kasoff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MarvK2000@aol.com">MarvK2000@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>RENEW SF</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Hiatt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachel.hiatt@sfcta.org">rachel.hiatt@sfcta.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFCTA</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Mielstedt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rm@march.net">rm@march.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>RENEW SF</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Stonehill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura.stonehill@sfcta.org">laura.stonehill@sfcta.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFCTA</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Tumlin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jtumlin@nelsonnygaard.com">jtumlin@nelsonnygaard.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson\Nygaard</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wells39@msn.com">wells39@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>RENEW SF</td>
<td>785 Market St., Ste. 1300</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-284-1544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Parking Survey Occupancy Rates
Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation Study

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Columbus Avenue Parking Occupancy, FRIDAY 3-5pm

Parking Occupancy:
Friday
3 - 5 PM
Columbus Avenue Parking Occupancy: FRIDAY 5-7pm

Parking Occupancy:
Friday
5 - 7 PM
Columbus Avenue District Parking Occupancy: FRIDAY 7-9pm

Parking Occupancy:
Friday
7 - 9 PM

Data Source: SFGIS
Parking Occupancy:
Saturday
10 AM - 12 PM
Parking Occupancy:
Saturday
12 - 2 PM

Columbus Avenue Parking Occupancy: SATURDAY 12-2pm

APPENDIX E  Parking Survey Occupancy Rates
Columbus Avenue Parking Occupancy: SATURDAY 2-4pm
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Pedestrian Survey
COLUMBUS AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Pedestrian Survey Findings

Survey Main Findings:

- Transit and walking are the main two modes used by both visitors and residents of the area, regardless of income.
- Those who drive to Columbus Avenue are most likely to be visitors from outside San Francisco, and the top reasons they drive to Columbus Avenue are because they come in large groups or there is no transit near their homes.
- Transit users and walkers spend less on average per visit than auto users, but come to the area at twice the frequency for recreational purposes.
- Because of the higher frequency of visits, transit riders and pedestrians spend more than drivers on recreational activities on a monthly basis.
- The majority of respondents indicated that what they liked the most about the area is the pleasant atmosphere and the restaurants. This indicates that enhancing Columbus Avenue’s sidewalk culture is key to attracting visitors as well as San Franciscans to the area.
- Weekday respondents indicated to the same degree that they dislike the street congestion, the slow transit speeds and the difficulty of finding parking. Weekend respondents mainly commented on the difficulty of finding parking.
- The majority of respondents would choose to invest new transportation funds in faster and more reliable transit service.
- While approximately 40 percent of respondents who drove to the area did not pay for parking, nearly 25 percent on weekdays and nearly 35 percent on weekends paid more than $10 to park. This indicates that parking supply consists of both under-priced on-street parking and higher-priced off-street parking.

Survey Methodology

The Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation survey was conducted during two weeks in March 2008. Surveys from Tuesdays and Wednesdays (March 11, 12, 18, 19) are classified as “weekday” and surveys from Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays (March 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22) are classified as “weekend”. The survey was conducted at the Columbus/Stockton/Union intersection and the Powell/Columbus intersection between 4:15 and 8pm to catch the after-work and recreational crowd on all survey days. To catch a diverse set of respondents, surveyors intercepted every fifth visitor who looked over the age of sixteen.
The survey instrument for both weekday and weekend periods contained the same twelve questions. The survey took approximately three minutes to complete and respondents were given the option to enter into a raffle to win a $40 BART card or an adult Muni transit pass.

The target number of surveys for each period was 200 to ensure good sampling at the 95 percent confidence level and using a confidence interval of four. 397 weekday surveys were completed and 380 weekend surveys were completed.

The purpose of the survey was to understand the travel patterns, area preferences and preferred transportation improvements of Columbus Avenue corridor visitors and residents.

**Travel Mode, Spending, and Frequency Overview**

The majority of respondents either take transit or walk and it is these people that come to North Beach most frequently. Per visit, transit riders and walkers spend less than auto users and users of other modes; however, considering they frequent North Beach twice as often as drivers and comprise the great majority of respondents, they outspend all other modes. Figure 1 displays the mode split, per capita spending amounts, frequency in accessing North Beach for recreational trips, and per capita monthly spending amounts.

**Figure 1. Average Frequency of Recreational Trips and Spending by Mode of Access to Columbus Avenue – All Respondents (Weekday and Weekend)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Mode Split</th>
<th>Per Capita Spending</th>
<th>Frequency of Recreational Trips</th>
<th>Per Capita Monthly Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$36 per visit</td>
<td>10 days/month</td>
<td>$360 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$36 per visit</td>
<td>7 days/month</td>
<td>$252 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$52 per visit</td>
<td>4 days/month</td>
<td>$208 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Taxi/Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$41 per visit</td>
<td>8 days/month</td>
<td>$328 per month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All Respondents*  

**Legend**  

- **Mode Split**  
- **Per Capita Spending**  
- **Frequency of Recreational Trips**  
- **Per Capita Monthly Spending**

n = 666
Travel Mode to North Beach

The majority of respondents took transit or walked to Columbus Avenue. Transit has the highest mode share for weekday respondents while walking has the highest mode share for weekend respondents. The percentage of automobile users is nearly twice as high on the weekend.

On both weekdays and weekends, the average parking cost for all drivers and carpoolers is $5. On average, visitors pay twice as much as residents for parking, with visitors paying $6 and residents $3. As shown in Figure 5, nearly half of respondents did not pay to park, and a quarter to a third of respondents paid $10 or more to park. These parking costs reflect the parking supply which consists of free on-street parking, metered on-street parking, and higher priced off-street parking in lots or garages. Nelson Nygaard’s Parking Occupancy and Turnover Evaluation found that a majority of the area’s general use auto spaces are located in off-street lots and garages, and that the cost of off-street parking can be up to nine times higher than on-street parking.
Figures 6 and 7 below show the share of visitors to the area by income group and mode of travel. The largest income group, 28% of total respondents, earns less than 35K. More than half of those surveyed on Columbus Avenue earn less than 63K. These figures show that for both weekday and weekend respondents, transit use decreases with income, but walking rates are fairly consistent for all income levels. On weekdays, the greatest proportion of transit users earns incomes under 35K, and the most frequent mode for those with incomes over 100K is walking. On weekends, the greatest proportion of auto users earns incomes over 100K, but even so, those with incomes over 100K walk more than they drive. These figures show that transit and walking together comprise the main travel modes of visitors of all income groups.
Figures 8, 9 and 10 below show the share of visitors to the area by mode of travel and resident status. Transit and walking together comprise the main travel modes of visitors regardless of where they live, although car use does rise as distance from North Beach increases. Those who drive to North Beach are most likely to be visitors from outside of San Francisco. These figures show a slight shift away from transit on weekends.
Figure 8. Proportion of Travelers by Mode and Resident Status – Weekday Respondents

Figure 9. Proportion of Travelers by Mode and Resident Status – Weekend Respondents

n = 379

n = 375
Figure 10. Proportion of Travelers by Mode and Resident Status – All Respondents

![Proportion of Travelers by Mode and Resident Status](image)

n = 754

Spending Patterns

The survey asked respondents to calculate the amount they had spent or were planning to spend in the area that day for recreational purposes, specifically at shops, restaurants or entertainment venues. As shown in Figure 11, weekend respondents spend more per trip than weekday respondents, and visitors spend more than residents.

Figure 11. Average Spending Amounts for Recreational Purposes (per person per trip)

![Average Spending Amounts for Recreational Purposes](image)

n = 739         n = 669

Looking at spending by mode, Figures 12 and 13 show that auto users spend more per trip, but factoring in trip frequency, walkers spend the most per month.
Frequency of Visits to the Area

Respondents were asked to specify how often they come to North Beach for all trip purposes, including work, recreational, educational and administrative. The majority of respondents indicated that they come to the area at least once a week, and half of all respondents indicated that they come to the area at least five times a week. Weekday respondents are more likely to visit 5+ times a week, while weekend visitors are more likely to visit monthly or rarely.
Figure 14. Frequency of Visits to North Beach for All Trip Purposes

Breaking down this trip frequency data by mode, Figures 15 and 16 show that the most frequent visitors are transit riders and walkers, while auto users are most likely to rarely or never visit North Beach.

n = 754

Figure 15. Frequency of Visits for All Trip Purposes by Mode – Weekday Respondents

n = 374
Figure 16. Frequency of Visits for All Trip Purposes by Mode – Weekend Respondents

n = 372

Trip frequency decreases when looking only at visits for recreational purposes, including retail shopping, dining or visiting an entertainment venue.

Figure 17. Frequency of Visits to North Beach for Recreational Shopping, Dining or Entertainment Purposes

n = 770

Again, the most frequent visitors are walkers and transit riders, while auto users are most likely to rarely or never visit North Beach. For recreational trip purposes, walkers average ten visits per month, transit riders seven, and auto users four.
Figure 18. Frequency of Recreational Visits by Mode – Weekday Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Bike/Taxi/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5+ times/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 times/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely/Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 384

Figure 19. Frequency of Recreational Visits by Mode – Weekend Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Auto</th>
<th>Bike/Taxi/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5+ times/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 times/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely/Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 378
Preferences for Columbus Avenue

When respondents were asked to indicate what they liked most about North Beach, they typically picked the pleasant atmosphere and restaurants, regardless of where they live or the day they were visiting.

**Figure 21. Preferences for Columbus Avenue by Resident Status - Weekday Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Shops</th>
<th>North Beach and Surrounding Area Resident</th>
<th>Greater SF Resident</th>
<th>Outside of SF Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Shops</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Atmosphere</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Transit Access</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Availability</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 334
### Figure 22. Preferences for Columbus Avenue by Resident Status - Weekend Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Beach and Surrounding Area Resident</th>
<th>Greater SF Resident</th>
<th>Outside of SF Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Shops</strong></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Shops</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurants</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entertainment</strong></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pleasant Atmosphere</strong></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Transit Access</strong></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Availability</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 346

### Issues with Columbus Avenue

When respondents were asked to indicate what they liked least about North Beach, they typically picked congested streets, slow transit and hard to find parking. Weekend respondents consistently picked hard to find parking, regardless of where they live. The fact that so many respondents took issue with parking is consistent with Nelson Nygaard’s Parking Occupancy and Turnover Study which shows that on-street parking reaches nearly 100 percent occupancy on the weekend.

### Figure 23. Issues with Columbus Avenue by Resident Status - Weekday Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Beach and Surrounding Area Resident</th>
<th>Greater SF Resident</th>
<th>Outside of SF Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalks too crowded</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets too congested</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit too slow</strong></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking hard to find</strong></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking is expensive</strong></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 289
Figure 24. Issues with Columbus Avenue by Resident Status - Weekend Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>North Beach and Surrounding Area Resident</th>
<th>Greater SF Resident</th>
<th>Outside of SF Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks too crowded</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets too congested</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit too slow</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking hard to find</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking is expensive</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 319

Transportation Improvements

When respondents were asked to indicate their preferences for investing transportation funds, “Faster, More Reliable Transit” was the most commonly picked option, followed by “Parking Availability and Accessibility” and “Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities”. There was no difference in ranking between weekday and weekend respondents. Figures 26 and 27 show that “Faster, More Reliable Transit is the top preference for respondents, regardless of resident status, except for weekend visitors who prefer investing in “Parking availability and accessibility”. Nelson Nygaard’s Parking Occupancy and Turnover Evaluation finds that the issue is not parking supply but parking management. The study shows that even when on-street parking nears 100 percent occupancy, there remains ample supply in off-street garages and lots. Thus, one of its near-term recommendations is to raise awareness of existing parking opportunities.

Figure 25. Preference for Transportation Improvements - All Respondents
Figure 26. Preference for Transportation Improvements - Weekend Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Beach and Surrounding Area Resident</th>
<th>Greater SF Resident</th>
<th>Outside of SF Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faster, reliable transit</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking availability and accessibility</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/road improvements</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bike facilities</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 374

Figure 27. Preference for Transportation Improvements - Weekday Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Beach and Surrounding Area Resident</th>
<th>Greater SF Resident</th>
<th>Outside of SF Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faster, reliable transit</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking availability and accessibility</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic/road improvements</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bike facilities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 375

Trip Purpose
Among all respondents, the most common purpose of that day’s trip to North Beach was that the respondent lived in North Beach. Among weekday respondents, the second most common trip purpose was work related, while among weekend respondents, the second most common trip purpose was entertainment.

**Figure 28. Trip Purpose - All Respondents**

On both weekdays and weekends, the survey respondents represent a mix of resident backgrounds. About half of respondents are from North Beach and the surrounding neighborhoods and about two-thirds are from the City of San Francisco. The remaining respondents are from the rest of the Bay Area, the rest of California, the rest of the country, and even international countries.

n = 784

**Home Locations of Respondents**

On both weekdays and weekends, the survey respondents represent a mix of resident backgrounds. About half of respondents are from North Beach and the surrounding neighborhoods and about two-thirds are from the City of San Francisco. The remaining respondents are from the rest of the Bay Area, the rest of California, the rest of the country, and even international countries.