APPENDIX 1

CMP Roadway Network Segmentation and Changes

CMP NETWORK - ARTERIALS

Rationale for Segmentation

rajox Exec			Major	Reaction of the Market	Free
Street Name	Land	Speed	Cross	Change	way
init Street In Ra	Use	Limit	Street	In . Volume	Ram
1st Street			lander of the second	VOIUme	
Market-Harrison	an a	electric contraction and a super-		and and the state of the second s	
3rd Street	ne a complete entre for a construction of the second	al an	and the second second		
Jamestown-Evans *	- Steven and the second states of the second states and the	X	х	and a second	
Evans-China Basin		х	and the second	and the second second	and the second
China Basin-Market	and the second second second second	х	eren en angeler ar en Fristerier fel	x	
4th Street			en e en el como en este el como		
Market-Harrison	A PERSONAL PROPERTY AND A PROPERTY A			Real Property and	x
Harrison-3rd St		a finan menjanan pakenang	entering of the second states and		х
5th Street			an an an an an an Anna an Anna an Anna. An an Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna A		
Market-Brannan	And a second sec	riper-science or others	and a second		and a state of the
6th Street	an a	and a second second Second second	A Contraction	a has had here	enter de la composition de la compositi La composition de la c
Market-Brannan		a participan de como de la	en l'angele en en en angele (an el en and	n and a second secon	and a second
7th Street	an a		era vala ele energia con con c Ga	n and the second se	
Brannan-Market			a dan seter sedar karda Centres sering Karda	and the second	1
8th Street	an a	andre and second as a second second	e arandira sooring sooring d	and the second second	anna 17
Market-Bryant				and a second	ante de la companya de la companya Esta companya de la co
9th Street		niko na prosense na prosen	and a second	ersonen constantes de la constante Constantes de la constantes de la constantes de la constantes de la constantes de la constante de la constantes	
Brannan-Market				and the second sec	an a
lOth Street	and the part of a second state of a second	a firmara antar manara an 1	en de la company de la com La company de la company de	and the second	Alderse Station Contact Na Line and Station
Aarket-Brannan		a de la construcción de la construc	an a	durantees to	
19th Avenue/Park Presidio	Blvd		an ann an an an ann an an an an an an an	Mulandalites or	
J.S.101-Lake		x	ang		
lake-Lincoln		X	X	hereiter an eine state and state	
incoln-Sloat		ne providela esperante espe	X	Series de C	and the second second
Sloat-J.Serra		and a second data second and a se	X	S. S. S. S. S. S.	
lemany Blvd	 Section of the section of the section	anger is sub and providence	and the second second		
C & C limit-Lyell *	n an	X	er ogen somer en deterne og det		an ann an Arainn a' Arainn An Arainn an Arainn a' Arainn An Arainn an Arainn a' Arainn
yell-Bayshore		x	e anno ann an	No Incorport	an airtean a Na start a S
rmy Street	and the second	en la maximum de la companya	n fra 15 a se a de tra de guerra y frage	R. C. Mary S.	and and and a
uerrero-Kansas *	X	x		BUTTER	x
ansas-Bryant *			11	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	x
rvant-3rd St.	++		12.1	and the second of	x
av Street	1 1			and the second	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1
an Ness-Embarcadero	TINT			Same and the	al an en bel
avshore Blvd	<u> </u>			100 - 11 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 -	And the second
rmy-Industrial *		1	x	In a second second	x
ndustrial- C & C limit			x		x
eale/Davis	1		in the	a second and a	nin an an a
lav-Mission		1 2 13	Ston G .	Fasting 1	and a second
rannan Street	1 1		I	Prog 122	
ivision-9th St	1 22	T	1	douch a	and the second
th St-5th St			-	Concession of	Ale in a second
roadway		L	erro de - e	Sell Caral I	
ough-Larkin	x		Strate and	Start Same 18	et de la la

Contracting the second s			Major	1.	Free-
Street Name	Land Use	Speed Limit	Cross Street	Change In · Volume	way Ramp
Larkin-Powell (Tunnel)	X	x		78.933	6. 240. SA
Powell-Montgomery		x	1808	王子之之居一定	and the second
Montgomery-Embarcadero			x	36.3	i konta
Brotherhood Way	-		2 U.S.	OR - LOGS	0.00002.6.9
I Serra-Alemany	T		11.1.20 194	Baller Charles	1.00 E 10 E 3
Bryant Street	1		24272790	4-2228-234	2.0
Division-4th St				19913	X
4th St-Embarcadero	1	1	0.0	1. T. T. 19 14 - 3	X
Bush Street			0.0	CALL STREET	1.1.2.2868
Masonic-Gough	x			0.0302-253	3 13 61
Gough-Market *	X		x	1.12.48.213-73	30A 2.8 Mg
Castro/Divisadero Street				1.64.972.3	6 0201
Pipe-Geary			x	1. C.	每天以後以后
Coarry-14th St	¥		x	00010	8 1.3 1
14th St-Market	× ×		x	SATSM-ME	MINE (E)
Class Stroot	4	an Maria an Antoine an Angel		30913	8 113 13
Clay Street	1	in the second	T. T	CARSY TO	BATEM
Kearny-Davis		ada seren anter		764955	2 11 12
Columbus Avenue	and the second second second second		I	Y I	
North Point-Greenwich	and the second second second	and a second	v		
Greenwich-Montgomery			~	A COLOR OF SPECIES	0.9199 1949
Drumm Street	T Coll		and a second		11 A 4 6 10
Washington-Market	- The process contraction of			21 11 12 14 17 1	
Duboce Avenue	1 1				and the second
Market-Mission *	X	and the second second second	a contra con constante constant	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	CAPACITY IN T
Mission-Potrero	X	had the second second		10 Y 10 10 10	
The Embarcadero		and a second second			
Townsend-North Point	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	and the second second			
Evans Avenue	the statement of the statement				
Army-3rd St *				and solution.	A Start Sector
Fell Street				2067.15	C VITLA
Gough-Laguna	1 32		12 24	2063-010	X
Laguna-Stanyan			18	すれめいた日~日	X
Franklin Street				<u> 1. 6. 6</u>	化化化学科
Market-Pine			x	Jeens	St. Wald
Pine-Lombard	X		ou ababa	8.483 - 97	No. 128. V
Fremont Street				by 18 erm	
Harrison-Market *			191 J. 19	in realized	a segure d
Fulton Street		1. 3.1	all S &	3 -lert	Redam
Masonic-Arguello		X	X		alas.
Arguello-Park Presidio *		x	х	on ken li	1
Geary Blvd				100 B	Server Press
Market-Gough	х	X		da e - a -	19.24110
Gough-Arguello		Χ.		78 d#2	in deal
Arguello-25th Ave			x	1974 I	charge
25th Ave-Great Hwy	x		x	achta	Americal

tar tomater for Segments

B

Street Name	Land Use	Speed Limit	Major Cross Street	Change In Volume	Free- way Ramp
Geneva Avenue	ana ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang		faith na anns an agus anns anns an anns an agus anns an	ABRIVE OL	1
Phelan-Cayuga	X		entre de la compañía de la compañía		
Cayuga-Paris	x	a Anna ann an Anna an A	an a		
Paris-Santos	X	- open an open services and and			
Golden Gate Avenue	and the second		and the second		1
Masonic-Franklin	X	X	X		
Franklin-Market	×	X	X		
Gough Street	eren elemente mandel anna de	and the second second second	and the strength of the strength		
Pine-Geary			X		
Geary-Golden Gate *	X		entre entre nue avec	•	10.000
Golden Gate-Market	X	an a serie compositive congress tables and	n dan series dan series and	A CARLES	1
San Jose Avenue/Guerrero	ere manager over an exercise	and a stranger and			1. a (1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.
Army-29th St	X	X	ar 1,27,53 July Mennesser Senters		ALC ACT A
29th St-Monterey Blvd				1.2.5.3 ·** 起的地	X
Harrison Street	er en de la companya	a silomona ana ana ana			11-11-1.0.03
Embarcadero-1st St *	na series and the second		1.288 St.	NO LINI	X
lst St-4th St	en e	-		100号推11~	X
4th St-8th St	an adama an	and many second	1	2.54.14.3.76.04~	X
8th St-13th St	and the production of the same		Management of the state of the	C. K. G. C. L.	X
Hayes Street	are and the second second	terre a contra construction de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la c	CF 222770 1.1		20.4.7 eg
Market-Gough			EM 13 P	01906	
Howard Street	terre i s ¹³ s en pala esta en esta		a i Ara Antonio antonio	1202313+8	(U GANAN
Embarcadero-S.Van Ness				21.01.2578	
Junipero Serra Blvd	and the second second second	a de la companya de l	1.081	医无口产于 約77萬	11.2 % 44
Sloat-19th Ave *	- Andrew and the same	X	X	20.8*1.128	
19th Ave-Brotherhood Way	and the second		X	3.94233.9	的代表的
Brotherhood-C & C limit		and the second second	X		938 1 E . G
Kearny Street	parameter and the	Politika and a second		OBVECT M	的了路的人。
Market-Columbus	the second second	and a second second second	ALL ALMAND T	8-13 ICW6	章(786d);
King Street	and the second second	hermaliterister, weber jielika webe	11.0.1.0	是影性与一方上上	2032-0
6th St-Embarcadero	- Andrew - A		an and the strength of the str	REASTA, CO.	\$10 CT &
Lincoln Blvd/Kezar Drive	and the second	terre and the second of the second second	18. 	1912-101	82930
19th Ave-5th Ave	X	and a second second second	alan - maaaaaaaaaaaa	Sara-de	28123
5th Ave-Stanyan	X			NS DELY	K.K.N.NES
Lombard Street	an andress same survey	and the second second	· Yanusaa	9 A410-	76013)
Francisco-Van Ness *	an magnessive stationed	rangemetros esta hora conserva		BV61003	32018
Main Street	en la conserva	an Francischer	EX.	135.167	2,230,000
Mission-Market	er andre service and servic	en granden de mensenan	an second a second s	Alla ni	and the
Market/Portola	an en de la caracter de la caracter	g - the strange in the second	an antalanta menangan	7.119.7*0	021073
Sloat-Santa Clara	x		en el la compañía de	2697228	odd u & j
Santa Clara-Clipper *	Grade	Change		ACE.3.4+1	1921 2 × M
Clipper-Castro	X			alou olo-	nneerf
Castro-Guerrero	X	-	32.0	0.582910-	100000
Suerrero-Van Ness	er atte opert er den allere ooker		X	X	W. all
Van Ness-Drumm	X	and an entrempt inter		SDYH-	astrad

 \bigcirc

Carrier Construction		-	Major	an a	Free-	
Street Name	Land Use	Speed Limit	Cross Street	Change In · Volume	way Ramp	
Masonic Avenue	et es l'activités d'acturation de	en la magnalan ann an an an	Ann an the standard of the space		and the second	
Pine-Geary	a province a subserved of		X	And the second sec		
Geary-Page			X	Sec. Sec.		
Mission/Otis	and the second	na principal na principal de la composición de la composición de la composición de la composición de la composi	an a the state of the product of the design of		S	
Embarcadero-3rd St	ж	a Sitter and a construction of the second	er henre the long out of a second second		er el prem	
3rd St-9th St	x	and a second second second second	and a state of the second s	5 88-3 (MA 77	and the second s	
9th St-14th St	ж	and an and a construction of	A 2 Million (1997)		11.765 43.0	
14th St-Army *	ж	and the second sec	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR A CONTRACT			
Army-Ocean *	- Section - Sect	a praticipa e companya	X		CARDON CON-	
Ocean-Sickles	X	en en tel territor en remanariado	and the second second second			
Montgomery Street	an a	and the other statements of			S MARK	
Broadway-Bush	Service and the service of the servi		And the second s	and the second sec	listan na 1945. Marina ana amin'ny s	
North Point Street	na na sanana na sanana Na san			and the state of the second	94 - 17.80-40 1	
Van Ness-Columbus	e de artistico e de provincio dorre	e	X	28 NJ 83	1. Y. C. A. B.	
Columbus-Embarcadero	and concerned in the second	an objective to a restore contract	X	ant i Anton e ante	11765	
O'Farrell Street			17.834 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990 - 1990		4. 3. 1.6.15 Termina	
Gough-Mason *	x	the second second second second	an sa ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang an		1.15 (2.11)	
Mason-Market	x	and the second second second second			C 781	
Oak Street	and the second second	the second considerate states	and a standard and a standard	143 - 193 B. M. B.	G 4176	
Stanvan-Divisadero *	x	an enderster en anne en en e	x			
Divisadero-Laguna	x		х		х	
Laguna-Franklin	a dense in a second a second	a contra a a contra	and a start support of the start	102912423	X	
Ocean Avenue	and approximation of the second		An esta contractor and a second		Add to Cale	
19th Ave-Miramar *	X	Conditional sector of the sect			al distantia di Kanana mangana	
Miramar-I-280	X	and provide a second second			Q ANDARS	
Pine Street	and the second second second	and the second second second second	nigt - an internation - the second	and the state	1.6.6.1.6	
Market-Kearny	x	all and the second	And the second second	1	40.22	
Kearny-Leavenworth	×		Charles and the		ta a sa arriv	
eavenworth-Franklin	×	i Antophikaraa ahaa ahaa ahaa ahaa		1. 121 (D. L. P. K.)	11.2821392	
Franklin-Presidio	x	advani	All and a	the later of the second	02570.2	
Taintin-Flesturo	-	Sector Concession		20081.30	TO CALL	
Division-21st St	y I		12000000	x	6 012 6	
	A V		Charles and the second	x	1. 166	
Cist Strainy	A			The WY SVE	14,2,4,1	
Stoat-City & County limit	90		1.2.1	110.4.4.* 38	28 D.Y.C	
Sloat Bouleward	and a grant set to a state of the			7.9.2.0 St. 17.2	A CHAN YA	
Shuling I Common I		-	40.62.574.3	10 10 Jan		
Skyline-J.Selia	the complete spectra		and the second	A KING KIT KI	The second	
stanyan Street			1			
ULTON-TURK			a di secon consecuto del 1979. 1971	Contraction of the second s		
Sutter Street		in the second se	10 20 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10	100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100		
larket-Mason *	X	and the second		and a second	11.2 11.1	
lason-Gough	X	ne finer strandate strands og att	and the second			
Sough-Divisadero	X	nin (her broke renetations of a	x			
lurk Street	and the second	the distribution of the second pro-				
larket-Hyde	X	independence of the second second				
lyde-Gough	x	ender er enner en nerenter innere en ere	ββ – 199 15. π. – Arter Landston, – Handel Berter, Herner 15. π. – Handel State (1999)		and a definition of	

 \bigcirc

Land Use	Speed Limit	Major Cross Street	Change In [.] Volume	Free- way Ramp
X		1. 18.40	oright O	3.0.1
X		and the period on the State		1000
		x		
				.8.03
Sig.	Syst.	Change	ater Tangan Jacob State	
X			e se an en an en an	
And and the resulting of the			0.00-01 -00	х
		1 . Starten and	an at the second	X
antenno con cultura taman d	Although a latent of the source applies p	n general and a strain of the second	and the second	
	T			an - 1
onge-teritori o diteritori vita dil	a of the subdent of the subdension of	and a standard for the second s	alan sana di sa kata s	o Sie e VV recent commence
	Land Use X X Sig. X	Land Speed Limit X X Sig. Syst. X	Land UseSpeed LimitMajor Cross Streetx	Land UseSpeed LimitMajor Cross StreetChange In VolumexxxxxSig.Syst.Change x

· · · ·

CMP NETWORK - FREEWAYS

Rationale for Segmentation

Freeway	Split	Off-ramp	On-ramp
I-280			
C & C limit- U.S. 101	х	regeneration and a second s	
101/280 -6th/Brannan	ж	2290 512 23	-door a
U.S.101	A. A. [25] An all approximations in the state of the state A state of the state	ALLAN COLORING	
C & C limit- I-280	x	nor folgevist	g is statis, 19
I-280- I-80	x		
I-80- Fell/Laguna	×	a state of the second	s and
1-80			
U.S. 101- Fremont		x	5
Fremont- Treasure Island	alana at an	x	

Table II
Rationale for Changes to Arterial Segmentation
Since 1991

Third Street	Eliminated Fairfax Street as a break point. Evans Avenue is the new break point because of the change in speed limit and because Evans is a major cross street.
Alemany Boulevard	Lyell Street is a necessary break point because of a speed limit change.
Army Street (César Chávez)	Because of the size of the U.S. 101 interchange at Army Street circle, a break point was established on each side of it. One is at Kansas Street and a second is at Bryant Street.
Bayshore Boulevard	Industrial is a necessary break point because of nearby off and on-ramps.
Bush Street	Gough is the best divider to break Bush into two segments because land use changes occur at Gough and because it is a major cross street.
Duboce Avenue	Folsom Street was eliminated as a break point and replaced with Mission Street, because of the presence of on and off ramps to 101.
Evans Avenue and Fremont Street	The 1991 intermediate segment limits could not be justified and were eliminated (no apparent change in traffic flow conditions)
Fulton Street	Arguello was identified as an intermediate segment limit because it is a major cross street and because of a speed limit change.
Harrison Street	Eliminated 2nd Street and substituted First Street is the first break point because of the I-80 on-ramp.
Junipero Serra Boulevard	The first segment boundary is 19th Avenue instead of Holloway, as justified by the change in speed limit and also because 19th Avenue is a major cross street.
Lombard Street	Eliminated intermediate segment boundaries because land uses and traffic conditions are uniform along this street.
Market Street	Established a new segment boundary at Clipper because of a change in grade on each side of Clipper. Eliminated unjustified breaks at Danvers, Sanchez and Gough.
Mission Street	Eliminated intermediate boundaries between 14th and Army and between Army and Ocean to better reflect land use.
O'Farrell Street	Eliminated intermediate segment boundaries at Van Ness, Leavenworth and Taylor, which created segments too short for accurate measurement. Mason is the new break point because of land use changes.
Van Ness Avenue	Added Golden Gate Avenue as an intermediate segment boundary because of land use changes (start of the Civic Center area).



METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607-4700 TEL 510.817.5700 TTY/TDD 510.817.5769 FAX 510.817.5848 E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov WEB www.mtc.ca.gov 1

January 10, 2007 RECD JAN 1 2 2007

Jon Rubin, Chair San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

John McLemore, Vice Chair Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Ammiano City and County of San Francisco

Irma L. Anderson Cities of Contra Costa County

Tom Azumbrado U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

> James T. Beall Jr. Santa Clara County

Bob Blanchard Sonoma County and Cities

> Mark DeSaulnier Contra Costa County

Bill Dodd Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini U.S. Department of Transportation

> Scott Haggerty Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

> Steve Kinsey Marin County and Cities

Sue Lempert Cities of San Mateo County

Bijan Sartipi State Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

> James P. Spering Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier San Mateo County

Pamela Torliatt Association of Bay Area Governments

> Shelia Young Cities of Alameda County

> > Steve Heminger Executive Director

cc:

Ann Flemer Deputy Executive Director, Operations

> Andrew Fremier Deputy Executive Director, Bay Area Toll Authority

Therese W. McMillan Deputy Executive Director, Policy Ms. Tilly Chang Deputy Director for Planning San Francisco Transportation Authority 100 Van Ness Avenue, 26th floor San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: San Francisco CMP Segment Modification

Dear Tilly:

Thank you for the letter dated January 4, 2007 regarding CMP monitoring on Brannan Street. After reviewing your letter and the CMP monitoring map for the area, MTC supports the proposed changes to make monitoring on Brannan in this area consistent with SFCTA's standard CMP segment definitions while continuing to monitor Brannan Street consistent with overall CMP guidance.

MTC expects monitoring on Brannan will take place on Brannan from Division to 6th Street and from 6th Street to 3rd Street effective spring 2007. Please let me know if there are any questions.

Yours truly

Doug Johnson

 $J: Section \ Danning \ djohnson \ SFCTA \ CMP_modifications_Jan_2007. doc \ doc \$

Sean Co, MTC Valerie Knepper, MTC Doug Kimsey, MTC



APPENDIX 2

Infill Opportunity Zone Resolution

Amendment of the Whole In Committee 11/23/2009

RESOLUTION NO.

494-09

[Resolution establishing Infill Opportunity Zones for Congestion Management Planning in the City and County of San Francisco under California Government Code Section 65088.]

Resolution establishing Infill Opportunity Zones for Congestion Management Planning in the City and County of San Francisco under California Government Code Section 65088.

WHEREAS, State Senate Bill 1636 ("SB 1636") allows local jurisdictions to designate eligible areas as Infill Opportunity Zones ("IOZs") so that Congestion Management Program ("CMP") requirements better support local land use and transportation policies, pursuant to California Government Code Section 65088.4; and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco County Transportation Authority ("Authority") and the City and County of San Francisco ("City") seek to reform the City's approach to analyzing transportation impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), to better support local land use and transportation polices, by measuring Automobile Trips Generated ("ATG") rather than Level of Service ("LOS"); and

WHEREAS, The adoption of an IOZ in the City would provide strong support for the Authority and the City's effort to replace LOS with ATG for CEQA transportation impact purposes; and

WHEREAS, The adoption of an IOZ in the City would allow the Authority, as Congestion Management Agency ("CMA"), to better support the City's Transit First Policy, land use planning efforts, compact land use pattern, and multimodal transportation system through CMP practices; and

WHEREAS, SB 1636 requires that any IOZ designation be made no later than December 31, 2009; and

Supervisors Mirkarimi, Maxwell BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Page 1 11/23/2009

WHEREAS, The IOZ designation is consistent with the San Francisco General Plan ("General Plan") because: (1) it will further the goals of the City's Transit First Policy as articulated in General Plan; (2) it will directly support policy objectives of the General Plan, including, but not limited to, Objectives 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, and 19 of the Transportation Element; and (3) it will compliment City efforts to promote infill housing and mixed-use commercial developments in proximity to multimodal transportation infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors finds the City to be eligible for IOZ designation in the area identified by the Authority in the IOZ Map ("IOZ Map") on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 091335 , which is hereby declared to be a part of this motion as if set forth fully herein; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors' eligibility findings are supported by analysis conducted by Authority staff, which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 091335 , and which is hereby declared to be a part of this motion as if set forth fully herein; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors finds that the IOZ designation is, on balance, consistent with the General Plan; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the eligible portion of the City identified by the Authority in the IOZ Map is hereby designated an IOZ within the meaning of California Government Code Section 65088.

Supervisors Mirkarimi, Maxwell BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Page 2 11/23/2009



City and County of San Francisco Tails

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Resolution

File Number: 091335

Date Passed: December 08, 2009

Resolution establishing Infill Opportunity Zones for Congestion Management Planning in the City and County of San Francisco under California Government Code Section 65088.

December 08, 2009 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Alioto-Pier, Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Daly, Dufty, Elsbernd, Mar, Maxwell and Mirkarimi

File No. 091335

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 12/8/2009 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

8 December 200° Date Approved

An - 2 Calingo
Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board
NAT
Mayor Savin Newson
N N



Infill Opportunity Zones San Francisco Eligible Areas Analysis November 2009

State Senate Bill 1636 (Figueroa) allows local jurisdictions to designate Infill Opportunity Zones (IOZs). Within a designated IOZ, the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) must use an alternative to automobile level of service (LOS) standards for CMP purposes.

SB 1636 requires that any IOZ designation(s) be made no later than December 31, 2009. We are advised by the City Attorney's office that this action would be taken by the Board of Supervisors.

ELIGIBLE GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Per SB 1636, a location must meet all of the following criteria to be IOZ-eligible:

- 1. The area must be zoned for compact residential or mixed use development;
- 2. The area must be located within a specified distance of certain types of transit service;
- 3. The area must be located in a county with a population of 400,000 or more; and
- 4. IOZs can only be designated in areas where infill development is consistent with the local jurisdiction's general plan and any applicable specific plan.

San Francisco meets the county-level population requirement. The General Plan (Housing Element) recognizes the role of infill development in addressing the city's housing needs, thus satisfying the fourth requirement.

Based on the first two requirements, however, the entire city is not eligible to be designated as an IOZ.

Transit Requirement: SB 1636 requires that IOZs be well served by transit; specifically, IOZ areas must be within:

- 300 feet of a bus rapid transit (BRT) corridor;
- 1/3 mile of a rail transit station;¹
- 1/3 mile of a ferry terminal served by bus or rail transit; or
- 1/3 mile of an intersection of at least two major bus routes.

The legislation does not define "major bus routes." The recommended IOZ area uses the legislation's definition of qualifying "transit service" to determine "major" bus routes: service must operate with headways less than 15 minutes for at least 5 hours on weekdays. The recommended San Francisco IOZ area includes zones within 1/3 mile radius of these intersections, combined with radial areas applied to BART stations, Caltrain stations, Muni rail stops, and ferry terminals. Finally, the recommended San

¹ SB 1636 also allows a "future" rail transit station to satisfy this requirement, but such a station must have advanced into the construction phase with programmed operational funding for frequent service.

Francisco IOZ includes a 300-foot buffer along each side of BRT corridors (considered as the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) Rapid Network bus corridors).²

Zoning Requirement: SB 1636 requires that IOZs be zoned to allow new "compact" residential or mixed use (including residential) development. San Francisco's existing high land use densities permit an interpretation that qualifies any area zoned to allow residential use either As-of-Right or as Conditional Use as IOZ-eligible in terms of the zoning requirement.

Most zoning classifications in San Francisco allow residential development as-of-right. Dwelling units are permitted in all residential and residential-commercial districts, and in any districts described by a combined classification (such as RM-2/NC-1, mixed residential and neighborhood commercial). With few exceptions, housing is also permitted throughout South of Market's mixed-use districts and all of those in Chinatown. Downtown and commercial zoned districts also allow for residential development. In the neighborhood commercial districts, housing is allowed but particularly encouraged above ground floor for new construction projects

Residential development in industrial districts and the South of Market's Service and Secondary Office (SSO) district requires a Conditional Use Permit. Residential and mixed uses are also conditionally permitted in areas classified as M-1 and M-2, describing light and heavy industrial land uses, respectively.

Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data reflecting currently-adopted zoning controls and transit network attributes, we determined which portions of San Francisco meet both the zoning and transit requirements. The resulting map, attached, identifies the recommended (i.e., all eligible) IOZ areas in San Francisco. (Treasure Island is omitted because it does not meet the transit requirement.)

SB 1636 also requires that a development project be completed within a designated IOZ within four years of such designation; otherwise, the IOZ terminates.

Attachment - Recommended San Francisco Infill Opportunity Zone

² BRT is defined as bus service that includes at least four of ten attributes specified in the statute.



APPENDIX 3

Traffic Monitoring (Speed and Travel Time Reliability) Methodology & Results

KEY TOPICS

- LOS Standard and Exempt Facilities
- CMP Network Changes
- Methodology
- Travel Speed Results
- LOS F Segments
- Travel Time Reliability Results
- Future Monitoring Considerations

The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority) has updated its Congestion Management Program (CMP) every two years since 1991. The Transportation Authority monitors roadway performance with Level of Service (LOS) along its CMP network, which includes all state highways, principal arterials and several other roads as defined in previous LOS monitoring efforts. The Transportation Authority ensures that LOS measurement methods used by its contractors, Caltrans, or other agencies involved in monitoring the CMP network are consistent with State law.



A3.1 LOS Standards and Exempt Facilities

LOS E was the adopted standard in the initial (1991) CMP Monitoring. Since 1991, CMP Monitoring has been conducted biannually to ensure that the non-exempt facilities within the CMP network are operated at LOS E or better.

The Transportation Authority is mandated to prepare a deficiency plan or monitoring follow-up, depending on the applicable exemption, to improve the performance of non-exempt facilities operated at LOS F. The criteria to qualify for the exemption are:

- Facilities that were already operating at LOS F at the time of baseline monitoring, conducted to develop the first CMP in 1991, are legislatively exempt from the LOS standards.
- CMP segments that are within a designated Infill Opportunity Zone (IOZ) are also exempt from LOS conformance requirements.

For LOS monitoring purposes, the CMP segments are categorized by exempt or nonexempt status:

- **Exempt:** segments which qualify for the exemption as detailed above.
- **Non-exempt:** all other segments. If a non-exempt segment fails for three consecutive CMP cycles, it is classified as deficient.

Since 2005, speed monitoring has included the exempt facilities in addition to the rest of the CMP network. Figures A5-1 and A5-2 show segments that are exempt from LOS standards because they were found to be LOS F in the inaugural CMP cycle, while Figure A3-3 shows the portions of the CMP network that are within San Francisco's Infill Opportunity Zone and are therefore exempt from LOS standards as well.



Figure A3-1. Segments Exempt in AM Due to Being at LOS F in the Inaugural Cycle



Figure A3-2. Segments Exempt in PM Due to Being at LOS F in the Inaugural Cycle



Figure A3-3. Segments Exempt Due to Being within Infill Opportunity Zones

A3.2 CMP Network Changes

The CMP network is described in detail in Chapter 3 of the main report. There are no changes to the CMP network from 2021 to 2023.

A3.3 Methodology

Since the 2013 CMP update, automobile LOS monitoring was conducted using commercial speed data from INRIX where available, and floating car runs were made to collect data for all other CMP segments for which INRIX data coverage was insufficient. In the 2013-2017 cycles, INRIX provided travel time data at one-minute intervals on a unique set of roadway segments called Traffic Message Channels (TMCs). Since the 2019 cycle, INRIX provided data at a spatially finer-granular level (XD segments) and the TMC-based travel time data were discontinued, and the TA switched to using XD-based travel time data. Same as the processing method used in the previous cycles, the XD-based speeds were aggregated to CMP segments spatially and the peak periods temporally. LOS was assigned based on the average speed observed in the AM and PM peak periods using both 1985 and 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies. Section 3.4 provides a detailed description of data processing steps.

The 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology has been adopted since the baseline monitoring cycle. It is necessary to maintain 1985 HCM for historical comparisons, identifying exempt segments, and monitoring potential network deficiencies. Since 2009, all the arterial segments were also evaluated using the HCM 2000 classification. Therefore, both the HCM 1985 and 2000 results are presented below.

For freeways, only HCM 1985 LOS was calculated, as the HCM 2000 methodology requires traffic density information for all unique freeway segments and ramps. Collection of comprehensive freeway traffic densities is beyond the scope of the CMP monitoring effort.

In addition to LOS, the buffer time index (BTI) which reflects auto travel time reliability was introduced in the 2021 cycle. The idea behind the metric is that travel times vary significantly during different times of the day and from day to day, and travelers remember these unexpected long delays experienced during their commutes and would therefore budget extra (i.e. buffer) time for the trip in order to reach destination on time. The buffer time here is calculated as the difference between the 95th percentile travel time and the average travel time. Buffer time index is the buffer time divided by the average travel time. It indicates the amount of extra time required to be on-time 95 percent of the time, or in other words, late in only one day per month (20 working days).

A3.3.1 MONITORING PERIOD

This section summarizes the monitoring days and the conditions that may affect the regular traffic pattern during the monitoring period. INRIX data for every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursdays in the months of April and May 2023 were utilized to calculated the average speed of each CMP segment, leaving 26 days within the monitoring period. The morning (a.m.) and afternoon (p.m.) peak periods were defined as 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m respectively.

These monitoring periods were also used for transit speed monitoring (see Appendix 6).

Public Holidays and School Breaks

There were no public holidays within the monitoring period (Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays in April and May 2023). The San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) was in session during the monitoring period.

Special/Construction/Weather Events

No INRIX data during the monitoring period were removed from analysis due to special, construction, or weather events.

A3.3.2 COMMERCIAL SPEED DATA

Since the adoption of the 2009 CMP update, there has been a proliferation of archived commercial speed data. This data is collected through real-time GPS monitoring of a variety of sources such as delivery vehicles, navigational devices, and highway performance monitoring systems, and obtained from third-party vendors like INRIX.

As part of the 2011 CMP update, the Transportation Authority explored the reliability of this new data source by comparing results computed from this source to those computed from floating car runs. The analysis found that, although the INRIX data speeds were somewhat higher, on average, than the floating car speeds, the difference was within the typical range of variation for floating car results and that commercial speed data and floating vehicle data were equally acceptable for meeting CMP legislative requirements. For more details about the pros and cons of using commercial speed data, refer to the 2013 CMP report.

In 2013, MTC contracted with INRIX to obtain region wide commercial speed data and has made the data available to the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) and other local governments free of charge for planning and monitoring purposes. The data available from INRIX was in the form of traffic message channel (TMC) links.

In 2019, MTC renewed the contract with INRIX with a major change that the speed data would be on the XD segments, whose length are typically much shorter than those of TMC segments. Due to this segmentation change, the aggregated CMP speeds from XD links and TMC links were found to be inconsistent even with the same underlying

data sources. To make "apples-to-apples" comparison, both 2017 and 2019 speeds based on XD speeds were calculated and reported, and the congestion trends from 2017 to 2019 were derived from them.

Since 2019, the CMP reports have used the XD-based speed data to derive and report auto LOS and reliability metrics.

A3.3.3 SUPPLEMENTAL TRAVEL TIME RUNS

Floating car surveys were conducted on CMP segments with insufficient INRIX speed coverage. The surveys were conducted using conventional methodologies. Drivers were instructed to follow road rules including the speed limit, traffic signals and not blocking intersections. GPS coordinates were recorded as the floating car travels along the CMP segment. The temporal aggregation of multiple floating car runs on the corresponding CMP segment was performed in the same manner as for the INRIX data, explained in Section 3.4 below.

A3.3.4 PROCESSING

The data were processed to obtain automobile speed, LOS, and reliability for each CMP segment during the morning and afternoon peak periods. The data processing consists of four steps as shown in Figure A₃-4. The following provides more details on the data processing procedure:

- The GIS shapefile was reviewed to prepare the base map of the CMP network for conflating the XD links against CMP segments;
- In this step, INRIX XD links were mapped to CMP segments to establish a relationship between XD links and CMP segment. In the cases where the ends of the CMP did not align with the ends of the XDs, travel time was interpolated linearly by using the overlapping portion;
- During data cleaning, INRIX data points based on historical data or that can be affected by the conditions mentioned earlier in Section 3.1 were dropped and will not be used in the LOS and reliability analysis. With the floating car data, the first and last timestamps from the GPS readings when entering and exiting the CMP segment were identified and the CMP travel time was calculated;

- In addition, in cases where multiple XD links spanned a single CMP segment, the travel times were summed and then aggregated spatially to obtain the required average peak period speeds by CMP segment. To ensure the aggregated speed was representative of the traffic condition on the whole CMP segment, a minimum spatial coverage requirement was applied. Based on the remaining aggregated one-minute speeds, the average and 5th percentile speeds for each CMP segment during the AM and PM monitoring periods were calculated.
- Finally, LOS and BTI were calculated. LOS was assigned based upon the peak period speed. For the methodology of LOS assignment, please refer to the section below. BTI was derived as



A3.3.5 LOS ASSIGNMENT

This section discusses the methodology for assigning a LOS (A to F) to each CMP segment for both morning and afternoon peak periods. The LOS assignments for arterials and freeways are consistent with previous reporting periods and legislative requirements from the California Government Code. First, each CMP segment was classified as either an arterial or a freeway. The methodology slightly differs depending on this classification, as follows.

Arterials

LOS for arterial segments was assigned twice using both 1985 and 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies. Both methods required identifying the class of the street (HCM 1985 Class I, II or III; HCM 2000 Class I, II, III or IV). Class was determined according to the free flow speed of the road. For example, the free flow speed may be the average speed at 6am when traffic volumes are light and travel speeds are not influenced by interactions with other vehicles. For the HCM 1985 and 2000, the classification of streets was taken from previous LOS monitoring reports. Then, by knowing the average travel speed in the morning and afternoon peak periods and the class of the street, the LOS could be assigned according to the HCM 1985 and HCM 2000 methodologies. Refer to Tables A5-2 and A5-3 for the LOS look up tables.

Freeways

Freeways followed a similar methodology as arterials; however, it was not necessary to assign a class of freeway. The HCM-1985 method was used to calculate LOS for all freeway CMP segments. By knowing the average speed of the freeway in the morning and afternoon peaks, Table A3-3 was used to assign a LOS in each time period.

ARTERIAL CLASS	I.	II	III
Range of Free Flow Speed (mph)	45 to 35	35 to 30	35 to 25
Typical Free Flow Speed (mph)	40	33	27
LEVEL OF SERVICE	AVERA	GE TRAVEL SPEED	(MPH)
A	≥ 35	≥ 30	≥ 25
В	≥ 28	≥ 24	≥ 19
С	≥ 22	≥ 18	≥ 13
D	≥ 17	≥ 14	≥ 9
E	≥ 13	≥ 10	≥ 7
F	< 13	< 10	< 7

Table A3-1. Arterial LOS Assignment, HCM 1985

Source: Table 11-1, Highway Capacity Manual, 1985

Table A3-2. Urban Street LOS Assignment, HCM 2000

URBAN STREET CLASS	1	H	111	IV
Range of Free Flow Speed (mph)	55 to 45	45 to 35	35 to 30	35 to 25
Typical Free Flow Speed (mph)	50	40	35	30
LEVEL OF SERVICE	A	VERAGE TRAVI	EL SPEED (MP	H)
A	> 42	> 35	> 30	> 25
В	> 34-42	> 28-35	> 24-30	> 19-25
С	> 27-34	> 22-28	> 18-24	> 13-19
D	> 21-27	> 17-22	> 14-18	> 9-13
E	> 16-21	> 13-17	> 10-14	> 7-9
F	≤ 16	≤ 1 3	≤ 10	≤ 7

Source: Exhibit 15-2, Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (U.S. Customary Units)

LEVEL OF SERVICE	DENSITY (PC/MI/LN)	SPEED (MPH)	V/C RATIO	SATURATION FLOW (PCPHPL)
А	≤ 12	≥ 60	0.35	700
В	≤ 20	≥ 55	0.58	1,000
C	≤ 30	≥ 49	0.75	1,500
D	≤ 42	≥ 41	0.90	1,800
E	≤ 67	≥ 30	1.00	2,000
F	> 67	< 30	-	-

Table A3-3. Freeway Segments, HCM 1985

Source: Adapted from Table 4-1, Special Report 209, HCM 1985

A3.4 Travel Speed Results

Speeds for the a.m. and p.m. peak for each CMP road segment from all CMP cycles can be found in attachments 5.1 and 5.2. Attachment 5.3 presents the 2023 LOS monitoring results for all CMP segments. For arterials, the results are presented for both the 1985 and 2000 HCM methodologies. Table A3-4 presents summary statistics on the peak period speeds.

Table A3-4. 2023 CMP Average Travel Speed Results Summary Statistics

	NUMBER OF SEGMENTS	AVERAGE Speed (Mph)	STANDARD DEVIATION	MINIMUM Speed	MAXIMUM SPEED
AM	245	17.6	9.8	6.5	63.5
РМ	245	15.7	9.2	6.3	63.9

A3.5 LOS F Segments

Tables A5-6 and A5-7 present the segments operated at LOS F (1985 HCM method) during the 2021 Monitoring. As noted above, the Transportation Authority uses the 1985 HCM for calculating LOS when making historical comparisons to the baseline cycle.

Table A3-5.
 2023 Roadway Monitoring Results – LOS F Segments (1985 HCM), AM Peak

NAME	FROM	то	DIR.	AVE SPEED/ LOS (1991)	IOZ (YES/ NO)	STATUS / COMMENTS
Junipero Serra	Brotherhood	19th	Ν	-	Y	Exempt: Segment is within an IOZ and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
Octavia	Market	Fell	Ν	-	Y	Exempt: Segment is within an IOZ and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
US-101	County Line	Cortland	Ν	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
US-101	Cortland	I-80	Ν	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
US-101	I-80	Market	Ν	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
I-80	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
I-80	Fremont Exit	US-101	W	-		Segment is partially in an IOZ. 1st Cycle LOS F: Segment requires follow-up monitoring per CMP procedures.
US-101	Market	I-80	S	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.

NAME	FROM	то	DIR.	LOS (1991)	IOZ (YES/ NO)	STATUS / COMMENTS
1st St	Market	Harrison	S	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
Junipero Serra	County Line	Brotherhood	N	-	Y	Exempt: Segment is within an IOZ and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
Junipero Serra	Brotherhood	19th	Ν	-	Y	Exempt: Segment is within an IOZ and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
Oak	Fillmore	Laguna	E	-	Y	Exempt: Segment is within an IOZ and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
US-101	Cortland	I-80	N	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
US-101	I-80	Market	N	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
I-80	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
I-80	Fremont Exit	Market	W	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
US-101	Market	I-80	S	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
I-80	US-101	Fremont Exit	E	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.
I-80	Fremont Exit	Treasure Island	E	F	-	Exempt: Segment monitored at LOS F during the baseline monitoring and therefore does not constitute a deficiency.

Table A3-6. 2021 Roadway Monitoring Results – LOS F Segments (1985 HCM), PM Peak

A3.6 Travel Time Reliability Results

Auto travel time reliability represented by Buffer Time Index (BTI) was a new metric added in this cycle. Unlike LOS, which indicates the congestion condition based on average speed, BTI provides additional information on variability of travel times experienced by travelers over a certain period of time. It is useful in that travelers can budget extra amount of time in accordance with BTI to ensure on-time arrival for 95 percent of time.

Table A3-7 presents summary statistics on the peak period BTI for the current cycle. During the 2023 monitoring cycle, the overall average travel time reliability was slightly worse in the AM peak period than the PM peak period. On average, travelers needed to allocate an additional 28% and 26% of their average travel time in the AM and PM to ensure 95% on-time arrival (an increase from 22% and 19% respectively for 2021). Attachment 5.4 presents the reliability monitoring results for all segments in the CMP network.

	NUMBER OF SEGMENTS	AVERAGE (%)	STANDARD DEVIATION (%)	MINIMUM (%)	MAXIMUM (%)
AM	245	28	17	6	174
РМ	245	26	18	6	225

Table A3-7. 2023 CMP Travel Time Reliability (Buffer Time Index) Results Summary Statistics

Attachment 3-1. CMP Segments Average Speeds (AM Peak) (1991 - 2023)

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE SPEED 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE Speed 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
1st St	Market	Harrison	S	0.48		15.1				12.5	11.2	20.8	16.3	14.2	13.8	18.5	11.8	12.8	13.4	11.6	17.0	14.6
2nd St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72								10.1	10.8	12.2	13.9	11.1	9.7	9.6	10.4	8.8	14.3	11.4
	Market	Brannan	S	0.72								14.3	18.6	16.3	20.8	9.6	11.9	10.6	10.5	10.9	14.1	13.2
	Jamestown	Evans	Ν	1.62		25.4				23.5		17.9	20.5	24.6	23.9	18.1	17.1	15.3	15.3	12.8	15.6	14.6
	Evans	Terry Francois	Ν	2.36	10.3	24				23.6		24.7	23.1	28.4	27.6	20.9	17.5	16.2	16.9	13.6	18.1	17.0
3rd St	Terry Francois	Market	Ν	1.05	12.1	12.1	15.3		10.8	9.2	6.2	8.1	9.7	20.0	15.1	13.6	12.1	10.6	10.7	10.9	14.4	10.1
	Terry Francois	Evans	S	2.36	10.3	24.1				23.8		20.2	28.9	28.6	27.3	21.7	18.7	17.5	17.8	14.0	18.8	18.4
	Evans	Jamestown	S	1.62		22.3				20.9		23.7	21.9	23.2	25.4	19.2	18.4	15.9	15.8	11.3	15.3	14.8
Ath St/Stockton	O'Farrell	Harrison	S	0.56		11.6	8.1	14.6				11.3	9.4	13.4	17.0	13.6	13.9	11	10.8	10.4	13.1	10.6
411 51/ 5100 K1011	Harrison	Channel	S	0.60									16.0	13.8	16.8	12.8	11.4	7.6	8.7	9.7	13.5	11.7
Eth Ot	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	7.9	10.5	10.7	12.1	10.5	11.8	8.6	10.9	11.8	14.7	16.3	9.5	10.0	8.7	10.7	10.1	13.1	11.0
50150	Market	Brannan	S	0.72	7.9	11.6				9.9	10.6	11.8	11.4	19.3	16.1	11.7	10.8	11.4	11.2	10.6	14.1	12.8
Cth. Ot	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72		13.8		·		4.7	5.5	12.6	10.3	11.2	15.7	13.6	10.6	10.4	10.6	10.5	14.7	10.0
oth St	Market	Brannan	S	0.72		22.4				10	8.3	13.6	14.2	15.1	16.5	17.5	14.6	12.3	12.4	11.2	21.3	13.9
7th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	8.9	13.9			14.2		6.8	13.4	19.1	18.9	19.3	15.4	10.8	8.6	8.9	10.1	13.2	10.0
8th St	Market	Bryant	S	0.60		17.1			17.7		15.9	16.6	18.7	15.0	17.9	15.9	13.5	12	12.2	12.6	12.8	11.6
9th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	9.9	12.5	13.3			10.3	9.6	14.2	13.0	11.4	13.8	14.4	10.2	9.1	9.2	10.0	10.2	9.2
10th St	Market	Brannan	S	0.73	12.1	20.5				16.3	9.7	17	26.1	21.9	21.4	23.8	18.1	16.5	17.3	16.4	20.9	15.7
	Market	Mission	E	0.74								19	18.5	12.1	13.7	16.3	13.1	9.3	9.8	7.8	15.1	12.0
	Mission	Potrero	E	0.67								15.9	13.6	14.1	13.6	14.7	13.3	10.2	10.9	10.7	15.0	13.1
16th St	Potrero	Mission	W	0.67								13.4	11.5	13.5	12.1	14.1	13.0	11.8	12.0	12.0	14.4	13.4
	Mission	Market	W	0.74								12.9	13.7	13.4	12.7	16.0	13.3	10.5	11.6	10.9	13.0	14.3
	Junipero Serra	Sloat	Ν	1.25		19.2			23.1			22.1	16.4	18.2	16.9	15.7	17.6	17.8	19.3	17.2	22.6	18.8
	Sloat	Lincoln	Ν	2.13	11.1	19.2			15			17.9	18.6	13.8	15.4	17.0	13.1	13.4	13.7	15.7	20.9	15.5
	Lincoln	Lake	Ν	1.85		21.9			19.7			19.9	20.4	19.9	22.1	24.5	21.7	19.9	20.0	19.2	27.0	24.4
19th Ave/Park	Lake	US-101	Ν	1.18		38.8				28.6		34.7	44.0	45.3	43.6	49.6	37.4	45.2	44.4	43.7	42.3	44.3
Presidio	US-101	Lake	S	1.26		38.3				47.2		42.2	40.3	40.7	24.4	42.9	39.7	32.1	35.2	26.9	47.0	40.1
	Lake	Lincoln	S	1.85		20.9			22			25.1	26.1	26.3	28.1	26.4	22.8	22	22.1	21.2	27.7	22.0
	Lincoln	Sloat	S	2.13	11.1	17.2			18.4			21.8	22.2	19.2	19.3	17.8	17.4	18.1	18.9	18.8	21.2	14.8
	Sloat	Junipero Serra	S	1.25		20.2			21.2			20.2	17.2	21.6	23.6	23.8	23.2	24.9	30.1	27.1	28.1	25.7
	Junipero Serra	Lyell	E	2.95		25.6				20		20.9	21.5	28.3	23.2	23.0	20.0	16.5	16.7	18.5	24.4	22.1
	Lyell	Bay Shore	E	1.59		28.5				19		23.7	28.5	26.1	28.5	29.7	22.3	21.3	20.1	21.3	29.8	25.6
Alemany	Bay Shore	Lyell	W	1.57		35.4				28.4		37.5	25.4	30.7	28.1	29.8	31.2	28.2	29.4	27.2	28.2	29.5
	Lvell	Junipero Serra	W	3.03		25.6				15.1		19.1	21.4	25.3	21.4	25.9	22.4	15.3	15.0	17.3	21.1	20.0
	Van Ness	Embarcadero	E	1.07	12.7	22.4				16.8		19.7	21.0	18.9	14.1	21.3	14.8	13.8	14.5	15.4	22.8	17.7
Bay	Embarcadero	Van Ness	W	1.07	12.7	19.7				22.8		18.3	19.6	19.3	20.1	20.6	17.1	16	16.5	15.4	19.1	16.8
	County Line	Industrial	N	2.27		20.9				25.3		18.4	26.2	17.4	19.1	13.9	10.8	12.3	11.5	12.0	21.9	15.7
	Industrial	Cesar Chavez	N	0.83		20.0				14.8		11.2	19.0	17.5	12.6	15.8	16.2	15.1	13.4	11 1	17.9	15.9
Bayshore	lerrold	Industrial	S	0.80		20.2				17.5		17.6	29.9	25.4	19.4	22.1	24 4	19.2	23.2	19.0	23.1	20.0
	Industrial	County Line	S	2.26		21				23.3		25.7	30.1	27.8	24.1	24.5	27.7	19.3	19.2	17 7	20.1	20.0
Beale/Davia	Clay	Mission		0.20		11.7	10	16.6	16.6	20.0		15.6	1/ 1	100	10.0	0.0	22.0	19.5	11 /	0.7	11.0	11 6
Deale/ Davis	Clay	IVIISSIUII	3	0.32		11.3	TO	10.0	T0.0			10.01	14.1	12.0	12.3	0.0	9.2	9.5	11.4	9.1	14.2	11.0

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE Speed 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE Speed 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Division	6th	E	0.54									15.7	13.8	11.7	20.3	16.2	18.9	13.5	11.8	15.8	13.8
Bronnon	6th	3rd	E	0.51									21.8	15.8	14.7	19.3	13.2	10.8	11.3	10.1	15.8	14.3
Brannan	3rd	6th	W	0.52									15.9	17.0	12.8	20.4	14.4	12.4	13.2	13.6	16.6	15.3
	6th	Division	W	0.54									16.3	16.9	14.1	22.9	15.9	12.2	11.6	10.3	13.8	13.3
	Gough	Larkin	E	0.36		19.2			9	10.6	12.3	11.4	14.7	15.1	16.3	8.8	11.6	10	11.5	10.9	17.1	13.0
	Larkin	Powell	Е	0.55		22.5			15.1	16.6	16.3	36.8	18.2	32.8	23.2	14.0	8.4	21.5	12.8	12.0	33.7	17.2
	Powell	Montgomery	E	0.35		16.8			8	10.9	11.8	13.9	15.4	20.1	15.8	11.4	11.2	8.2	12.4	11.5	18.2	13.3
Broadway	Montgomery	Embarcadero	E	0.35		11.2	9.4	15.1	12.2	11.6	8.8	10.8	11.3	13.9	15.3	11.3	9.9	8.1	11.7	10.2	17.9	14.2
bioadway	Embarcadero	Montgomery	W	0.35		17.7			14.8	11.2	12.1	17	17.5	19.9	17.1	12.7	17.1	10.8	13.3	10.5	14.7	14.0
	Montgomery	Powell	W	0.35		15.2			10	8.9	13.5	14.5	11.5	13.3	11.7	11.1	11.2	9.2	11.7	11.6	15.3	14.2
	Powell	Larkin	W	0.55		35.6			16	20	16.3	34.1	34.6	32.9	31.6	27.8	33.1	31.3	25.3	21.1	30.9	30.7
	Larkin	Gough	W	0.36		10.6	11.2	12.9	15.2	17.1	14.4	14.4	17.9	19.5	15.0	11.6	8.8	15.1	16.2	15.7	14.8	13.0
Brotherbood	Junipero Serra	Alemany	E	0.43									21.3	25.8	29.2	28.7	23.0	24.4	23.3	22.3	24.9	23.5
Biothemood	Alemany	Junipero Serra	W	0.47									31.8	29.7	28.8	28.7	23.3	24	24.5	24.0	29.0	25.4
Bryant	Division	4th	E	0.99	7.7	12.2	13.2		12.9	13.2		12.2	11.2	13.1	19.4	15.9	14.9	11.7	12.3	11.1	16.4	14.7
bryant	4th	Embarcadero	E	0.77		21.8			14.4			18.3		21.2	18.9	21.5	16.6	12	12.5	11.7	16.4	13.9
Ruch	Masonic	Gough	E	1.24		17.3				22.4		18.2	17.2	18.0	23.3	20.4	16.6	15.7	15.4	17.0	18.7	15.7
Dusii	Gough	Market	E	1.45	3.2	10.9	9.6	11.4	11.6	12.6	8.7	10.7	11.7	10.9	13.8	16.4	12.1	10.4	11.4	10.4	16.0	12.1
Castro/Divisadoro	Market	14th	Ν	0.32		17.5			11.9	10.1	10.7	16	9.0	14.8	15.6	14.0	12.5	10.4	10.7	10.8	14.0	11.4
	14th	Geary	Ν	1.13	4.5	14			10.6	11.2	8.8	11.2	11.3	15.0	14.9	14.4	11.7	10	9.9	9.4	12.3	11.7
	Geary	Pine	Ν	0.27		10.8	7.7	7.5	7.4	7.3	8.4	7.1	6.1	11.1	8.1	13.0	10.3	7.9	9.4	8.8	12.6	9.7
	Pine	Geary	S	0.27		14.2			13.2	7.3	7.8	11.7	15.6	14.5	13.0	13.6	11.1	12.1	12.3	9.7	12.9	10.3
	Geary	14th	S	1.13		14.8			14	11.5	9.8	12.3	15.8	16.6	12.8	14.9	11.7	12.3	12.4	12.0	13.5	13.3
	14th	Market	S	0.32		11.9	10.4	13.3	14.2			10.3	16.4	9.9	16.0	15.0	12.5	11.6	12.0	11.4	15.0	12.1
	Guerrero	Bryant	E	0.76		19				14.3		16.6	17.2	18.8	17.0	17.4	12.7	12.6	13.6	13.3	18.3	12.0
	Bryant	Kansas	E	0.38		19.9				28.9		28.3	31.3	20.5	26.9	26.2	20.8	24.9	20.1	20.8	25.0	23.8
Cesar Chavez	Kansas	3rd	E	0.80		17.6				19.5		25	16.4	18.6	19.9	20.4	18.0	14.3	14.3	14.8	19.7	17.1
	3rd	Kansas	W	0.80		19.4				18.8		22.1	20.1	18.6	23.0	21.4	17.6	15	14.4	13.2	18.2	16.8
	Kansas	Bryant	W	0.38		17.7				31.9		30.1	26.2	23.5	25.3	22.8	20.4	19.8	17.5	17.1	19.3	19.9
	Bryant	Guerrero	W	0.75		19.6				16.2		19.3	16.0	13.8	14.8	15.2	13.1	9.4	10.3	9.6	13.2	13.9
Clay	Kearny	Davis	E	0.38	11.7	3.7			12.5	10.6	9.2	10.8	14.3	19.1	19.0	12.4	9.9	10.7	10.7	10.1	12.0	10.6
	Montgomery	Greenwich	Ν	0.67		14			14.9			13.3	14.3	14.9	12.6	13.3	12.4	11.6	12.0	10.7	13.9	13.5
Columbus	Greenwich	North Point	Ν	0.42		22.6			9.1	18.2		18.8	16.6	10.6	10.5	13.6	12.5	11.5	10.9	8.7	13.7	12.9
	North Point	Greenwich	S	0.42		18.6			16.9			15.9	12.5	18.7	18.4	13.4	12.8	11	11.0	9.3	14.4	14.5
	Greenwich	Montgomery	S	0.67		16.3			11.1	9.2	9.3	11.7	12.3	11.6	12.0	12.9	11.8	11.2	11.7	10.8	16.6	11.5
	County Line	SF Cemetery	E	1.16		45.2						27.3	38.3	42.7		32.3	25.4	30.8	43.6	45.8	55.9	51.6
	SF Cemetery	Lyon/Francisco	E	0.93		34.2						28.3	19.3	12.5		25.0	15.3	17.8	15.0	13.3	38.1	57.2
Doyle/Lombard/	Lyon/Francisco	Van Ness	E	1.29		22.2				13.7		20.9	21.2	20.8	19.2	19.8	19.0	18.6	17.7	17.6	24.5	18.1
Richardson	Van Ness	Lyon/Francisco	W	1.29		19.7				16.9		16.6	18.3	17.7	16.6	20.4	16.4	13.5	14.3	9.2	15.6	18.2
	Lyon/Francisco	SF Cemetery	W	0.96		47.7						31.4	40.3	37.8		37.5	32.3	46.1	39.9	37.8	43.6	37.5
	SF Cemetery	County Line	W	1.15		43.3						28.7	41.3	44.1		39.3	35.1	48.3	50.7	52.0	55.3	55.2
Drumm	Market	Washington	Ν	0.22		19.9				23		12.9	13.1	16.8	16.1	11.2	13.0	9	10.0	8.1	12.6	10.4
	Washington	Market	S	0.22		5.3	5.3			22		8.4	11.6	8.7	20.3	6.8	7.5	7	8.4	6.9	8.9	8.8

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE SPEED 95	AVE SPEED 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE SPEED 2004	AVE SPEED 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE SPEED 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Market	Mission	Е	0.35		7.7	9.1	3	8.8	5.5	5.8	12		9.7	16.6	19.6	13.3	9.2	9.5	8.4	15.5	10.8
Dubaas (Division	Mission	Potrero	E	0.66	9.9	12	11.5	10.4	12.6	13		15.1		13.8	23.5	12.7	13.7	11.3	16.5	11.5	18.8	18.1
Duboce/Division	Potrero	Mission	W	0.66	9.9	17.1				11.3	5.8	12.7		12.8	18.0	11.8	13.5	11	14.4	13.6	15.6	15.0
	Mission	Market	W	0.35		10.7	11.7	9.4	13.5			14.7		14.6	14.1	16.6	11.2	8.4	8.6	8.0	12.3	10.9
Embargadoro	Townsend	North Point	Ν	2.16		21.2				14.5		12.3	22.4	21.1	20.4	17.5	16.0	13.2	14.4	14.9	18.2	14.4
Emparcadero	North Point	Townsend	S	2.16		15.2				13.8		16.6	17.3	13.2	14.1	16.1	14.3	13.2	14.3	12.9	17.7	14.3
Evans	Cesar Chavez	3rd	S	0.73		16.3				20.4		16.1	16.9	20.7	15.7	14.8	12.8	10.4	16.6	15.7	19.9	16.2
Evalis	3rd	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.73		19.9				17		28.4	24.8	22.5	15.9	15.3	13.4	16.5	14.9	14.1	16.2	13.7
	Gough	Market	E	0.29		11.6	12	4.3	8.1	7.6	6.1	7.7	8.8	11.4	8.7	17.8	9.1	8.1	8.3	6.2	11.5	10.1
Fell	Gough	Laguna	W	0.18		26.7				11.8	11.1	7.2	6.2	12.9	15.2	17.5	14.2	9.8	11.2	12.3	14.9	11.4
	Laguna	Stanyan	W	1.56		19				24.5	16.2	23.2	27.9	26.4	26.3	23.8	20.0	20.5	20.0	19.4	18.1	18.5
	13th	8th	E	0.49								10.2			18.2	19.4	14.8	12.5	12.5	11.8	14.4	12.7
Folsom	8th	4th	E	0.69								24.8	13.3	14.9	17.0	18.1	12.6	12.8	13.3	13.4	13.6	14.0
10130111	4th	1st	E	0.52								19.5	17.0	20.7	18.8	18.9	15.1	11.7	11.8	9.4	12.9	10.9
	1st	Embarcadero	E	0.34								11.5	18.6	13.2	10.8	16.4	12.2	7	7.2	6.2	12.9	8.5
Franklin	Market	Pine	Ν	1.06	8.5	13.3				11.5	9	13.5	16.9	14.9	12.7	15.6	11.1	9.9	10.1	10.4	12.5	10.8
	Pine	Lombard	Ν	0.83		14				26.3		18.3	18.3	20.5	21.1	21.0	17.8	18	18.6	18.5	18.6	15.2
Fremont	Harrison	Market	Ν	0.48		6.4				11.3	10.7	12.4	12.7	12.9	13.6	16.3	11.2	9.6	9.8	9.5	12.1	8.9
	Park Presidio	10th Ave	E	0.20		16.7				15.2			30.8	27.2	24.5	21.7	19.3	18.3	17.6	16.2	21.5	19.0
	10th Ave	Arguello	E	0.53		22.4				16.3			29.5	19.2	17.0	18.1	16.4	15.6	18.4	16.9	21.5	18.6
Fulton	Arguello	Masonic	E	0.66	9.8	18.6				11.5	9.9	15	12.5	16.2	13.4	15.6	14.5	13.4	13.7	12.7	17.6	17.1
	Masonic	Arguello	W	0.66		15.9				16.2		18.5	23.5	20.4	16.5	18.2	17.1	15.2	16.0	15.0	16.9	18.3
	Arguello	10th Ave	W	0.53		22				28.7			21.8	27.3	17.4	19.8	20.7	19.9	19.9	20.1	22.6	23.0
	10th Ave	Park Presidio	W	0.20		14.2				10.4	6.4		16.6	15.4	11.8	19.1	19.6	17	18.5	19.1	22.6	19.5
	Great Hwy	25th Ave	E	1.78		24.2				23.5	16.4	21.5	25.3	25.0	23.1	18.3	14.4	17.5	19.4	20.2	23.2	20.6
	25th Ave	Arguello	E	1.42		21.6			10.6	20.7	10.3	16.7	25.1	23.9	20.3	16.7	13.6	14.7	15.5	16.2	22.3	17.9
	Arguello	Gough	E	1.91		25.3			24.6		15	23.6	23.4	28.5	22.2	20.5	16.4	19.6	18.8	17.0	22.5	17.6
Geary	Kearny	Gough	W	1.18		12.3	15.4		7.2	15.2	9.5	15	14.2	15.1	14.1	13.4	11.2	10.3	10.9	9.4	13.3	11.5
	Gough	Arguello	W	1.92		23.8			24.7		15.4	17.7	20.2	20.1	20.3	21.0	16.2	17.5	17.0	16.7	18.8	19.1
	Arguello	25th Ave	W	1.42		21.3			13.7		11	15.5	23.0	22.1	19.8	16.4	14.2	13.4	13.8	12.3	15.9	15.9
	25th Ave	Great Hwy	W	1.79		28.3				26	14.7	23.3	24.3	23.9	24.5	18.3	15.4	16.8	18.6	18.8	20.0	19.4
	Ocean	Cayuga	E	0.56		15				20.4		14.7	13.3	8.8	11.9	13.8	10.9	10.1	11.6	10.2	17.4	14.5
	Cayuga	Paris	E	0.33	10.4	11.7	13			16.1	8.8	11.8	11.1	13.4	15.3	14.7	11.7	12.4	12.3	11.0	17.4	13.9
Geneva	Paris	Santos	E	1.19		29.7				25		27.2	21.2	20.6	22.9	22.6	15.8	18.6	19.3	18.1	22.9	20.9
	Santos	Paris	W	1.19		27.4				27.3		26.7	22.8	23.4	22.7	20.0	16.6	18.4	17.9	16.4	22.3	20.9
	Paris	Cayuga	W	0.33	10.4	11.6	13.3			18.7		10.4	9.9	8.2	8.7	12.9	10.7	8.5	9.5	9.0	16.5	12.5
	Cayuga	Ocean	W	0.53		4.5	15.5			15		11	6.9	9.6	8.8	13.6	10.2	8.2	9.2	8.3	14.8	11.6
Golden Gate	Masonic	Franklin	E	1.37		19.3				17.2		26.3	15.9	17.0	15.4	13.6	12.1	17.1	14.5	13.7	13.0	13.8
	Franklin	Market	E	0.65	12.2	16.9				13.2		12.2	12.4	10.7	12.3	10.9	8.1	10.2	8.0	7.6	12.7	8.1
	Pine	Geary	S	0.26	9.5	25.6				28.4		21.5	23.6	20.6	16.4	19.1	13.5	13.2	13.3	15.0	16.0	13.7
Gough	Geary	Golden Gate	S	0.33		20.1				20.1	20.9	15.3	22.5	23.2	19.1	16.8	12.7	9.6	10.8	10.4	16.0	11.4
	Golden Gate	Market	S	0.54	8.3	12.8	11.1	6.5	18.9		8.9	15.4	13.8	15.7	15.9	16.0	10.5	11	9.5	10.0	15.3	10.3

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE SPEED 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE Speed 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Monterey	29th	Ν	1.17		17.3				33.8		28.3	27.3	25.6	24.4	21.2	12.7	13.4	12.5	12.9	28.2	17.5
0	29th	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.29	6.2	19.3				15.2		22.6	19.9	24.5	10.2	17.1	15.1	12.5	16.3	12.3	18.4	14.5
Guerrero/San Jose	Cesar Chavez	29th	S	0.28		26.3				20.5		19.9	22.4	21.2	12.2	20.7	15.6	14.6	15.6	12.2	16.6	18.3
	29th	Monterey	S	1.17		23.7				31.6		23.1	26.1	30.3	30.0	27.8	24.3	24.7	25.3	21.3	32.1	26.3
	Embarcadero	1st	W	0.34		34.8				13.8		18.6	12.7	20.1	17.5	17.4	13.6	9.3	9.9	9.7	14.9	13.5
Lleviese	1st	4th	W	0.52		27.6				15.2		17.3	24.4	11.4	14.0	17.8	12.3	11.2	10.7	10.9	14.9	12.7
Harrison	4th	8th	W	0.69		28.9				26.2		19.1	16.0	15.8	19.5	17.9	17.2	16.9	17.1	14.3	14.2	15.3
	8th	Division	W	0.40		14.4				13.6		14.3	15.3	13.3	14.4	15.8	14.0	10.1	10.1	10.1	12.4	10.1
Hayes	Market	Gough	W	0.39	·	10.2	11.1	11.6	23.3		9.4	16.6	18.0	12.4	12.5	15.3	12.9	9.1	8.5	9.3	12.3	11.0
Howard	Embarcadero	S Van Ness	W	2.11		14.9				14.2		15.6	16.2	14.2	15.0	16.2	13.3	10.9	10.7	10.2	12.7	12.5
	County Line	Brotherhood	Ν	0.29		40.4				33.3		39	45.8	40.0	44.1	27.0	27.0	18.7	15.0	15.4	51.5	19.9
	Brotherhood	19th	Ν	0.34	9.7	23.8				36.7		32.8	29.2	22.1	10.8	12.8	13.1	10.2	11.1	8.2	25.4	12.0
	19th	Sloat	Ν	1.21		27				19.4	17.3	18.8	24.7	24.9	19.8	21.6	20.6	22.9	23.0	20.7	28.6	22.3
Jumpero Serra	Sloat	19th	S	1.21		32.4				20.9	18.9	18.7	16.1	22.1	10.8	25.3	21.6	23.4	23.2	20.0	26.8	20.0
	19th	Brotherhood	S	0.33		19.9				30.7		43	39.4	39.6	42.3	42.7	39.3	42.8	45.3	42.3	45.6	44.9
	Brotherhood	County Line	S	0.30		41.9				38.7		40.4	42.5	43.5	44.1	49.0	48.7	54.6	51.5	48.4	55.2	53.0
Kearny	Market	Columbus	Ν	0.65	6.3	13.7			8.8	12.9	5.4	14.1	13.7	13.8	14.7	11.7	8.6	7.5	7.7	8.0	11.8	9.8
Kind	4th	2nd	E	0.34									20.9			14.9	12.4	13	13.0	13.9	18.0	16.7
Killg	2nd	4th	W	0.34									18.3			15.9	13.6	11.7	11.5	12.7	21.6	16.8
	19th Ave	5th Ave	E	0.83		22.6				11.4	13.4	17.2	23.9	22.4	26.9	20.2	15.4	17.7	17.7	14.7	22.3	19.5
Lipcoln / Kozar	5th Ave	Stanyan	E	0.70		10.7	12.2	23.4				20.3	11.9	20.3	21.1	16.0	16.7	13.2	14.3	15.5	20.4	17.9
LINCOIN/ Rezal	Stanyan	5th Ave	W	0.70		31.7				9.9	15.4	25	25.4	24.4	24.3	25.5	24.4	24	24.4	24.8	24.2	23.1
	5th Ave	19th Ave	W	0.83		25.2				10.6	13.8	26.3	27.7	25.9	29.2	23.6	21.6	18.2	18.7	19.0	22.9	21.6
Main	Mission	Market	Ν	0.12		9.9	9.8	8.4	11.5	11.8	9.1	13.9	16.8	10.7	21.7	12.0	5.3	8.9	9.1	9.3	12.6	9.9
	Sloat	Santa Clara	E	0.43		16			18.9			13.8	16.8	20.3	25.1	21.8	14.0	13.4	13.7	14.2	22.0	16.6
	Santa Clara	Burnett	Е	1.34		24.1			33			18.6	20.5	19.5	18.5	21.0	15.9	15.7	16.3	15.9	21.5	20.2
	Burnett	Castro	E	1.62	7	33			22			20.9	25.4	26.5	21.1	23.5	18.8	20	18.3	18.3	24.3	22.6
	Castro	Guerrero	E	0.79	8.7	20						13.2	10.1	15.7	9.2	13.6	10.4	12.8	13.2	12.4	16.4	12.7
	Guerrero	Van Ness	E	0.43	8.3	16.3			9.3	16.2		6.7	8.9	16.0	12.9	16.2	10.6	9.9	9.8	9.5	13.0	12.0
Market/Portola	Van Ness	Drumm	E	1.77	9.6	14.4				8.4	9.8	9.3	12.0	12.5	11.6	12.3	10.1	7.5	7.2	7.5	11.0	10.3
Warkey Fortola	Drumm	Van Ness	W	1.77	9.6	15.3				12	11.4	12.8	13.6	14.9	15.7	13.1	11.8	7.1	7.9	8.2	8.8	8.3
	Van Ness	Guerrero	W	0.43	8.3	17.8			7.3	23.3		13.6	13.9	14.2	13.8	15.2	14.3	13.7	13.7	12.6	13.8	13.2
	Guerrero	Castro	W	0.79		18.8						16.9	15.7	15.1	12.5	17.7	15.1	12.4	12.7	12.8	16.9	15.4
	Castro	Burnett	W	1.63		28			27.5			22.6	25.1	25.3	22.4	23.3	19.9	21.3	22.0	19.0	23.3	24.2
	Burnett	Santa Clara	W	1.34		22.8			30.2			19	22.0	21.2	23.5	20.3	18.5	16.9	18.4	16.8	23.3	20.6
	Santa Clara	Sloat	W	0.43		13.2			9.5	18.2		19.6	16.2	10.4	12.5	18.6	15.4	13.6	14.3	14.7	19.6	15.4
	Page	Geary	Ν	0.79	10	13.1				11.3	9.4	15.4	16.3	19.9	12.8	20.2	12.3	14.6	15.0	11.6	15.3	14.2
Masonic	Geary	Bush/Euclid	Ν	0.20	8.5	14.6				9.7	7.9	14.2	23.8	27.0	15.4	23.1	15.7	17.6	16.8	15.0	17.9	15.9
HIUSOIIIO	Presidio	Geary	S	0.29	8.5	11.2	15.7			10.3	7.7	13.5	18.3	19.7	10.0	17.5	14.9	16.5	16.8	16.1	17.6	16.7
	Geary	Page	S	0.79	10	16.4				14.8		11.8	16.2	17.2	11.1	19.2	14.3	13.5	14.1	12.3	15.3	14.3
NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE SPEED 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE SPEED 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE SPEED 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE SPEED 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
--------------	----------------	----------------	---------------------	----------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------
	Sickles	Ocean	N	1.45		21.1			26.5			26.3	21.8	22.2	21.8	16.8	13.5	13.4	13.3	11.4	17.7	17.5
	Ocean	Cesar Chavez	Ν	1.95		20.3			20.4	18.3		18.1	14.8	19.3	17.2	14.2	13.1	11.9	12.9	12.4	18.2	16.4
	Cesar Chavez	14th	Ν	1.39	10.9	19.8			14.3			13.6	14.6	18.5	15.7	13.7	12.7	11.4	11.6	9.5	13.2	13.2
	14th	9th	Ν	0.65		12	11.3	11	10	8.1	8.2	11	11.5	15.1	16.3	14.3	12.4	10.3	10.8	9.6	14.0	12.1
	9th	3rd	Ν	0.98		13.7			13.4		9.1	18.4	13.0	17.1	16.2	16.2	13.2	14	14.4	13.2	14.8	14.1
	3rd	Embarcadero	Ν	0.74	9.7	8.9	10.8	11.2	8.2	8.7	8.6	11.8	10.2	17.3	12.2	14.7	10.1	7.5	8.6	7.0	12.8	10.0
Mission/Otis	Embarcadero	3rd	S	0.74	9.7	8	10.8	14.3	10.7	9.7	10.7	13.2	13.1	13.8	10.1	14.7	10.5	8.7	9.2	8.4	13.4	10.8
	Зrd	9th	S	0.98		16.9			16.2		8.4	16.3	16.6	15.5	15.4	16.7	14.4	13	13.2	12.9	14.6	16.2
	9th	14th	S	0.68	9.7	12.8	12.8	10.7	11.7	8.7	5.8	14.1	15.2	15.8	19.4	14.4	12.0	10.5	9.8	9.1	14.7	11.7
	14th	Cesar Chavez	S	1.39	10.9	17.9			14.8			16	13.5	17.9	15.0	14.1	13.2	14	14.2	12.7	15.0	15.8
	Cesar Chavez	Ocean	S	1.95		17.6			19.6			18.9	16.7	20.1	18.8	16.2	14.6	12.9	13.2	12.1	16.7	16.4
	Ocean	Sickles	S	1.45		20.8			31.8			20.7	25.3	22.3	22.0	17.2	15.6	16	16.8	15.9	18.1	18.2
Montgomery	Broadway	Bush	S	0.51	6.2	6.5				9.3	8.5	10.2	11.7	14.1	11.1	14.1	10.3	8.9	9.6	8.5	11.0	9.7
	Van Ness	Columbus	Е	0.38		15.2				12.5	10.8	18.9	13.1	17.5	18.9	14.4	13.3	13.2	13.4	17.2	17.9	16.3
	Columbus	Embarcadero	Е	0.61		14.9				15.4		17.6	23.5	18.7	22.2	21.4	12.2	13	14.2	13.8	16.3	15.1
North Point	Embarcadero	Columbus	W	0.61		16				13.9		18.9	21.4	15.7	18.6	15.2	13.9	12.5	12.9	12.6	15.8	15.4
	Columbus	Van Ness	W	0.38		15.3				13.7		17.6	17.0	16.2	16.1	16.0	12.7	11.8	8.9	8.5	13.6	13.1
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	0.92		23.1				23.5		27.7	25.4	23.6	25.0	19.7	17.0	19.3	19.7	18.5	19.7	18.9
	Divisadero	Fillmore	E	0.37						25.2		24.7	26.7	19.7	20.4	14.9	12.6	11.5	8.1	10.4	16.2	12.4
Oak	Fillmore	Laguna	Е	0.27	8.2					8.8	15.3	16.5	21.4	17.0	8.8	11.8	12.9	7.1	8.1	10.4	16.2	7.8
	Laguna	Franklin	E	0.27		20				7.5	7	14.8	12.4	15.1	17.0	13.4	9.1	9.9	10.3	10.0	16.2	11.4
	19th Ave	Miramar	Е	1.11		19.5				7.6	11.4	14.3	13.6	18.7	13.9	15.0	14.5	13.6	14.0	12.8	16.5	15.8
0	Miramar	Howth	E	0.48						7.6	8.2	12.6	12.9	11.1	11.4	14.1	11.9	11.9	11.9	12.0	14.7	12.8
Ucean	Howth	Miramar	W	0.48		9.4	16.3			8.6	8.4	13.4	11.3	14.8	15.8	13.4	11.4	10.1	9.1	10.9	14.9	12.6
	Miramar	19th Ave	W	1.11		15.4				9.2	8.2	13.8	13.4	11.1	14.6	14.3	13.3	11.2	11.2	12.0	16.2	14.4
Ostavia	Market	Fell	Ν	0.27								8.7	10.6	11.0	10.1	5.8	7.3	8.1	8.2	7.7	8.6	6.5
Octavia	Fell	Market	S	0.28								14.5	6.8	10.4	7.5	3.3	2.8	7.5	8.5	7.3	16.0	9.2
	Gough	Mason	E	0.85		16.6				13.5		11.9	12.7	13.4	12.2	14.6	11.9	10.2	9.7	9.0	12.5	11.9
OFarrell	Mason	Market	E	0.28		18.7				10.9	8.3	8.2	9.1	11.6	9.6	13.3	9.9	8.8	9.9	8.1	12.5	9.9
	Market	Kearny	W	0.38	4.6	9.9	7.3	8.1	8.3	7.9	7.2	7.5	7.3	8.8	10.5	6.9	7.4	6.5	7.6	6.8	14.3	8.8
Dine	Kearny	Leavenworth	W	0.63		16.2				15.6		13.4	25.2	18.2	24.1	15.2	17.6	14.2	13.6	14.7	14.3	14.3
Pine	Leavenworth	Franklin	W	0.46		17.2				9.4	9.4	12.3	18.3	17.7	17.7	13.5	7.5	9.9	11.9	11.5	15.3	13.1
	Franklin	Presidio	W	1.27		20				20.4		23.7	21.0	21.3	21.8	17.3	17.1	16.1	20.0	19.3	17.7	17.2
	Cesar Chavez	21st	Ν	0.61		25.2			15.5			17.8	26.6	21.2	23.5	15.2	10.4	14	15.1	16.9	15.1	13.8
Detres	21st	Division	Ν	0.80		21.4			18.3			17.7	26.5	22.5	24.3	19.0	19.5	11.7	14.8	14.4	18.9	16.9
Potrero	Division	21st	S	0.80		24.8			18.2			21.5	20.5	23.9	19.0	19.2	14.4	15.5	15.5	15.4	17.9	16.1
	21st	Cesar Chavez	S	0.60		20.1			13.5			19.1	25.5	22.0	23.3	17.2	14.5	17.3	16.4	18.1	21.4	18.1
	County Line	Sloat	Ν	1.94		43.7				41.8		49	46.8	46.7	44.5	38.1	34.8	35.4	30.0	38.9	45.6	39.9
Skyline	Sloat	County Line	S	1.94		41.6				41.6		48.7	39.2	42.1	40.6	41.0	32.4	34.6	32.9	35.2	40.6	39.6
01	Skyline	Junipero Serra	E	1.38		19.8	21.5	14.5	18.1	23.4		22.8	18.2	22.6	19.0	24.3	23.0	20.3	21.5	21.7	27.1	23.3
Sloat	Junipero Serra	Skyline	W	1.38		23.3				23.5		29.8	26.1	26.7	32.0	27.7	24.0	24.9	25.4	25.7	27.7	25.2
	Fulton	Turk	Ν	0.20		12.2	12.8	13.2			13.7	15.7	16.6	15.6	14.2	18.2	14.1	14	14.9	13.8	15.8	15.1
Stanyan	Turk	Fulton	S	0.20		11.6	7.4	16.7			11.7	16.6	12.3	11.1	11.2	19.2	16.2	13.5	14.3	15.9	15.5	15.8

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE Speed 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE SPEED 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Divisadero	Gough	E	0.82		13.9				12.4	16.1	15.7	14.6	16.2	14.5	15.9	10.9	11	11.6	11.1	13.0	13.6
0	Market	Mason	W	0.56		11.6	10.2	13.2			11.2	11.2	16.9	17.5	17.8	13.4	12.6	8.9	9.1	9.2	11.7	9.9
Sutter	Mason	Gough	W	0.82	9	12.3	13.4			14.5		12.8	8.6	8.9	10.5	11.2	10.6	11.4	10.3	9.4	12.2	11.3
	Gough	Divisadero	W	0.82		14.1				15.5		15.1	15.3	15.0	13.6	13.4	11.5	11.2	12.0	12.0	13.3	12.9
Townsond	7th	2nd	E	0.86								16.6	15.8	19.6	17.3	17.2	14.1	11.2	11.6	11.2	17.4	16.1
Townsend	2nd	7th	W	0.86								18.9	17.9	18.4	13.9	17.5	12.4	10.4	11.2	10.1	18.2	16.1
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	0.91		21				15.5		17.7	20.8	18.0	17.7	17.7	15.7	12.8	13.6	12.2	18.2	16.1
	Market	Hyde	W	0.38		10.9	11.6	11.2	11.7	8.1	11.7	16.9	12.4	14.7	12.8	10.3	12.6	10.5	10.7	8.6	11.0	9.2
Turk	Hyde	Gough	W	0.46		14.1				10.1	8	11.2	14.0	12.8	12.8	14.1	12.6	10.3	10.3	8.5	11.0	10.7
	Gough	Divisadero	W	0.82		22.1				22.4		24.4	28.4	19.8	19.7	21.5	17.4	16.5	16.9	16.8	16.6	16.8
	Divisadero	Stanyan	W	0.91		17.1				23.1		17.1	20.0	21.3	16.3	18.4	18.4	16.3	19.0	17.7	20.2	18.4
	Cesar Chavez	13th	Ν	1.49									17.0	20.1	18.4	18.8	16.0	15.1	15.6	15.6	17.2	13.8
	13th	Golden Gate	Ν	0.81		15.9			18.2		7.3	11.8	14.6	15.0	20.2	13.9	13.0	8.9	9.1	9.4	12.3	12.5
	Golden Gate	Washington	Ν	0.84		13.6			10.4	10.4	6.9	11.5	11.9	15.2	16.8	12.1	11.1	10.2	10.3	9.1	12.3	11.8
Van Ness/S VanNess	Washington	Lombard	Ν	0.58		11.9	14.3	12.1	9.4	12.6	6.9	9.2	10.2	13.6	11.3	13.1	12.7	10	10.5	8.7	12.5	13.1
van Ness/S van Ness	Lombard	Washington	S	0.58	4.5	18.2			7.6	12.2	13.4	12.7	17.8	16.4	16.4	12.2	13.0	11.3	11.9	12.1	16.1	8.1
	Washington	Golden Gate	S	0.84		15			9.2	7.3	9.4	16.1	17.2	21.2	21.6	14.1	12.8	11.6	12.0	13.8	16.0	14.2
	Golden Gate	13th	S	0.80		17.3			16.6		7.4	12.7	11.8	15.7	14.0	15.3	11.7	10.7	11.0	7.7	15.6	11.4
	13th	Cesar Chavez	S	1.49	12.6	15.7			16.8		16	19.2	19.8	17.9	12.8	16.3	15.1	15	14.8	15.7	18.0	15.4
Washington	Drumm	Kearny	W	0.44		14.2			7.9	30.5		17.1	14.9	14.6	12.8	10.1	11.8	9.6	10.8	10.2	11.0	11.3
West Portal	Sloat	Ulloa	Ν	0.54		17.8				14.8		18.7	15.3	15.5	16.8	14.4	15.9	11.5	10.5	14.5	15.0	14.1
	Ulloa	Sloat	S	0.54		16.1				12.4	12.1	16.1	15.1	17.5	17.4	17.2	14.8	15.8	10.9	16.4	14.0	12.7
1-280	Junipero Serra	Weldon	E	4.03	22.9	43	27.3			43.2	43.6	31.9	56.7	47.6	37.5	35.2	29.9	24.7	21.4	20.9	64.0	33.5
	Weldon	6th/Brannan	Ν	3.51		29.1				30.5	31.2	27.7	34.3	41.6	28.1	35.4	36.8	33.9	30.0	28.2	45.8	49.9
	County Line	Cortland	Ν	2.31	10.9	47.2	31	30.1	35.7	44.8	37.1	57.5	59.0	50.6	43.0	25.9	25.8	20.7	21.8	19.0	51.4	22.0
US-101	Cortland	I-80	Ν	1.90	21.4	21.2				28.1	27.8	38	35.4	41.7	36.9	29.6	28.2	25.9	25.8	26.3	31.7	26.6
	I-80	Market	Ν	1.27	18.7	45.4	44.8	37.6	36.9				20.9	21.9	13.9	24.6	23.6	21.4	12.3	18.6	13.1	13.3
1-80	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W	2.71	17.5	32.2	26.5			28.8	22.3	36.8	34.4	50.8	44.5	46.4	42.2	46	38.4	40.0	41.0	29.5
	Fremont Exit	US-101	W	1.70	48.1	33.3	37.9	32.7	40.4	25.9	24	51.6	50.0	55.3	48.7	50.4	49.5	46.4	43.4	46.6	47.1	29.2
1-280	6th/Brannan	Weldon	S	3.47		51.9	46.4	54.8		47.3	41	69	60.0	62.9	55.1	58.1	57.9	55.9	58.0	53.0	54.4	62.9
	Weldon	Junipero Serra	S	4.07	55.7	57.5				51.5	50.5	65.5	66.5	65.2	60.6	64.3	63.5	64.8	64.1	62.6	63.9	63.5
	Market	I-80	S	1.17	13.5	17.9						12	46.9	40.3	41.3	26.1	33.2	31.2	36.2	24.3	42.1	24.1
US-101	I-80	Cortland	S	1.97	45.8	53.6	36.4	42.3	44.7	40.1	31.7	40.3	54.8	54.6	51.8	40.9	46.5	40.8	39.7	39.8	59.0	43.4
	Cortland	Monster Park Exit	S	2.30	53.3	45.6	36.3	34.1	39	33.3	31.6	45.8	48.3	54.2	48.7	31.5	32.3	24.7	24.6	24.2	65.3	32.6
1-80	US-101	Fremont Exit	E	1.74	18.6	53.6	36	32.4	28.8	16.3	24.9	12.3	38.1	48.1	48.5	36.8	34.7	42.3	37.1	38.7	40.9	48.6
	Fremont Exit	Treasure Island	E	2.70	50.6	50.8	39.9	40.3	30.5	36.5	20.2	43.7	50.2	56.0	51.4	44.2	46.6	58.7	51.2	47.3	56.7	55.3

Attachment 3-2. CMP Segments Average Speeds (PM Peak) (1991 - 2023)

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE Speed 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE SPEED 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE Speed 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
1st St	Market	Harrison	S	0.48	1.2	15.5				2.1	2.6	4.2	12.8	13.1	18.2	13.2	4.8	4.3	4.3	4.5	6.7	6.3
2nd St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72								9.5	11.8	10.4	13.3	3.1	5.3	6.6	7.9	8.5	11.9	9.4
2110 30	Market	Brannan	S	0.72								13.4	11.9	10.6	12.2	6.0	6.9	11.1	9.5	8.7	14.2	10.2
	Jamestown	Evans	Ν	1.62		18.5				20.2		12.5	21.6	22.1	24.0	17.8	17.8	16.0	15.9	11.7	16.9	15.4
	Evans	Terry Francois	Ν	2.36	10.3	18.5				20.5		24.0	26.1	30.1	30.0	20.4	14.1	13.8	13.9	11.2	17.7	14.5
3rd St	Terry Francois	Market	Ν	1.05	12.1	8.8	11.6	10.2	11.7	11.6	7.3	12.7	11.3	16.1	12.9	12.8	9.7	8.8	8.9	10.6	14.4	9.7
	Terry Francois	Evans	S	2.36	10.3	17.0				20.2		21.8	30.7	27.8	29.5	20.5	16.6	17.9	18.0	14.4	19.7	17.3
	Evans	Jamestown	S	1.62		17.6				18.1		15.8	22.2	22.3	22.7	18.7	17.5	15.6	15.2	11.4	14.9	14.8
Ath St/Stooktop	O'Farrell	Harrison	S	0.56	4.7	8.4	10.5	10.5	5.9	10.5	9.8	8.9	9.1	8.5	15.1	11.5	9.8	9.8	10.1	7.3	10.5	7.5
411 31/ 3100 8101	Harrison	Channel	S	0.60									14.1	14.3	14.9	12.6	8.7	7.3	8.0	8.0	11.6	10.0
5th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	7.9	12.7	7.7	11.3	7.6	16.5		9.8	9.5	15.6	15.7	4.0	6.5	3.5	7.9	7.5	12.0	9.9
50150	Market	Brannan	S	0.72	7.9	13.5				5.2	6.3	9.3	11.2	13.1	13.8	5.4	6.7	7.0	8.1	7.7	12.7	9.1
6th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72		12.7	7.6	11.2	9.0	6.4	6.6	12.7	11.7	11.1	11.0	12.1	7.5	7.6	7.8	7.7	13.8	10.3
011 31	Market	Brannan	S	0.72	6.7	11.5	12.0	9.4	9.5	6.8	4.4	12.9	10.9	12.3	9.6	11.8	11.0	10.4	10.6	8.8	18.3	9.1
7th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	8.9	16.8			13.7		10.4	15.4	14.9	16.4	20.9	13.7	8.3	8.3	8.5	8.8	13.4	10.5
8th St	Market	Bryant	S	0.60		15.8			15.7		13.0	15.9	21.2	17.0	23.8	15.9	8.4	8.4	8.7	11.8	10.7	9.0
9th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	9.9	12.4	9.7	13.8	11.2	9.1	11.8	13.3	11.2	14.6	13.4	12.9	8.7	7.7	7.6	7.4	12.0	10.7
10th St	Market	Brannan	S	0.73	12.1	20.5				13.7		16.4	20.9	16.3	20.4	20.5	13.4	13.7	14.3	14.2	17.5	12.7
	Market	Mission	E	0.74								11.0	10.5	10.7	11.9	14.9	13.5	9.2	9.0	7.7	11.9	11.1
16th 6t	Mission	Potrero	E	0.67								13.1	9.8	12.8	11.7	14.8	11.9	7.9	8.3	7.9	13.0	10.9
16th St	Potrero	Mission	W	0.67								11.2	13.6	15.2	13.4	12.5	11.1	9.5	10.1	8.3	13.7	11.5
	Mission	Market	W	0.74								10.6	14.1	12.3	8.4	17.0	11.7	10.1	10.7	10.6	14.3	11.8
	Junipero Serra	Sloat	Ν	1.25		17.5			21.5			14.8	16.0	13.5	23.2	16.9	15.2	17.0	18.9	17.2	24.2	19.6
	Sloat	Lincoln	Ν	2.13	11.1	21.0			18.6			21.6	24.0	23.0	21.4	17.4	19.5	18.9	19.2	18.2	21.7	16.5
	Lincoln	Lake	Ν	1.85		25.4			19.8			27.2	27.2	28.5	29.3	28.1	22.9	19.3	15.0	13.6	28.9	19.0
19th Ave/Park	Lake	US-101	Ν	1.18		35.9				15.6		34.7	44.2	46.0	43.0	44.6	17.7	40.8	39.5	40.5	39.2	38.7
Presidio	US-101	Lake	S	1.26		36.4				34.5		35.4	42.7	35.2	30.9	42.9	38.0	22.8	24.1	24.6	44.5	24.5
	Lake	Lincoln	S	1.85		26.4			20.3			24.1	15.8	19.8	24.6	19.0	16.4	13.6	13.7	12.7	15.9	12.5
	Lincoln	Sloat	S	2.13	11.1	21.9			17.5			20.5	24.3	23.6	27.7	20.2	19.8	20.5	21.1	19.3	19.5	16.4
	Sloat	Junipero Serra	S	1.25		18.4			11.9		11.9	9.9	16.9	12.1	17.7	18.2	15.8	16.6	20.4	21.3	21.5	16.7
	Junipero Serra	Lyell	E	2.95		29.5				20.8		20.4	18.6	22.4	22.0	24.3	19.9	16.8	17.3	17.2	22.2	20.8
Alemeny	Lyell	Bay Shore	E	1.59		32.9				12.7	14.7	32.1	23.7	29.9	30.2	33.0	29.2	26.4	25.1	28.2	28.0	27.8
Alemany	Bay Shore	Lyell	W	1.57	4.6	30.8				23.3		32.4	23.4	31.4	24.7	31.2	27.6	24.4	25.2	23.3	26.7	26.6
	Lyell	Junipero Serra	W	3.03		22.1				23.9		19.5	19.8	22.2	22.5	29.6	22.2	15.7	16.0	14.5	20.5	19.6
Boy	Van Ness	Embarcadero	E	1.07	12.7	16.8				12.1		13.4	18.2	16.5	18.2	20.7	15.6	13.3	13.5	13.5	17.8	15.0
Бау	Embarcadero	Van Ness	W	1.07	12.7	12.0	15.7			13.1	13.5	18.7	18.6	16.2	16.4	19.9	14.9	14.4	14.6	14.6	20.5	15.2
	County Line	Industrial	Ν	2.27		22.6				33.9		22.0	20.7	21.5	23.1	23.1	20.2	18.9	19.3	17.5	24.2	19.4
Payshore	Industrial	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.83		26.4				16.4		13.1	22.1	14.4	15.5	17.6	17.3	15.2	15.2	13.1	20.1	14.9
Dayshuld	Jerrold	Industrial	S	0.80		21.0				28.4		21.1	19.1	22.3	15.3	20.5	19.3	16.2	16.7	14.6	22.0	20.0
	Industrial	County Line	S	2.26		22.0				26.4		19.7	27.0	26.3	21.8	25.5	20.6	17.7	18.3	15.8	23.7	20.3
Beale/Davis	Clay	Mission	S	0.32		13.4				8.4	8.4	14.6	10.7	11.2	11.7	5.2	5.4	8.1	8.4	6.4	13.4	7.5

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE Speed 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE Speed 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Division	6th	E	0.54									11.6	13.7	13.6	14.7	9.9	15.7	11.2	9.0	13.3	11.1
Bronnon	6th	3rd	E	0.51									9.9	10.3	17.2	14.1	8.5	7.3	7.7	7.0	13.4	12.1
Didilidii	3rd	6th	W	0.52									8.6	14.0	16.4	16.9	11.0	7.9	8.6	8.4	16.4	12.2
	6th	Division	W	0.54									17.2	9.8	8.8	21.1	14.4	9.9	10.4	10.1	14.3	13.0
	Gough	Larkin	E	0.36		14.6			14.2	10.0	12.0	11.5	10.2	10.5	10.2	12.8	10.5	9.2	11.3	10.4	14.7	13.2
	Larkin	Powell	Е	0.55		38.9			25.5	11.0	12.7	26.1	31.8	36.1	33.6	25.2	29.8	24.1	18.3	19.4	29.7	26.8
	Powell	Montgomery	E	0.35		16.3			12.4	10.4	11.2	12.8	11.2	13.3	14.2	9.0	10.6	9.5	11.0	9.8	14.7	11.9
Broadway	Montgomery	Embarcadero	E	0.35		13.1			8.4	7.9	7.2	9.0	9.4	14.7	13.2	6.8	5.0	8.9	9.5	8.1	15.4	12.7
Diodaway	Embarcadero	Montgomery	W	0.35		15.4			9.6	4.4	6.9	10.1	13.1	14.9	13.3	9.9	10.5	9.6	10.9	8.6	13.1	11.6
	Montgomery	Powell	W	0.35	6.2	8.4	9.2	12.5	8.5	8.3	10.2	8.0	10.1	7.7	11.8	6.6	5.3	4.6	9.3	8.9	14.0	10.0
	Powell	Larkin	W	0.55		24.7			25.3	11.0	10.6	32.7	31.0	32.3	29.6	25.5	27.8	27.3	22.1	15.5	30.4	29.1
	Larkin	Gough	W	0.36	7.7	14.6			7.8	9.9	8.8	7.3	10.9	11.3	11.1	12.6	8.1	7.1	12.6	11.5	14.4	10.7
Brotherbood	Junipero Serra	Alemany	E	0.43									21.0	26.6	24.6	29.4	22.0	21.7	21.7	20.6	23.6	20.2
	Alemany	Junipero Serra	W	0.47									26.2	33.4	31.5	31.6	24.8	25.4	27.0	26.7	28.5	26.1
Brvant	Division	4th	E	0.99	7.7	11.8	9.8	12.8	15.7	10.6	9.6	13.3	8.8	12.7	14.3	13.9	8.6	8.0	8.4	8.3	13.1	11.0
	4th	Embarcadero	E	0.77		13.2				9.5	10.2	19.5	16.0	15.7	14.0	18.2	13.3	10.1	9.5	10.9	14.0	11.8
Bush	Masonic	Gough	E	1.24		20.0				20.5		19.0	19.6	21.2	21.9	22.7	19.1	17.1	16.3	17.7	17.6	15.8
	Gough	Market	E	1.45	3.2	10.1	11.5	11.7	11.6	10.2	9.2	12.5	13.9	14.3	11.3	16.0	10.5	9.1	9.3	9.1	13.4	10.0
	Market	14th	Ν	0.32	7.7	16.7			12.1	16.1		15.2	10.0	15.7	15.2	14.7	12.8	11.9	12.4	11.9	13.9	11.9
	14th	Geary	Ν	1.13	4.5	12.8	11.2	12.3	11.8	11.1	9.5	9.4	13.8	12.3	11.6	14.0	11.4	10.6	10.6	9.9	12.3	11.5
Castro/Divisadero	Geary	Pine	Ν	0.27		8.4	13.5		9.8	14.6		7.5	10.3	10.7	9.2	13.7	11.4	9.4	9.8	9.4	12.3	9.9
	Pine	Geary	S	0.27		11.6	8.1	11.0	8.3	12.6	7.9	11.7	8.6	13.5	10.1	13.0	10.2	9.3	9.7	8.8	10.9	9.7
	Geary	14th	S	1.13		15.7			11.4	12.1	8.2	12.3	9.4	11.1	10.3	12.7	9.6	9.6	10.1	9.5	10.4	9.1
	14th	Market	S	0.32		13.8			14.3	17.3		12.0	11.6	15.2	11.6	13.4	10.5	9.7	10.1	9.8	11.2	8.9
	Guerrero	Bryant	E	0.76		20.7				15.1		18.2	14.1	15.1	10.6	15.6	10.8	9.9	11.0	10.5	13.0	12.1
	Bryant	Kansas	E	0.38		26.7				8.5		31.4	30.7	27.6	30.0	27.8	21.2	21.8	17.7	17.3	23.0	23.4
Cesar Chavez	Kansas	3rd	E	0.80		17.3				12.0	15.1	19.5	22.8	25.4	22.8	22.2	18.1	16.1	15.8	16.1	22.4	18.7
	3rd	Kansas	W	0.80		16.3						21.1	16.3	22.3	19.5	23.7	18.7	17.1	16.3	16.4	21.4	17.5
	Kansas	Bryant	W	0.38		17.5						30.4	30.4	21.0	23.4	23.6	19.4	18.3	17.1	16.3	21.3	17.4
	Bryant	Guerrero	W	0.75		16.5				15.8		18.8	12.8	16.8	11.6	16.2	12.2	10.3	11.0	10.7	14.3	11.3
Clay	Kearny	Davis	E	0.38	11.7	7.0	8.7	10.4	10.4	9.4	6.5	8.7	16.3	11.7	16.2	6.6	8.7	8.2	8.8	8.3	11.6	10.2
	Montgomery	Greenwich	Ν	0.67	6.3	12.8	12.9	10.3	11.1	15.0		12.8	21.0	14.1	12.7	12.4	12.5	11.9	12.4	12.2	16.4	13.4
Columbus	Greenwich	North Point	Ν	0.42		13.4			16.2			13.3	16.8	9.2	13.4	13.3	12.6	12.4	11.6	10.5	15.3	13.5
	North Point	Greenwich	S	0.42		15.2			17.7			15.9	12.5	13.3	14.0	11.5	10.8	8.8	9.1	7.9	12.8	12.5
	Greenwich	Montgomery	S	0.67	6.3	16.0			10.2	9.3	8.7	9.2	10.4	7.1	12.3	11.9	10.2	8.9	9.5	8.6	13.2	10.8
	County Line	SF Cemetery	E	1.16		55.3						21.7	39.8	39.8		34.1	39.9	39.4	48.7	48.6	54.4	50.0
	SF Cemetery	Lyon/Francisco	E	0.93		32.3						23.8	32.7	35.8		38.9	35.1	29.7	20.9	19.8	34.2	58.8
Doyle/Lombard/	Lyon/Francisco	Van Ness	E	1.29		16.4				14.8		14.5	15.7	18.2	15.3	18.7	13.8	12.1	13.4	11.9	18.6	16.9
Richardson	Van Ness	Lyon/Francisco	W	1.29		20.5				22.4		15.3	16.0	15.7	16.4	18.0	13.3	13.4	14.2	13.3	18.3	15.7
	Lyon/Francisco	SF Cemetery	W	0.96		43.9						23.5	35.2	39.4		26.0	13.0	40.2	36.0	37.2	42.4	31.8
	SF Cemetery	County Line	W	1.15		32.6						24.2	38.8	41.0		22.4	14.2	37.3	38.8	35.3	50.6	36.4
Drumm	Market	Washington	Ν	0.22		12.8	13.5			24.7		11.7	11.2	16.2	17.2	8.0	6.3	8.3	8.8	7.2	13.1	9.8
-	Washington	Market	S	0.22		9.3	3.6			17.4		9.7	6.1	7.6	17.7	5.5	6.0	7.6	7.2	8.1	9.3	7.7

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIRECTION	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE Speed 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE Speed 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Market	Mission	E	0.35		10.0	15.4			7.5	6.3	9.4		14.8	16.7	22.5	15.5	11.3	10.9	9.3	12.6	10.2
Duboco (Division	Mission	Potrero	E	0.66	9.9	14.1				14.2		14.1		13.3	18.5	10.5	10.7	10.2	12.4	11.5	14.1	12.4
Duboce/ Division	Potrero	Mission	W	0.66	9.9	16.4				12.0	7.1	9.4		9.6	16.2	8.6	7.2	7.1	12.1	7.5	15.7	13.4
	Mission	Market	W	0.35	6.3	6.2				7.4	6.0	6.5		10.6	9.6	14.7	8.3	6.5	6.5	7.0	13.4	9.6
Embarcadero	Townsend	North Point	Ν	2.16		9.0	16.4			14.7		16.0	15.2	14.0	8.9	14.0	11.8	12.8	13.5	14.1	17.6	13.5
Embarcadero	North Point	Townsend	S	2.16		16.7				6.4	12.3	15.2	18.5	20.2	17.6	13.8	9.0	9.3	10.1	10.3	14.3	10.4
Evans	Cesar Chavez	3rd	S	0.73		21.4				15.4		19.1	21.8	21.6	17.5	16.8	13.1	13.8	17.2	16.4	22.6	18.2
LVans	3rd	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.73		20.3				15.2		23.8	22.7	20.1	21.5	16.9	12.2	24.6	16.8	16.0	21.1	17.4
	Gough	Market	E	0.29		13.5				9.4	8.3	7.0	18.4	12.6	12.9	18.6	12.0	8.9	9.2	6.7	11.6	10.6
Fell	Gough	Laguna	W	0.18	5.6	13.3	7.3	8.2	12.0	7.8	7.4	16.9	11.8	9.0	9.3	17.2	12.7	10.1	10.2	11.1	15.8	12.2
	Laguna	Stanyan	W	1.56		20.7				23.5		19.6	23.1	23.7	24.1	22.5	19.1	18.7	20.2	18.7	16.6	15.8
	13th	8th	E	0.49								18.0			14.6	18.4	13.4	9.4	9.5	9.5	12.7	10.1
Folsom	8th	4th	E	0.69								18.8	21.2	17.2	19.4	17.3	9.5	8.2	8.8	8.3	11.4	12.1
10130111	4th	1st	E	0.52								18.3	20.0	15.0	16.9	14.8	6.4	7.8	8.2	7.3	10.7	7.6
	1st	Embarcadero	E	0.34								10.0	17.0	12.1	12.1	16.0	11.4	7.5	7.6	7.0	10.7	8.2
Franklin	Market	Pine	Ν	1.06	8.5	18.8				14.6		14.5	15.9	15.6	13.4	17.9	12.0	10.3	10.7	10.9	14.1	11.9
	Pine	Lombard	Ν	0.83		16.4				7.3	7.7	17.5	21.7	23.8	20.8	21.3	16.1	16.7	17.1	17.5	17.2	12.8
Fremont	Harrison	Market	Ν	0.48		9.3	10.6	16.6		3.2	5.2	14.1	10.5	10.1	10.6	16.8	8.9	7.8	8.3	9.9	13.6	10.1
	Park Presidio	10th Ave	E	0.20										25.7	25.0	23.4	20.6	19.1	17.1	17.3	18.9	19.2
	10th Ave	Arguello	E	0.53										23.5	15.0	18.6	17.4	14.3	17.8	18.5	18.9	17.8
Fulton	Arguello	Masonic	E	0.66	9.8	13.2				14.8		15.0	10.9	13.6	12.2	14.8	15.2	12.2	11.9	11.1	16.4	14.1
	Masonic	Arguello	W	0.66		18.9				14.7		20.7	23.9	20.6	13.8	18.0	15.8	13.1	13.9	13.3	16.2	17.1
	Arguello	10th Ave	W	0.53										22.1	17.7	18.1	17.6	16.1	15.3	14.8	20.1	20.1
	10th Ave	Park Presidio	W	0.20										8.5	11.3	18.1	14.7	13.5	14.5	13.9	20.1	14.2
	Great Hwy	25th Ave	E	1.78		26.2				20.1	16.0	23.6	23.0	21.4	23.8	18.2	14.0	15.6	17.9	18.2	19.7	17.7
	25th Ave	Arguello	E	1.42		21.5			15.0		8.4	14.9	21.0	22.9	21.5	16.9	12.8	14.7	15.6	15.3	17.2	16.6
	Arguello	Gough	E	1.91	11.3	22.6			20.7		14.7	22.4	27.4	20.3	20.1	18.5	14.9	17.6	17.6	14.5	18.4	15.4
Geary	Kearny	Gough	W	1.18	6.7	9.9	14.4		15.9	23.8	10.0	12.2	12.1	10.1	12.9	12.0	10.2	7.9	8.3	8.8	12.8	10.5
	Gough	Arguello	W	1.92		23.1			21.2		13.3	19.1	20.5	25.0	25.1	22.3	15.0	18.5	18.5	17.0	20.0	17.4
	Arguello	25th Ave	W	1.42	11.3	20.3			15.8		10.6	15.1	18.1	17.0	17.1	15.9	11.8	13.3	14.2	14.3	17.1	15.1
	25th Ave	Great Hwy	W	1.79		23.9				29.4	12.7	21.0	23.3	22.0	22.7	16.9	15.0	17.1	18.0	18.0	19.9	19.5
	Ocean	Cayuga	E	0.56		12.0	17.2			14.6		12.9	11.6	8.4	12.9	14.2	9.6	10.0	10.1	9.2	15.1	12.5
	Cayuga	Paris	E	0.33	10.4	12.1	10.5	15.5				8.8	9.2	10.8	11.5	14.4	10.7	10.6	11.1	9.9	15.1	11.2
Geneva	Paris	Santos	E	1.19		20.5				22.1		21.0	20.5	21.2	22.0	22.4	15.6	19.1	20.0	18.7	21.4	19.7
	Santos	Paris	W	1.19		22.6				31.3		25.2	21.2	23.6	23.4	20.4	15.5	17.5	17.0	15.0	21.7	19.8
	Paris	Cayuga	W	0.33	10.4	12.3	10.7	11.9	12.8	12.7	10.6	10.1	9.7	10.5	8.1	13.2	10.8	9.5	10.3	9.7	16.0	12.6
	Cayuga	Ocean	W	0.53	6.7	10.4	12.0	9.6	14.2			7.9	6.9	9.2	10.2	13.1	9.7	9.1	10.0	9.7	14.4	10.9
Golden Gate	Masonic	Franklin	E	1.37		20.4				16.0		25.9	20.1	18.9	13.8	16.1	15.5	14.9	15.4	14.7	13.3	12.8
	Franklin	Market	E	0.65	12.2	15.2				14.3		11.7	12.0	12.8	8.9	9.5	3.5	6.2	7.2	6.8	12.2	8.8
	Pine	Geary	S	0.26	9.5	21.8				6.5	6.3	11.4	9.6	24.3	23.0	18.4	12.6	11.6	12.0	12.5	11.1	12.1
Gough	Geary	Golden Gate	S	0.33		17.1				15.8	9.4	13.6	9.7	18.3	20.2	14.7	9.5	6.5	6.9	8.0	11.1	7.1
	Golden Gate	Market	S	0.54	8.3	16.4				7.6	6.4	7.0	7.2	8.7	12.3	12.6	7.9	8.1	8.3	8.8	11.1	8.1

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE SPEED 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE SPEED 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE SPEED 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Monterey	29th	N	1.17		30.8				41.2		27.0	26.3	23.7	24.2	27.0	14.5	15.1	14.0	14.3	29.5	15.6
	29th	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.29		12.6	7.9	17.8		15.6		14.1	16.4	20.0	12.7	18.9	14.1	14.4	17.4	12.8	14.0	12.3
Guerrero/San Jose	Cesar Chavez	29th	S	0.28		24.0				24.9		20.1	20.5	14.3	20.8	18.7	12.7	9.7	8.9	6.3	15.1	16.0
	29th	Monterey	S	1.17		21.6	23.0			26.8		27.7	37.7	26.0	27.6	27.2	21.9	19.1	19.9	16.0	25.1	20.4
	Embarcadero	1st	W	0.34		11.4	11.6	9.6	9.4	14.5		14.3	8.0	11.9	12.8	14.6	7.6	5.3	6.0	6.6	14.3	8.2
	1st	4th	W	0.52		20.5				14.0		20.0	22.4	16.7	18.9	16.5	13.1	7.8	8.3	9.4	14.3	11.8
Harrison	4th	8th	W	0.69	12.7	19.1				16.0		19.0	19.0	11.6	14.9	16.0	14.3	13.7	14.1	12.7	13.9	13.9
	8th	Division	W	0.40		13.6				13.0		12.4	12.7	13.2	11.6	16.1	12.8	10.5	10.7	10.6	12.8	9.9
Hayes	Market	Gough	W	0.39	5.6	11.7	15.7			10.9	7.1	11.8	13.3	9.6	8.8	11.5	11.2	7.5	7.2	7.9	11.9	9.0
Howard	Embarcadero	S Van Ness	W	2.11	5.4	13.6				13.0		12.7	14.6	12.6	12.2	15.5	11.1	9.3	9.9	9.4	13.3	11.1
	County Line	Brotherhood	Ν	0.29		40.4				26.3		41.8	41.0	35.6	47.1	26.0	20.8	17.4	14.1	15.7	49.4	10.6
	Brotherhood	19th	Ν	0.34		19.1	21.7	23.6	26.5			16.2	16.4	15.2	10.5	13.8	12.9	10.7	11.8	9.2	25.1	10.3
lumin and Oama	19th	Sloat	Ν	1.21		20.5	18.9	12.8	19.3	14.4	14.6	11.8	15.5	22.8	22.0	24.6	20.5	24.7	24.8	21.6	27.9	23.6
Junipero Serra	Sloat	19th	S	1.21		18.0	20.6	11.8	12.0	18.1	14.7	18.8	14.9	16.7	16.8	26.3	18.5	20.4	20.2	17.5	23.0	18.6
	19th	Brotherhood	S	0.33		22.1				16.6	19.0	35.3	40.4	39.2	40.3	38.0	34.0	37.3	42.5	39.7	42.7	41.6
	Brotherhood	County Line	S	0.30		48.1				26.3		39.2	44.5	39.6	45.3	50.6	48.9	53.6	49.9	47.5	52.0	50.8
Kearny	Market	Columbus	Ν	0.65	6.3	12.9	10.8	9.2	9.1	8.1	7.2	11.7	11.2	13.0	14.8	11.9	8.9	8.3	8.3	9.0	12.7	9.8
Vind	4th	2nd	E	0.34									21.7			13.9	11.5	12.3	12.7	12.1	15.7	13.4
Killg	2nd	4th	W	0.34									7.7			12.0	8.7	8.0	8.0	8.5	19.0	12.1
	19th Ave	5th Ave	E	0.83		16.4				14.5		12.3	24.0	23.1	20.6	21.5	18.9	18.0	16.7	16.6	19.7	18.1
Lincoln / Kozor	5th Ave	Stanyan	E	0.70		22.8				14.0		22.8	21.8	21.7	22.8	22.0	21.1	20.0	20.2	20.3	19.9	18.1
LINCOIN/ Kezar	Stanyan	5th Ave	W	0.70		21.3				9.8	9.9	23.6	18.1	29.1	24.8	21.4	18.6	20.9	21.1	19.7	20.1	19.7
	5th Ave	19th Ave	W	0.83	11.3	20.8				12.0	9.1	22.7	12.8	12.9	18.9	18.0	16.4	14.5	15.2	14.4	17.5	17.3
Main	Mission	Market	Ν	0.12		9.8	8.4	6.7	7.7	5.4	7.5	14.4	16.3	19.3	14.3	3.2	5.0	11.0	6.7	8.4	13.1	12.8
	Sloat	Santa Clara	E	0.43		16.5			15.9			21.0	16.0	20.2	21.1	22.1	16.5	15.1	15.3	15.7	21.4	17.4
	Santa Clara	Burnett	E	1.34		23.6			37.4			20.6	22.2	24.0	20.0	23.1	20.2	19.0	19.8	19.9	22.2	21.2
	Burnett	Castro	E	1.62		34.1			30.9			22.0	24.5	22.0	23.5	24.6	20.9	21.4	21.0	21.8	21.0	21.2
	Castro	Guerrero	Е	0.79		15.0			9.2	14.8		10.0	10.6	9.9	10.3	13.9	11.4	10.0	10.4	11.0	13.8	12.5
	Guerrero	Van Ness	Е	0.43	8.3	17.9			7.4	6.7	9.0	7.0	10.5	12.1	14.8	20.3	12.2	9.1	8.3	7.8	12.5	10.1
Market/Portola	Van Ness	Drumm	E	1.77	9.6	12.9	6.3			8.7	9.3	11.0	9.2	9.5	10.6	11.9	8.9	6.4	6.4	6.1	12.3	10.5
Market/Fortola	Drumm	Van Ness	W	1.77	9.6	15.5				10.0	7.4	9.9	11.5	13.5	12.1	11.7	9.4	5.6	7.4	7.3	10.2	8.7
	Van Ness	Guerrero	W	0.43	8.3	12.5	8.0	10.8	11.1	24.8		12.1	8.3	12.2	11.3	12.9	10.9	11.0	11.6	10.4	15.1	13.0
	Guerrero	Castro	W	0.79		16.5			11.5	13.2		19.4	15.0	15.1	12.7	16.0	13.0	15.4	15.8	13.6	17.0	14.0
	Castro	Burnett	W	1.63		27.0			24.7			28.0	28.4	26.7	30.1	26.3	21.9	21.2	22.0	21.7	23.4	24.2
	Burnett	Santa Clara	W	1.34		19.6			35.7			24.0	22.0	20.4	21.4	22.0	17.2	16.4	18.1	16.2	22.7	19.9
	Santa Clara	Sloat	W	0.43	11.8	22.2			18.4			14.8	7.9	8.3	14.0	19.5	13.5	13.3	14.0	13.6	20.4	14.4
	Page	Geary	Ν	0.79	10.0	13.6				11.9	7.3	13.8	14.7	18.8	17.2	17.8	12.7	12.4	12.6	11.1	13.8	12.9
Masonic	Geary	Bush/Euclid	Ν	0.20	8.5	21.5				15.1		15.5	24.7	27.0	22.4	24.1	15.8	16.8	17.0	16.7	17.9	15.4
Masoline	Presidio	Geary	S	0.29	8.5	9.3	12.7	16.9				11.4	10.5	14.5	9.2	15.9	9.5	11.1	11.4	7.8	13.0	10.5
	Geary	Page	S	0.79	10.0	13.4				16.3		11.1	12.5	16.9	13.5	19.2	13.4	12.6	12.7	12.8	11.8	9.0

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE SPEED 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE SPEED 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE SPEED 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE SPEED 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Sickles	Ocean	N	1.45		18.1			22.0			23.0	19.8	22.4	20.3	17.3	14.2	14.1	14.2	12.4	16.7	16.6
	Ocean	Cesar Chavez	Ν	1.95		17.3			18.5			19.1	15.3	17.8	16.3	14.1	13.9	13.3	14.0	12.8	16.3	15.0
	Cesar Chavez	14th	Ν	1.39	10.9	10.5	12.3	13.0	14.7			12.6	13.8	13.9	14.2	11.8	11.1	9.6	9.7	9.4	12.3	11.6
	14th	9th	Ν	0.65		12.2	9.9	9.2	10.5	8.5	8.3	12.3	12.6	13.3	12.2	14.7	13.3	9.2	9.8	9.4	13.7	12.8
	9th	3rd	Ν	0.98		19.9			13.5	9.7	9.8	12.7	14.2	13.7	12.4	15.1	10.3	10.1	10.5	10.0	13.6	11.4
	Зrd	Embarcadero	Ν	0.74	9.7	15.9			5.1	10.7	9.2	7.6	8.9	13.0	10.9	14.3	8.3	6.7	7.3	5.9	12.1	8.6
MISSION/OUS	Embarcadero	3rd	S	0.74	9.7	7.6	13.0		10.7	9.7	8.6	13.4	11.3	13.9	11.0	12.8	9.3	7.3	7.7	7.5	12.9	9.2
	Зrd	9th	S	0.98		19.1			12.1	12.3	8.4	18.3	13.2	15.1	14.4	14.5	11.1	11.4	11.7	10.7	13.0	11.7
	9th	14th	S	0.68	9.7	14.9			16.7			12.9	13.4	13.4	13.5	12.4	10.9	10.5	9.2	9.2	13.0	8.6
	14th	Cesar Chavez	S	1.39	10.9	14.9			13.2			13.3	13.4	15.2	13.8	12.8	11.5	10.5	10.8	9.6	13.6	11.9
	Cesar Chavez	Ocean	S	1.95		15.6			14.7			14.7	14.5	13.8	15.5	13.3	11.8	11.1	11.2	10.0	15.2	14.0
	Ocean	Sickles	S	1.45		15.1			24.9			21.3	16.6	20.3	19.4	15.9	13.8	14.4	13.1	12.5	17.2	16.8
Montgomery	Broadway	Bush	S	0.51	6.2	2.4				12.4	8.2	8.2	5.5	9.2	7.2	12.8	5.5	5.0	6.1	5.6	8.9	7.5
	Van Ness	Columbus	E	0.38		15.4				7.4	11.0	11.4	15.0	15.5	14.4	9.3	8.9	9.7	9.2	12.7	15.4	13.3
North Doint	Columbus	Embarcadero	E	0.61		14.5				11.4	9.9	12.8	20.3	15.9	16.3	17.7	8.4	9.3	11.4	15.0	16.6	14.6
North Point	Embarcadero	Columbus	W	0.61		16.9				12.2	10.3	19.5	21.3	15.8	20.2	18.0	12.4	15.8	14.6	17.4	18.4	17.1
	Columbus	Van Ness	W	0.38	8.5	20.9				10.4	9.8	19.5	12.6	16.4	13.2	10.4	13.2	12.2	9.5	9.1	14.8	13.5
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	0.92		23.1				13.0	11.8	16.2	13.5	11.8	16.4	21.1	20.6	20.6	20.9	19.6	19.5	18.9
01	Divisadero	Fillmore	E	0.37						16.9		24.6	26.7	25.3	26.4	23.8	18.7	19.2	8.6	12.1	12.5	13.0
Оак	Fillmore	Laguna	E	0.27	8.2					15.3	15.7	23.8	27.8	22.3	24.5	16.6	12.4	6.2	8.6	12.1	12.5	7.0
	Laguna	Franklin	E	0.27		21.6				15.6		23.0	27.4	21.5	22.6	17.9	11.0	8.8	10.1	9.8	12.5	9.4
	19th Ave	Miramar	E	1.11		17.1				9.4	12.5	12.4	14.9	12.9	12.8	13.8	13.8	12.0	12.4	11.7	15.5	14.3
0	Miramar	Howth	E	0.48	0.8	21.0				10.7	13.2	14.2	13.7	14.8	12.7	14.2	11.1	10.7	11.0	10.6	13.2	11.9
Ocean	Howth	Miramar	W	0.48	6.1	14.9				9.1	11.2	8.4	10.7	13.0	11.9	12.5	8.6	8.0	7.9	7.9	13.9	9.9
	Miramar	19th Ave	W	1.11		14.6				8.8	10.3	12.5	15.4	12.4	14.5	14.2	13.1	11.8	12.0	12.1	15.9	14.3
Octovia	Market	Fell	Ν	0.27								8.2	14.5	16.1	13.6	10.9	10.4	10.3	10.5	9.3	10.0	8.8
Octavia	Fell	Market	S	0.28								14.2	12.6	11.6	9.9	9.8	4.0	6.8	7.5	7.2	14.2	9.3
OlEarrall	Gough	Mason	E	0.85	5.7	13.7				12.6	14.6	9.9	10.0	11.2	11.2	13.3	10.8	8.6	8.6	8.4	11.2	10.5
Oraneli	Mason	Market	E	0.28	6.9	7.9				4.2	6.7	6.7	6.1	9.0	8.0	12.5	8.5	6.8	7.9	7.2	11.2	8.2
	Market	Kearny	W	0.38	4.6	10.8	7.3	10.3	6.7	8.0	4.3	8.9	5.9	8.9	13.2	4.3	6.7	5.4	6.9	6.7	13.1	8.5
Pino	Kearny	Leavenworth	W	0.63		12.9	19.8			17.1		16.2	13.6	16.8	16.2	12.1	13.8	9.1	12.6	12.7	13.1	12.9
Fille	Leavenworth	Franklin	W	0.46	4.8	13.2				9.4	6.5	12.6	10.9	14.3	14.5	8.5	5.2	6.0	9.3	9.1	15.5	10.5
	Franklin	Presidio	W	1.27		15.3				19.2		20.3	23.4	22.4	22.0	14.5	16.7	13.7	18.8	18.4	17.9	17.2
	Cesar Chavez	21st	Ν	0.61		23.8			14.5			17.0	23.6	18.8	21.3	15.1	7.7	12.9	14.2	14.0	16.8	12.9
Detrore	21st	Division	Ν	0.80		21.4			19.3			14.9	21.3	15.6	23.2	15.3	6.3	13.5	13.5	12.3	17.3	13.5
Polleio	Division	21st	S	0.80		22.6			18.8			16.5	20.5	25.2	22.6	14.0	8.5	15.7	16.3	13.3	16.4	14.7
	21st	Cesar Chavez	S	0.60	4.8	13.7			19.1			15.5	15.8	19.4	18.0	8.5	3.9	17.3	13.9	11.0	15.6	12.4
Cludino	County Line	Sloat	Ν	1.94		44.9				42.6		49.3	41.7	46.8	42.2	42.6	35.8	35.8	29.1	33.7	41.0	35.4
Skyllne	Sloat	County Line	S	1.94		42.1				36.6		47.1	37.8	38.1	38.3	38.5	30.9	34.6	33.3	33.8	38.4	34.7
Sloot	Skyline	Junipero Serra	E	1.38		19.2	24.9			19.9	18.4	25.9	17.6	20.7	17.7	25.4	22.6	19.9	21.7	20.1	24.5	22.0
51081	Junipero Serra	Skyline	W	1.38		23.2				27.4		24.8	27.2	26.9	29.6	29.5	24.7	24.6	24.1	22.3	25.8	24.3
Stonyon	Fulton	Turk	N	0.20	4.6	10.8	11.6	16.8				15.9	12.0	12.6	15.6	18.3	13.3	13.2	14.0	12.7	15.4	14.2
Stanyan	Turk	Fulton	S	0.20		7.6	10.5	8.0	13.3			18.9	6.4	9.2	8.6	15.9	11.5	9.9	10.4	13.7	10.9	8.7

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	AVE Speed 91	AVE Speed 92/3	AVE Speed 95	AVE Speed 97	AVE Speed 99	AVE Speed 2001	AVE Speed 2004	AVE Speed 2006	AVE Speed 2007	AVE Speed 2009	AVE Speed 2011	AVE Speed 2013	AVE Speed 2015	AVE SPEED 2017 (TMC)	AVE SPEED 2017 (XD)	AVE Speed 2019	AVE Speed 2021	AVE Speed 2023
	Divisadero	Gough	E	0.82		15.4				12.8		15.8	15.9	15.5	13.4	15.2	12.0	11.0	10.9	9.4	12.9	11.5
0	Market	Mason	W	0.56		7.3	12.4	12.7	8.0	12.7		11.6	13.5	11.3	12.7	11.9	10.4	8.0	8.1	8.1	12.5	10.1
Sutter	Mason	Gough	W	0.82	9.0	17.0				14.6		13.3	12.4	14.6	11.8	12.3	10.9	10.8	10.4	10.8	13.0	12.0
	Gough	Divisadero	W	0.82		16.6				14.3		13.3	15.6	14.9	13.6	13.0	11.8	11.2	11.8	12.2	14.1	13.6
Townsond	7th	2nd	E	0.86								21.3	16.8	11.9	15.9	17.2	8.4	9.0	9.6	8.6	16.5	12.6
Townsend	2nd	7th	W	0.86								18.7	18.0	12.8	11.4	16.5	9.4	9.1	10.1	9.0	17.9	13.7
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	0.91		14.9				16.4		18.4	19.1	17.2	17.2	19.5	17.9	13.9	14.8	13.6	18.6	14.7
	Market	Hyde	W	0.38		14.9				7.3	8.3	12.8	13.3	11.1	11.4	13.4	12.5	9.2	9.7	8.5	11.5	9.7
Turk	Hyde	Gough	W	0.46	8.7	14.9				9.1	11.3	10.5	10.6	9.3	11.3	14.6	12.0	9.9	10.2	8.6	11.5	10.2
	Gough	Divisadero	W	0.82		27.1				18.0		19.3	21.7	19.4	18.3	22.1	16.7	15.9	16.3	16.1	16.5	15.7
	Divisadero	Stanyan	W	0.91		19.2				14.6		21.3	18.9	25.6	17.4	19.4	17.4	15.8	17.4	17.9	18.8	17.8
	Cesar Chavez	13th	Ν	1.49		22.4			16.9	26.1		16.3	15.5	14.7	13.9	18.5	14.7	14.6	14.8	15.1	16.6	12.7
	13th	Golden Gate	Ν	0.81		13.7			18.3		6.6	10.2	12.8	14.7	13.7	13.4	9.7	8.5	8.7	7.6	15.0	12.7
	Golden Gate	Washington	Ν	0.84		15.1			11.4	12.8	9.8	16.6	16.9	17.4	21.9	14.8	11.7	13.6	13.7	13.3	16.6	11.6
Van Ness/S VanNess	Washington	Lombard	Ν	0.58		13.2			18.0	26.1	9.2	22.4	26.6	26.4	24.5	17.6	16.4	15.5	16.1	16.6	18.6	11.1
van Nessy o van Ness	Lombard	Washington	S	0.58		17.7			14.5	12.8	11.7	13.5	19.9	12.4	17.1	13.7	12.3	11.4	11.9	10.4	13.1	10.1
	Washington	Golden Gate	S	0.84	4.6	11.7	7.0	8.4	9.7	10.0	9.8	8.0	10.4	12.2	11.5	12.8	9.8	7.9	8.2	9.2	11.6	8.6
	Golden Gate	13th	S	0.80	4.6	6.9			23.1		5.0	9.1	12.7	12.3	16.5	14.2	7.8	6.9	7.3	7.5	11.7	9.2
	13th	Cesar Chavez	S	1.49	12.6	18.2			18.9			20.2	20.4	17.1	18.7	19.0	15.1	14.7	14.8	13.8	15.5	12.1
Washington	Drumm	Kearny	W	0.44		10.3	12.5	8.0	9.5	18.4		14.1	15.2	11.3	14.9	8.1	9.1	10.9	10.0	9.5	11.3	11.5
West Portal	Sloat	Ulloa	Ν	0.54		17.1				11.6	10.0	15.1	15.1	12.6	15.4	13.7	11.6	12.3	9.5	12.1	12.9	11.5
	Ulloa	Sloat	S	0.54		18.2				11.3	8.0	17.1	15.4	15.2	16.7	13.4	14.3	13.0	10.2	11.5	13.2	10.2
1-280	Junipero Serra	Weldon	E	4.03	54.9	59.1				45.0	43.7	67.4	60.4	64.6	61.3	65.9	63.8	65.0	63.3	56.7	66.4	63.9
	Weldon	6th/Brannan	Ν	3.51		46.3	51.0	48.6	38.6	38.9	42.3	25.5	50.8	41.8	35.6	36.3	32.1	26.4	23.6	25.5	46.0	40.2
	County Line	Cortland	Ν	2.31	20.6	72.4				43.2	40.1	55.2	63.9	49.1	49.0	53.1	51.3	52.4	53.2	51.3	65.2	41.0
US-101	Cortland	I-80	Ν	1.90	24.6	45.8	31.8	40.9	6.2	24.0	17.8	53.1	48.6	23.6	18.3	13.3	12.8	14.8	13.8	12.6	23.5	8.5
	I-80	Market	Ν	1.27	12.2	15.3					8.2	13.5	32.6	22.8	30.5	31.8	24.6	20.6	12.4	13.5	25.4	23.0
1-80	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W	2.71	27.5	26.3				31.6	21.7	41.9	21.9	26.8	30.3	23.8	19.5	20.3	17.9	17.5	35.4	13.0
	Fremont Exit	US-101	W	1.70	18.6	21.5				24.9	13.8	22.4	18.2	24.5	19.9	17.4	15.9	16.7	16.0	14.3	19.4	12.9
1-280	6th/Brannan	Weldon	S	3.47		22.9				30.9	28.5	29.8	54.8	54.5	41.5	37.8	36.4	39.0	35.4	41.1	51.4	47.1
	Weldon	Junipero Serra	S	4.07	51.9	56.6				44.5	31.4	54.3	53.5	45.7	50.6	52.1	48.4	45.4	45.7	43.1	58.2	45.3
	Market	I-80	S	1.17	18.8	13.4					14.9	8.9	18.9	21.3	13.1	13.4	12.6	14.3	16.0	14.1	15.8	13.9
US-101	I-80	Cortland	S	1.97	31.6	46.3	47.2	35.5	32.4	44.4	21.4	30.3	45.2	45.6	46.9	49.6	43.3	46.7	46.8	43.5	49.8	43.1
	Cortland	Monster Park Exit	S	2.30	48.1	51.1	30.8	39.2	49.0	41.6	30.5	52.2	49.8	55.2	51.3	59.4	58.3	59.4	58.6	56.3	62.0	58.5
1-80	US-101	Fremont Exit	E	1.74	19.0	25.9				14.8	10.0	8.9	19.6	7.0	10.8	9.7	7.6	7.2	6.9	6.4	8.7	8.0
	Fremont Exit	Treasure Island	E	2.70	29.3	37.7	34.6	45.6	23.1	21.6	14.6	41.5	45.7	36.0	32.0	35.2	33.4	36.0	31.8	33.8	33.3	29.6

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	HCM 1985 Class	HCM 2000 Class	AM LOS (HCM 1985)	AM LOS (HCM 2000)	РМ LOS (нсм 1985)	PM LOS (HCM 2000)
1st St	Market	Harrison	S	0.48	3	4	С	С	F	F
Orad Ct	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	3	4	D	D	D	D
2nu St	Market	Brannan	S	0.72	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Jamestown	Evans	Ν	1.62	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Evans	Terry Francois	Ν	2.36	3	3	С	D	С	D
3rd St	Terry Francois	Market	Ν	1.05	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Terry Francois	Evans	S	2.36	3	3	С	С	С	D
	Evans	Jamestown	S	1.62	3	4	С	С	С	С
Ath Ct/Ctool/top	O'Farrell	Harrison	S	0.56	3	4	D	D	E	E
4111 St/ Stockton	Harrison	Channel	S	0.60	3	4	D	D	D	D
Eth Ct	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	3	4	D	D	D	D
50150	Market	Brannan	S	0.72	3	4	D	D	D	D
Cth Ct	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	3	4	D	D	D	D
611 51	Market	Brannan	S	0.72	3	4	С	С	D	D
7th St	Brannan	Market	N	0.72	3	4	D	D	D	D
8th St	Market	Bryant	S	0.60	3	3	D	Е	E	F
9th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	0.72	3	4	D	D	D	D
10th St	Market	Brannan	S	0.73	3	3	С	D	D	E
	Market	Mission	E	0.74	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Mission	Potrero	E	0.67	3	4	С	С	D	D
Totu St	Potrero	Mission	W	0.67	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Mission	Market	W	0.74	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Junipero Serra	Sloat	Ν	1.25	3	3	С	С	В	С
	Sloat	Lincoln	Ν	2.13	3	3	С	D	С	D
	Lincoln	Lake	Ν	1.85	3	3	В	В	В	С
19th Ave/Park	Lake	US-101	Ν	1.18	1	1	А	А	А	В
Presidio	US-101	Lake	S	1.26	1	1	А	В	С	D
	Lake	Lincoln	S	1.85	3	3	В	С	D	E
	Lincoln	Sloat	S	2.13	3	3	С	D	С	D
	Sloat	Junipero Serra	S	1.25	3	3	А	В	С	D
	Junipero Serra	Lyell	E	2.95	3	2	В	С	В	D
Alementy	Lyell	Bay Shore	E	1.59	3	2	А	С	А	С
Alemany	Bay Shore	Lyell	W	1.57	3	2	А	В	А	С
	Lyell	Junipero Serra	W	3.03	3	2	В	D	В	D
Dev	Van Ness	Embarcadero	E	1.07	3	4	С	С	С	С
Вау	Embarcadero	Van Ness	W	1.07	3	4	С	С	С	С
	County Line	Industrial	Ν	2.27	3	3	С	D	В	С
Roychors	Industrial	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.83	3	3	С	D	С	D
Daysnore	Jerrold	Industrial	S	0.80	3	3	В	С	В	С
	Industrial	County Line	S	2.26	3	3	В	С	В	С
Beale/Davis	Clay	Mission	S	0.32	3	4	D	D	E	E

Attachment 3-3. CMP Segments Level of Service (LOS) (2023)

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIRECTION	LENGTH (MI)	HCM 1985 Class	HCM 2000 Class	AM LOS (HCM 1985)	AM LOS (HCM 2000)	РМ LOS (нсм 1985)	PM LOS (HCM 2000)
	Division	6th	Е	0.54	3	4	С	С	D	D
Brannan	6th	3rd	Е	0.51	3	4	С	С	D	D
Brannan	3rd	6th	W	0.52	3	4	С	С	D	D
	6th	Division	W	0.54	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Gough	Larkin	E	0.36	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Larkin	Powell	E	0.55	1	1	D	Е	С	D
	Powell	Montgomery	E	0.35	3	4	С	С	D	D
Dreeducer	Montgomery	Embarcadero	E	0.35	3	4	С	С	D	D
Broadway	Embarcadero	Montgomery	W	0.35	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Montgomery	Powell	W	0.35	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Powell	Larkin	W	0.55	1	1	В	С	В	С
	Larkin	Gough	W	0.36	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Junipero Serra	Alemany	E	0.43	3	3	В	С	В	С
Brotherhood	Alemany	Junipero Serra	W	0.47	3	3	А	В	А	В
	Division	4th	E	0.99	3	3	С	D	D	E
Bryant	4th	Embarcadero	E	0.77	3	3	С	Е	D	Е
	Masonic	Gough	E	1.24	3	3	С	D	С	D
Bush	Gough	Market	E	1.45	3	3	D	Е	D	Е
	Market	14th	Ν	0.32	3	4	D	D	D	D
	14th	Geary	Ν	1.13	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Geary	Pine	Ν	0.27	3	4	D	D	D	D
Castro/Divisadero	Pine	Geary	S	0.27	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Geary	14th	S	1.13	3	4	С	С	D	D
	14th	Market	S	0.32	3	4	D	D	E	Е
	Guerrero	Bryant	E	0.76	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Bryant	Kansas	E	0.38	3	4	В	В	В	В
	Kansas	3rd	E	0.80	3	4	С	С	С	С
Cesar Chavez	3rd	Kansas	W	0.80	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Kansas	Bryant	W	0.38	3	4	В	В	С	С
	Bryant	Guerrero	W	0.75	3	4	С	С	D	D
Clay	Kearny	Davis	E	0.38	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Montgomery	Greenwich	Ν	0.67	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Greenwich	North Point	Ν	0.42	3	4	D	D	С	С
Columbus	North Point	Greenwich	S	0.42	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Greenwich	Montgomery	S	0.67	3	4	D	D	D	D
	County Line	SF Cemetery	E	1.16	1	2	А	А	А	А
	SF Cemetery	Lyon/Francisco	E	0.93	1	2	А	А	А	А
Dovle/Lombard/	Lyon/Francisco	Van Ness	E	1.29	3	4	С	С	С	С
Richardson	Van Ness	Lyon/Francisco	W	1.29	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Lyon/Francisco	SF Cemetery	W	0.96	1	2	А	А	В	В
	SF Cemetery	County Line	W	1.15	1	2	А	А	А	А
	Market	Washington	Ν	0.22	3	4	D	D	D	D
Drumm	Washington	Market	S	0.22	3	4	Е	Е	Е	Е

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIRECTION	LENGTH (MI)	HCM 1985 Class	HCM 2000 Class	AM LOS (HCM 1985)	AM LOS (HCM 2000)	РМ LOS (нсм 1985)	РМ LOS (нсм 2000)
	Market	Mission	E	0.35	3	4	D	D	D	D
Dula a (Divisian	Mission	Potrero	E	0.66	3	4	С	С	D	D
Duboce/Division	Potrero	Mission	W	0.66	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Mission	Market	W	0.35	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Townsend	North Point	N	2.16	3	3	С	D	С	E
Embarcadero	North Point	Townsend	S	2.16	3	3	С	D	D	Е
France	Cesar Chavez	3rd	S	0.73	3	4	С	С	С	С
Evans	3rd	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.73	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Gough	Market	E	0.29	3	4	D	D	D	D
Fell	Gough	Laguna	W	0.18	3	3	D	Е	D	Е
	Laguna	Stanyan	W	1.56	3	3	С	С	С	D
	13th	8th	E	0.49	3	3	D	E	D	E
	8th	4th	Е	0.69	3	3	С	D	D	Е
Folsom	4th	1st	Е	0.52	3	3	D	Е	E	F
	1st	Embarcadero	E	0.34	3	3	Е	F	Е	F
-	Market	Pine	N	1.06	3	4	D	D	D	D
Franklin	Pine	Lombard	Ν	0.83	3	4	С	С	D	D
Fremont	Harrison	Market	N	0.48	3	4	E	Е	D	D
	Park Presidio	10th Ave	E	0.20	3	4	В	В	В	В
	10th Ave	Arguello	Е	0.53	3	4	С	С	С	С
E 11	Arguello	Masonic	Е	0.66	3	4	С	С	С	С
Fulton	Masonic	Arguello	W	0.66	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Arguello	10th Ave	W	0.53	3	4	В	В	В	В
	10th Ave	Park Presidio	W	0.20	3	4	В	В	С	С
	Great Hwy	25th Ave	E	1.78	3	4	В	В	С	С
	25th Ave	Arguello	Е	1.42	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Arguello	Gough	E	1.91	3	4	С	С	С	С
Geary	Kearny	Gough	W	1.18	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Gough	Arguello	W	1.92	3	4	В	В	С	С
	Arguello	25th Ave	W	1.42	3	4	С	С	С	С
	25th Ave	Great Hwy	W	1.79	3	4	В	В	В	В
	Ocean	Cayuga	Е	0.56	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Cayuga	Paris	Е	0.33	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Paris	Santos	E	1.19	3	4	В	В	В	В
Geneva	Santos	Paris	W	1.19	3	4	В	В	В	В
	Paris	Cayuga	W	0.33	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Cayuga	Ocean	W	0.53	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Masonic	Franklin	E	1.37	3	4	С	С	D	D
Golden Gate	Franklin	Market	Е	0.65	3	4	E	E	E	E
	Pine	Geary	S	0.26	3	4	С	С	D	D
Gough	Geary	Golden Gate	S	0.33	3	4	D	D	E	E
	Golden Gate	Market	S	0.54	3	4	D	D	E	E

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	HCM 1985 Class	HCM 2000 Class	AM LOS (HCM 1985)	AM LOS (HCM 2000)	РМ LOS (нсм 1985)	РМ LOS (HCM 2000)
	Monterey	29th	Ν	1.17	1	2	D	D	Е	Е
Guerrero/	29th	Cesar Chavez	Ν	0.29	3	4	С	С	D	D
San Jose	Cesar Chavez	29th	S	0.28	3	4	С	С	С	С
	29th	Monterey	S	1.17	1	2	С	С	D	D
	Embarcadero	1st	W	0.34	3	3	С	Е	Е	F
Harriaan	1st	4th	W	0.52	3	3	D	Е	D	Е
Harrison	4th	8th	W	0.69	3	3	С	D	С	E
	8th	Division	W	0.40	3	3	D	E	D	F
Hayes	Market	Gough	W	0.39	3	4	D	D	E	E
Howard	Embarcadero	S Van Ness	W	2.11	3	4	D	D	D	D
	County Line	Brotherhood	N	0.29	1	1	D	E	F	F
	Brotherhood	19th	Ν	0.34	1	1	F	F	F	F
	19th	Sloat	Ν	1.21	1	2	С	С	С	С
Junipero Serra	Sloat	19th	S	1.21	1	2	D	D	D	D
	19th	Brotherhood	S	0.33	1	1	А	А	А	В
	Brotherhood	County Line	S	0.30	1	1	А	А	А	А
Kearny	Market	Columbus	Ν	0.65	3	4	D	D	D	D
	4th	2nd	Е	0.34	3	4	С	С	С	С
King	2nd	4th	W	0.34	3	4	С	С	D	D
	19th Ave	5th Ave	Е	0.83	3	3	В	С	С	С
	5th Ave	Stanyan	Е	0.70	3	3	С	D	С	С
Lincoln/ Kezar	Stanyan	5th Ave	W	0.70	3	3	В	С	В	С
	5th Ave	19th Ave	W	0.83	3	3	В	С	С	D
Main	Mission	Market	N	0.12	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Sloat	Santa Clara	Е	0.43	3	3	С	D	С	D
	Santa Clara	Burnett	Е	1.34	3	3	В	С	В	С
	Burnett	Castro	Е	1.62	3	4	В	В	В	В
	Castro	Guerrero	E	0.79	3	3	D	E	D	Е
	Guerrero	Van Ness	E	0.43	3	3	D	E	D	Е
	Van Ness	Drumm	E	1.77	3	4	D	D	D	D
Market/Portola	Drumm	Van Ness	W	1.77	3	4	E	E	E	E
	Van Ness	Guerrero	W	0.43	3	3	С	E	С	E
	Guerrero	Castro	W	0.79	3	3	С	D	С	Е
	Castro	Burnett	W	1.63	3	4	В	В	В	В
	Burnett	Santa Clara	W	1.34	3	3	В	С	В	С
	Santa Clara	Sloat	W	0.43	3	3	С	D	С	D
	Page	Geary	N	0.79	3	3	С	D	D	E
	Geary	Bush/Euclid	Ν	0.20	3	3	С	D	С	D
Masonic	Presidio	Geary	S	0.29	3	3	С	D	D	E
	Gearv	Page	S	0.79	3	3	С	D	D	F

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL Direction	LENGTH (MI)	HCM 1985 Class	HCM 2000 Class	AM LOS (HCM 1985)	AM LOS (HCM 2000)	РМ LOS (нсм 1985)	РМ LOS (HCM 2000)
	Sickles	Ocean	Ν	1.45	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Ocean	Cesar Chavez	Ν	1.95	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Cesar Chavez	14th	Ν	1.39	3	4	С	С	D	D
	14th	9th	Ν	0.65	3	4	D	D	D	D
	9th	Зrd	Ν	0.98	3	4	С	С	D	D
Mission (Otis	3rd	Embarcadero	Ν	0.74	3	4	D	D	Е	Е
Mission/Otis	Embarcadero	3rd	S	0.74	3	4	D	D	D	D
	3rd	9th	S	0.98	3	4	С	С	D	D
	9th	14th	S	0.68	3	4	D	D	Е	Е
	14th	Cesar Chavez	S	1.39	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Cesar Chavez	Ocean	S	1.95	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Ocean	Sickles	S	1.45	3	4	С	С	С	С
Montgomery	Broadway	Bush	S	0.51	3	4	D	D	E	E
	Van Ness	Columbus	E	0.38	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Columbus	Embarcadero	E	0.61	3	4	С	С	С	С
North Point	Embarcadero	Columbus	W	0.61	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Columbus	Van Ness	W	0.38	3	4	С	С	С	С
Oak	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	0.92	3	3	С	С	С	С
	Divisadero	Fillmore	Е	0.37	3	3	D	Е	С	Е
	Fillmore	Laguna	E	0.27	3	3	Е	F	F	F
	Laguna	Franklin	Е	0.27	3	3	D	E	D	F
	19th Ave	Miramar	E	1.11	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Miramar	Howth	E	0.48	3	4	D	D	D	D
Ocean	Howth	Miramar	W	0.48	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Miramar	19th Ave	W	1.11	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Market	Fell	N	0.27	3	4	F	F	E	E
Octavia	Fell	Market	S	0.28	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Gough	Mason	E	0.85	3	4	D	D	D	D
O'Farrell	Mason	Market	E	0.28	3	4	D	D	E	E
	Market	Kearny	W	0.38	3	3	E	F	E	F
	Kearny	Leavenworth	W	0.63	3	3	С	D	D	E
Pine	Leavenworth	Franklin	W	0.46	3	3	С	Е	D	Е
	Franklin	Presidio	W	1.27	3	3	С	D	С	D
	Cesar Chavez	21st	N	0.61	3	4	С	С	D	D
	21st	Division	Ν	0.80	3	4	С	С	С	С
Potrero	Division	21st	S	0.80	3	4	С	С	С	С
	21st	Cesar Chavez	S	0.60	3	4	С	С	D	D
	County Line	Sloat	N	1.94	3	1	A	В	A	В
Skyline	Sloat	County Line	S	1.94	3	1	A	В	А	В
	Skyline	Junipero Serra	E	1.38	1	2	С	С	D	D
Sloat	Junipero Serra	Skyline	W	1.38	1	2	С	С	С	С
	Fulton	Turk	N	0.20	3	4	C	C	C	C
Stanyan	Turk	Fulton	S	0.20	3	4	C	C	E	E

NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIRECTION	LENGTH (MI)	HCM 1985 Class	HCM 2000 Class	AM LOS (HCM 1985)	AM LOS (HCM 2000)	РМ LOS (нсм 1985)	PM LOS (HCM 2000)
	Divisadero	Gough	Е	0.82	3	4	С	С	D	D
Quittan	Market	Mason	W	0.56	3	4	D	D	D	D
Sutter	Mason	Gough	W	0.82	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Gough	Divisadero	W	0.82	3	4	D	D	С	С
Tourseaud	7th	2nd	E	0.86	3	4	С	С	D	D
Iownsend	2nd	7th	W	0.86	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	0.91	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Market	Hyde	W	0.38	3	4	D	D	D	D
Turk	Hyde	Gough	W	0.46	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Gough	Divisadero	W	0.82	3	3	С	D	С	D
	Divisadero	Stanyan	W	0.91	3	4	С	С	С	С
	Cesar Chavez	13th	Ν	1.49	3	4	С	С	D	D
	13th	Golden Gate	Ν	0.81	3	4	D	D	D	D
Van Ness/ S Van Ness	Golden Gate	Washington	Ν	0.84	3	4	D	D	D	D
	Washington	Lombard	Ν	0.58	3	4	С	С	D	D
	Lombard	Washington	S	0.58	3	4	E	E	D	D
	Washington	Golden Gate	S	0.84	3	4	С	С	E	E
	Golden Gate	13th	S	0.80	3	4	D	D	D	D
	13th	Cesar Chavez	S	1.49	3	4	С	С	D	D
Washington	Drumm	Kearny	W	0.44	3	4	D	D	D	D
West Darts	Sloat	Ulloa	Ν	0.54	3	4	С	С	D	D
West Portai	Ulloa	Sloat	S	0.54	3	4	D	D	D	D
1.080	Junipero Serra	Weldon	E	4.03	Fwy	Fwy	Е		А	
1-280	Weldon	6th/Brannan	Ν	3.51	Fwy	Fwy	С		Е	
	County Line	Cortland	Ν	2.31	Fwy	Fwy	F		E	
US-101	Cortland	I-80	Ν	1.90	Fwy	Fwy	F		F	
	I-80	Market	Ν	1.27	Fwy	Fwy	F		F	
1.80	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W	2.71	Fwy	Fwy	F		F	
1-80	Fremont Exit	US-101	W	1.70	Fwy	Fwy	F		F	
1.080	6th/Brannan	Weldon	S	3.47	Fwy	Fwy	А		D	
1-280	Weldon	Junipero Serra	S	4.07	Fwy	Fwy	А		D	
	Market	I-80	S	1.17	Fwy	Fwy	F		F	
US-101	I-80	Cortland	S	1.97	Fwy	Fwy	D		D	
	Cortland	Monster Park Exit	S	2.30	Fwy	Fwy	Е		В	
1.80	US-101	Fremont Exit	Е	1.74	Fwy	Fwy	D		F	
1-00	Fremont Exit	Treasure Island	Е	2.70	Fwy	Fwy	В		F	

Attachment 3-4. CMP Segments Auto Travel Time Reliability

							A	M			Р	M	
NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIR	CLASS	DIST. (MI)	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023
1st St	Market	Harrison	S	3	0.48	44%	35%	21%	31%	42%	74%	34%	23%
Ond St	Brannan	Market	Ν	3	0.72	38%	36%	19%	30%	57%	33%	19%	25%
2110 St	Market	Brannan	S	3	0.72	54%	31%	28%	21%	33%	38%	19%	30%
	Jamestown	Evans	Ν	3	1.62	26%	26%	19%	16%	29%	31%	18%	12%
	Evans	Terry Francois	Ν	3	2.36	30%	26%	17%	15%	56%	32%	12%	27%
3rd St	Terry Francois	Market	Ν	3	1.05	42%	41%	22%	36%	44%	34%	16%	28%
	Terry Francois	Evans	S	3	2.36	23%	24%	17%	13%	29%	17%	15%	17%
	Evans	Jamestown	S	3	1.62	32%	28%	18%	18%	30%	24%	15%	15%
4+h- 0+ (0+a-a-h-t-a-a-	O'Farrell	Harrison	S	3	0.56	39%	45%	14%	18%	41%	35%	15%	20%
4th St/Stockton	Harrison	Channel	S	3	0.60	39%	44%	13%	22%	40%	45%	14%	35%
511.01	Brannan	Market	Ν	3	0.72		32%	19%	39%		39%	20%	24%
5th St	Market	Brannan	S	3	0.72		35%	18%	23%		30%	27%	37%
0.414 0.4	Brannan	Market	Ν	3	0.72	57%	44%	34%	30%	59%	33%	38%	21%
6th St	Market	Brannan	S	3	0.72	27%	38%	12%	29%	31%	49%	15%	33%
7th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	3	0.72	51%	52%	22%	35%	46%	44%	13%	14%
8th St	Market	Bryant	S	3	0.60	36%	39%	16%	17%	70%	60%	18%	40%
9th St	Brannan	Market	Ν	3	0.72	50%	43%	27%	33%	67%	50%	9%	18%
10th St	Market	Brannan	S	3	0.73	33%	32%	23%	21%	47%	38%	25%	43%
	Market	Mission	E	3	0.74	48%	48%	26%	29%	44%	34%	14%	18%
16th St	Mission	Potrero	E	3	0.67	51%	32%	18%	27%	36%	32%	16%	19%
	Potrero	Mission	W	3	0.67	28%	34%	21%	28%	45%	42%	16%	24%
	Mission	Market	W	3	0.74	28%	33%	18%	26%	44%	28%	10%	19%
	Junipero Serra	Sloat	Ν	3	1.25	26%	36%	16%	52%	34%	30%	15%	22%
	Sloat	Lincoln	Ν	3	2.13	51%	55%	34%	40%	29%	29%	23%	34%
	Lincoln	Lake	Ν	3	1.85	28%	28%	16%	19%	153%	32%	13%	58%
19th Ave/	Lake	US-101	Ν	1	1.18	12%	11%	11%	10%	21%	51%	9%	16%
Park Presidio	US-101	Lake	S	1	1.26	84%	87%	11%	29%	116%	78%	11%	95%
	Lake	Lincoln	S	3	1.85	31%	32%	14%	43%	69%	28%	57%	55%
	Lincoln	Sloat	S	3	2.13	30%	27%	18%	50%	19%	21%	23%	56%
	Sloat	Junipero Serra	S	3	1.25	47%	25%	13%	18%	32%	30%	28%	34%
	Junipero Serra	Lyell	E	3	2.95	43%	23%	14%	14%	63%	17%	11%	11%
	Lyell	Bay Shore	E	3	1.59	39%	51%	15%	31%	19%	23%	14%	16%
Alemany	Bay Shore	Lyell	W	3	1.57	35%	14%	12%	13%	28%	13%	12%	16%
	Lyell	Junipero Serra	W	3	3.03	39%	22%	14%	11%	32%	20%	7%	10%
_	Van Ness	Embarcadero	E	3	1.07	54%	51%	12%	28%	26%	25%	12%	12%
Вау	Embarcadero	Van Ness	W	3	1.07	26%	31%	12%	17%	41%	33%	14%	18%
	County Line	Industrial	Ν	3	2.27	39%	55%	16%	41%	36%	37%	11%	23%
	Industrial	Cesar Chavez	Ν	3	0.83	52%	59%	23%	21%	46%	47%	13%	32%
Bayshore	Jerrold	Industrial	S	3	0.80	48%	36%	16%	25%	36%	40%	15%	17%
	Industrial	County Line	S	3	2.26	23%	32%	13%	17%	35%	33%	12%	18%
Beale/Davis	Clay	Mission	S	3	0.32			19%	25%			12%	41%

						AM					PM				
NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIR	CLASS	DIST. (MI)	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023		
	Division	6th	E	3	0.54	39%	26%	13%	24%	41%	41%	21%	39%		
Bronnon	6th	3rd	E	3	0.51	62%	37%	15%	22%	45%	41%	17%	32%		
Dialillall	3rd	6th	W	3	0.52	48%	32%	19%	25%	47%	54%	17%	27%		
	6th	Division	W	3	0.54	41%	32%	25%	21%	48%	33%	28%	24%		
	Gough	Larkin	E	3	0.36	55%	49%	14%	27%	37%	36%	23%	20%		
	Larkin	Powell	E	1	0.55	113%	81%	21%	115%	67%	31%	14%	16%		
	Powell	Montgomery	E	3	0.35	43%	52%	26%	40%	38%	37%	18%	23%		
Dreadurau	Montgomery	Embarcadero	E	3	0.35	42%	34%	28%	27%	42%	34%	18%	22%		
Broadway	Embarcadero	Montgomery	W	3	0.35	74%	45%	23%	26%	34%	54%	19%	31%		
	Montgomery	Powell	W	3	0.35	64%	53%	19%	25%	41%	53%	14%	39%		
	Powell	Larkin	W	1	0.55	33%	34%	29%	23%	30%	25%	12%	12%		
	Larkin	Gough	W	3	0.36	45%	36%	14%	30%	35%	20%	11%	26%		
Duathauhaad	Junipero Serra	Alemany	E	3	0.43	37%	40%	24%	32%	49%	45%	22%	28%		
Brothernood	Alemany	Junipero Serra	W	3	0.47	51%	49%	21%	32%	50%	33%	18%	21%		
Bryant	Division	4th	E	3	0.99	26%	37%	16%	17%	52%	48%	22%	29%		
	4th	Embarcadero	E	3	0.77	59%	45%	14%	28%	102%	45%	22%	41%		
Bush	Masonic	Gough	E	3	1.24	37%	26%	12%	27%	26%	20%	11%	17%		
	Gough	Market	E	3	1.45	33%	33%	14%	26%	30%	21%	14%	19%		
	Market	14th	Ν	3	0.32	53%	48%	27%	43%	24%	43%	16%	21%		
Castro/Divisadero	14th	Geary	Ν	3	1.13	33%	29%	23%	28%	28%	28%	11%	16%		
	Geary	Pine	Ν	3	0.27	33%	28%	26%	26%	23%	19%	12%	23%		
	Pine	Geary	S	3	0.27	35%	27%	17%	23%	37%	28%	21%	26%		
	Geary	14th	S	3	1.13	32%	30%	18%	25%	52%	24%	14%	26%		
	14th	Market	S	3	0.32	34%	28%	25%	27%	44%	25%	24%	23%		
	Guerrero	Bryant	E	3	0.76	68%	49%	38%	42%	36%	41%	28%	27%		
	Bryant	Kansas	E	3	0.38	34%	33%	18%	28%	35%	37%	15%	26%		
0	Kansas	3rd	E	3	0.80	40%	51%	23%	19%	46%	36%	18%	18%		
Cesar Chavez	3rd	Kansas	W	3	0.80	56%	48%	21%	16%	41%	34%	13%	22%		
	Kansas	Bryant	W	3	0.38	41%	41%	20%	18%	42%	29%	14%	23%		
	Bryant	Guerrero	W	3	0.75	36%	38%	30%	27%	35%	33%	19%	23%		
Clay	Kearny	Davis	E	3	0.38		27%	20%	21%		41%	16%	25%		
	Montgomery	Greenwich	Ν	3	0.67	23%	27%	26%	22%	35%	31%	17%	18%		
O a luma huna	Greenwich	North Point	Ν	3	0.42	25%	25%	25%	29%	22%	25%	15%	20%		
Columbus	North Point	Greenwich	S	3	0.42	41%	28%	14%	20%	27%	26%	16%	23%		
	Greenwich	Montgomery	S	3	0.67	45%	33%	19%	33%	36%	29%	20%	20%		
	County Line	SF Cemetery	E	1	1.16	56%	20%	7%	9%	12%	10%	6%	9%		
	SF Cemetery	Lyon/Francisco	E	1	0.93	63%	49%	19%	14%	73%	84%	49%	9%		
Doyle/Lombard/	Lyon/Francisco	Van Ness	E	3	1.29	36%	28%	13%	18%	35%	33%	21%	14%		
Richardson	Van Ness	Lyon/Francisco	W	3	1.29	34%	39%	43%	18%	42%	38%	22%	30%		
	Lyon/Francisco	SF Cemetery	W	1	0.96	20%	20%	14%	17%	43%	165%	10%	14%		
	SF Cemetery	County Line	W	1	1.15	9%	8%	8%	9%	140%	204%	3%	225%		
	Market	Washington	Ν	3	0.22			14%	25%			19%	27%		
Drumm	Washington	Market	S	3	0.22			28%	23%			17%	26%		

	AM								РМ						
NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIR	CLASS	DIST. (MI)	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023		
	Market	Mission	E	3	0.35	68%	50%	41%	41%	44%	41%	26%	26%		
D. 1. (D	Mission	Potrero	E	3	0.66		41%	31%	31%		73%	29%	22%		
Duboce/Division	Potrero	Mission	W	3	0.66	58%	58%	32%	28%	76%	69%	23%	22%		
	Mission	Market	W	3	0.35	57%	45%	34%	28%	51%	43%	21%	35%		
	Townsend	North Point	Ν	3	2.16	46%	35%	27%	28%	33%	21%	10%	25%		
Embarcadero	North Point	Townsend	S	3	2.16	27%	25%	15%	21%	45%	32%	16%	34%		
	Cesar Chavez	3rd	S	3	0.73		57%	17%	23%		60%	13%	21%		
Evans	3rd	Cesar Chavez	Ν	3	0.73		48%	24%	35%		34%	24%	22%		
	Gough	Market	E	3	0.29	65%	35%	44%	35%	49%	53%	30%	28%		
Fell	Gough	Laguna	W	3	0.18	48%	36%	24%	31%	49%	28%	13%	22%		
	Laguna	Stanyan	W	3	1.56	29%	20%	21%	25%	26%	24%	21%	32%		
	13th	8th	E	3	0.49	38%	29%	16%	26%	51%	35%	15%	24%		
	8th	4th	Е	3	0.69	44%	36%	14%	30%	43%	44%	15%	34%		
Folsom	4th	1st	E	3	0.52	40%	39%	17%	27%	93%	53%	19%	30%		
	1st	Embarcadero	Е	3	0.34	37%	33%	17%	30%	40%	29%	19%	22%		
	Market	Pine	Ν	3	1.06	45%	43%	37%	42%	34%	26%	27%	24%		
Franklin	Pine	Lombard	Ν	3	0.83	32%	28%	16%	13%	21%	17%	15%	18%		
Fremont	Harrison	Market	Ν	3	0.48	53%	52%	35%	35%	43%	39%	24%	29%		
	Park Presidio	10th Ave	E	3	0.20	40%	30%	20%	28%	56%	30%	18%	22%		
	10th Ave	Arguello	Е	3	0.53	53%	34%	20%	32%	61%	25%	18%	30%		
Fulton	Arguello	Masonic	E	3	0.66	47%	37%	13%	30%	136%	29%	14%	29%		
	Masonic	Arguello	W	3	0.66	23%	32%	21%	21%	68%	26%	16%	21%		
	Arguello	10th Ave	W	3	0.53	33%	24%	19%	26%	70%	36%	18%	17%		
	10th Ave	Park Presidio	W	3	0.20	38%	37%	19%	29%	59%	34%	18%	35%		
	Great Hwy	25th Ave	E	3	1.78	18%	19%	11%	14%	24%	18%	11%	10%		
	25th Ave	Arguello	E	3	1.42	35%	38%	23%	42%	30%	33%	12%	15%		
	Arguello	Gough	E	3	1.91	26%	26%	17%	14%	26%	24%	13%	10%		
Geary	Kearny	Gough	W	3	1.18	25%	29%	10%	15%	30%	31%	17%	16%		
,	Gough	Arguello	W	3	1.92	25%	31%	15%	10%	30%	21%	11%	13%		
	Arguello	25th Ave	W	3	1.42	21%	29%	18%	15%	30%	21%	12%	15%		
	25th Ave	Great Hwy	W	3	1.79	20%	20%	16%	14%	23%	25%	11%	12%		
	Ocean	Cavuga	E	3	0.56	51%	34%	16%	21%	47%	31%	16%	16%		
	Cayuga	Paris	E	3	0.33	32%	40%	16%	34%	27%	35%	16%	24%		
	Paris	Santos	E	3	1.19	33%	32%	14%	33%	24%	27%	10%	21%		
Geneva	Santos	Paris	W	3	1.19	26%	38%	17%	22%	35%	40%	11%	15%		
	Paris	Cavuga	W	3	0.33	58%	39%	18%	27%	33%	40%	11%	24%		
	Cavuga	Ocean	W	3	0.53	49%	36%	24%	36%	28%	32%	10%	21%		
	Masonic	Franklin	E	3	1.37		20%	11%	11%		17%	11%	13%		
Golden Gate	Franklin	Market	E	3	0.65		34%	13%	14%		30%	15%	17%		
	Pine	Gearv	S	3	0.26	60%	38%	34%	25%	89%	57%	39%	56%		
Gough	Gearv	Golden Gate	S	3	0.33	80%	63%	34%	78%	39%	56%	39%	41%		
	Golden Gate	Market	S	3	0.54	27%	36%	29%	47%	35%	37%	37%	19%		
		market	0	5	0.04	£1/0	0070	2070	-F 7 70	0070	0170	0170			

NAMEPARCE		AM								PM						
<table-container> Here Metry N 1 1.17 35% 35% 29% 64% 42% 44% 14% 14% 34% 34% 34% 35%<th>NAME</th><th>FROM</th><th>то</th><th>TRAVEL DIR</th><th>CLASS</th><th>DIST. (MI)</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2017</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2019</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2021</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2023</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2017</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2019</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2021</th><th>BUFFER INDEX 2023</th></table-container>	NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIR	CLASS	DIST. (MI)	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023		
<table-container>AnalysisAnd</table-container>		Monterey	29th	Ν	1	1.17	35%	35%	29%	54%	42%	44%	11%	34%		
numberSectore <th< td=""><td>Cuerrere (Cen Jeee</td><td>29th</td><td>Cesar Chavez</td><td>Ν</td><td>3</td><td>0.29</td><td>63%</td><td>64%</td><td>26%</td><td>45%</td><td>59%</td><td>32%</td><td>16%</td><td>29%</td></th<>	Cuerrere (Cen Jeee	29th	Cesar Chavez	Ν	3	0.29	63%	64%	26%	45%	59%	32%	16%	29%		
Image: border	Guerrero/San Jose	Cesar Chavez	29th	S	3	0.28	42%	41%	26%	29%	79%	67%	34%	64%		
<table-container>HardonIntervalue</table-container>		29th	Monterey	S	1	1.17	28%	33%	17%	20%	43%	35%	35%	27%		
<table-container>HaranoInternational International<br< td=""><td></td><td>Embarcadero</td><td>1st</td><td>W</td><td>3</td><td>0.34</td><td>40%</td><td>41%</td><td>15%</td><td>29%</td><td>61%</td><td>69%</td><td>20%</td><td>37%</td></br<></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></table-container>		Embarcadero	1st	W	3	0.34	40%	41%	15%	29%	61%	69%	20%	37%		
name 4h 8h 9k	Harrison	1st	4th	W	3	0.52	64%	42%	15%	14%	71%	44%	20%	24%		
8thDivisionW30.4042%41%13%17%47%29%17%19%HayactBurketGughW30.3025%36%23%21%27%26%16%26%HowartEnderStandardStandardM32.1125%26%13%12%27%26%16%36%16%HowardStandardStandardN32.1125%26%98%13%17%21%28%46%13%16%HourdStandardN10.2985%98%13%17%21%28%46%13%28%28%Junpero StandardStandardN10.3452%47%54%52%42%28%40%14%28%Junpero StandardStandardN10.3452%47%54%52%42%28%40%14%12%Junpero StandardStandardN10.3412%36%31%17%21%28%43%13%13%13%14%14%13%13%13%13%13%13%13%13%13%13%14%14%13% <td>пантооп</td> <td>4th</td> <td>8th</td> <td>W</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.69</td> <td>34%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>22%</td>	пантооп	4th	8th	W	3	0.69	34%	29%	14%	21%	25%	30%	14%	22%		
HeysMarketGougnW30.3925%39%23%21%27%26%19%19%20%HowaMarketStandardW32.1126%24%13%12%23%26%26%13%26%36%36%12%36%23%23%23%23%26%36%		8th	Division	W	3	0.40	42%	41%	13%	17%	47%	29%	17%	19%		
HoardFloarSan NessW32.1125%24%13%12%23%26%13%16%Quy LineBrothodoN10.2985%98%19%174%28%46%19%32%Brothodo19hN10.2985%98%19%174%28%46%19%32%Brothodo19hN10.2985%98%19%52%42%28%46%19%28%Brothodo19hN11.2136%31%17%28%18%14%13%13%Brothodo19hS11.2129%19%18%13%33%30%14%13%13%Brothodo19hS10.3311%8%13%13%15% <td< td=""><td>Hayes</td><td>Market</td><td>Gough</td><td>W</td><td>3</td><td>0.39</td><td>25%</td><td>39%</td><td>23%</td><td>21%</td><td>27%</td><td>26%</td><td>19%</td><td>20%</td></td<>	Hayes	Market	Gough	W	3	0.39	25%	39%	23%	21%	27%	26%	19%	20%		
P_{under} P_{under	Howard	Embarcadero	S Van Ness	W	3	2.11	25%	24%	13%	12%	23%	26%	13%	16%		
Herehood19hN10.3452%47%54%52%42%28%40%21%19hSafaN11.2136%31%17%21%28%18%14%12%10aBrotenodSa11.2129%19%18%13%33%30%14%13%10aBrotenodSato10.3311%8%13%12%13%15%12%13%33%30%14%33%10aBrotenodCountorS10.3311%8%11%12%13%15%15%15%13%13%10aMarciCountorS10.3311%8%11%12%13%12%13%13%13%13%10aMarciCountorsN30.6547%40%31%29%30%24%27%13%13%10aMarciN30.6547%40%31%29%30%24%27%30%30%10aMarciN30.6547%40%31%29%28%48%38%22%30% <t< td=""><td></td><td>County Line</td><td>Brotherhood</td><td>Ν</td><td>1</td><td>0.29</td><td>85%</td><td>98%</td><td>19%</td><td>174%</td><td>28%</td><td>46%</td><td>19%</td><td>32%</td></t<>		County Line	Brotherhood	Ν	1	0.29	85%	98%	19%	174%	28%	46%	19%	32%		
Junper Series19hStatN11.2136%31%17%21%28%18%14%12%Stat9h9h9h18%13%13%33%30%14%13%19h8rdtenhoodS10.3311%8%13%12%13%15%12%14%19hMarketCoundy LineS10.3311%8%11%12%15%12%13%13%KerryMarketCoundy SN30.6547%40%31%29%28%36%24%27%17%KerryMarketCoundy SN30.6547%40%31%29%28%48%38%22%38%38%22%39%KerryMarketStatR30.6556%35%29%28%46%36%21%36% <t< td=""><td></td><td>Brotherhood</td><td>19th</td><td>Ν</td><td>1</td><td>0.34</td><td>52%</td><td>47%</td><td>54%</td><td>52%</td><td>42%</td><td>28%</td><td>40%</td><td>21%</td></t<>		Brotherhood	19th	Ν	1	0.34	52%	47%	54%	52%	42%	28%	40%	21%		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		19th	Sloat	Ν	1	1.21	36%	31%	17%	21%	28%	18%	14%	12%		
19hBrohenoodS1 0.33 11% 8% 13% 12% 15% 15% 12% 14% RenormCounty LineS1 0.30 11% 8% 11% 12% 15% 12% 13% 13% 13% KearnyMarketColumbusN3 0.65 47% 40% 31% 29% 30% 24% 27% 7% 7% $Marget2ndS30.6547\%40\%31\%29\%28\%48\%38\%22\%39\%MargetShareR30.3465\%35\%29\%28\%48\%38\%22\%39\%MargetShareR30.3465\%35\%29\%28\%48\%38\%22\%39\%MargetShareR30.3465\%35\%29\%28\%48\%38\%22\%39\%MargetShareR30.3465\%35\%29\%28\%48\%38\%22\%39\%MargetShareR30.3465\%50\%21\%38\%40\%32\%13\%19\%MargetShareR30.7040\%40\%55\%58\%26\%25\%12\%12\%12\%MargetShareShareShare30.23$	Junipero Serra	Sloat	19th	S	1	1.21	29%	19%	18%	13%	33%	30%	14%	13%		
Independent of the second s		19th	Brotherhood	S	1	0.33	11%	8%	13%	12%	13%	15%	12%	14%		
KearnyMarketColumbusN30.6547%40%31%29%30%24%27%17% K_{Hg} 4th2ndE30.3465%35%29%28%48%38%22%39%2nd4thW30.3485%41%14%30%66%51%20%30% I_{100} 4thW30.8356%50%21%38%40%32%13%19% I_{100} 5th AveE30.7040%40%55%58%26%25%15%15%15% I_{100} 5th AveW30.7019%23%15%14%29%32%15%15%15% I_{100} 19h AveW30.836.6731%20%25%36%26%25%15%15%15% I_{100} 19h AveW30.7019%23%15%14%29%22%12%16% I_{100} 19h AveW30.1283%21%20%25%45%32%17%25% I_{100} MarketN30.1283%14%20%24%34%24%34%26% I_{100} MarketN30.1283%14%20%25%34%34%26%26%25%34%34%26%36%36%36%36%<		Brotherhood	County Line	S	1	0.30	11%	8%	11%	12%	15%	12%	13%	13%		
h h	Kearny	Market	Columbus	Ν	3	0.65	47%	40%	31%	29%	30%	24%	27%	17%		
King2nd4thW3 0.34 85% 41% 14% 30% 66% 51% 20% 30% I_{MAV} $5th$ Ave $5th$ Ave E 3 0.83 56% 50% 21% 38% 40% 32% 13% 19% I_{MAV} $5th$ Ave $5th$ Ave E 3 0.70 40% 40% 55% 58% 26% 25% 15% 15% 15% $Stanyan$ E 3 0.70 19% 23% 15% 14% 29% 22% 12% 16% Sth Ave $19th$ Ave W 3 0.70 19% 23% 15% 14% 29% 22% 12% 16% Sth Ave $19th$ Ave W 3 0.70 19% 23% 15% 14% 29% 22% 12% 16% Sth Ave $19th$ Ave W 3 0.70 19% 23% 15% 14% 29% 22% 12% 16% $Main$ <td rowspan="2">King</td> <td>4th</td> <td>2nd</td> <td>E</td> <td>3</td> <td>0.34</td> <td>65%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>48%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>39%</td>	King	4th	2nd	E	3	0.34	65%	35%	29%	28%	48%	38%	22%	39%		
International Market Internati		2nd	4th	W	3	0.34	85%	41%	14%	30%	66%	51%	20%	30%		
Lincoln/ Kear Stanyan E 3 0.70 40% 40% 55% 58% 26% 25% 15% 15% Stanyan 5th Ave W 3 0.70 19% 23% 15% 14% 29% 22% 12% 16% Stanyan 19th Ave W 3 0.83 42% 31% 20% 25% 45% 32% 17% 25% Main Mission Market N 3 0.12 83% 14% 41% 34% 15% 14% 14% 34% 15% 16% 15% 16%		19th Ave	5th Ave	E	3	0.83	56%	50%	21%	38%	40%	32%	13%	19%		
Lincoln/ Kezar Stanyan 5th Ave W 3 0.70 19% 23% 15% 14% 29% 22% 12% 16% 5th Ave 19th Ave W 3 0.83 42% 31% 20% 25% 45% 32% 17% 25% Main Mission Market N 3 0.12 83% 14% 41% 34% 34% 16%		5th Ave	Stanyan	E	3	0.70	40%	40%	55%	58%	26%	25%	15%	15%		
5th Ave 19th Ave W 3 0.83 42% 31% 20% 25% 45% 32% 17% 25% Main Mission Market N 3 0.12 83% 14% 41% 34% 19% 16%	Lincoln/ Kezar	Stanyan	5th Ave	W	3	0.70	19%	23%	15%	14%	29%	22%	12%	16%		
Main Mission Market N 3 0.12 83% 14% 41% 34% 19% 16%		5th Ave	19th Ave	W	3	0.83	42%	31%	20%	25%	45%	32%	17%	25%		
	Main	Mission	Market	Ν	3	0.12	83%		14%	41%	34%		19%	16%		
Sloat Santa Clara E 3 0.43 71% 98% 22% 50% 47% 43% 13% 25%		Sloat	Santa Clara	E	3	0.43	71%	98%	22%	50%	47%	43%	13%	25%		
Santa Clara Burnett E 3 1.34 44% 33% 15% 23% 29% 30% 11% 14%		Santa Clara	Burnett	E	3	1.34	44%	33%	15%	23%	29%	30%	11%	14%		
Burnett Castro E 3 1.62 34% 34% 15% 20% 26% 23% 10% 13%		Burnett	Castro	E	3	1.62	34%	34%	15%	20%	26%	23%	10%	13%		
Castro Guerrero E 3 0.79 45% 34% 27% 30% 33% 36% 14% 17%		Castro	Guerrero	E	3	0.79	45%	34%	27%	30%	33%	36%	14%	17%		
Guerrero Van Ness E 3 0.43 49% 36% 40% 47% 44% 14% 24%		Guerrero	Van Ness	E	3	0.43	49%	43%	36%	40%	47%	44%	14%	24%		
Van Ness Drumm E 3 1.77 19% 25% 29% 18% 20% 32%		Van Ness	Drumm	E	3	1.77	19%	25%		29%	18%	20%		32%		
Market/Portola Drumm Van Ness W 3 1.77 14% 18% 25% 15%	Market/Portola	Drumm	Van Ness	W	3	1.77	14%	18%			25%	15%				
Van Ness Guerrero W 3 0.43 37% 42% 20% 19% 38% 37% 16% 18%		Van Ness	Guerrero	W	3	0.43	37%	42%	20%	19%	38%	37%	16%	18%		
Guerrero Castro W 3 0.79 49% 48% 13% 17% 35% 30% 13% 15%		Guerrero	Castro	W	3	0.79	49%	48%	13%	17%	35%	30%	13%	15%		
Castro Burnett W 3 1.63 31% 29% 11% 12% 32% 65% 8% 12%		Castro	Burnett	W	3	1.63	31%	29%	11%	12%	32%	65%	8%	12%		
Burnett Santa Clara W 3 1.34 34% 31% 15% 20% 47% 35% 11% 15%		Burnett	Santa Clara	W	3	1.34	34%	31%	15%	20%	47%	35%	11%	15%		
Santa Clara Sloat W 3 0.43 49% 15% 40% 56% 43% 20% 44%		Santa Clara	Sloat	W	3	0.43	43%	49%	15%	40%	56%	43%	20%	44%		
Page Geary N 3 0.79 31% 34% 27% 34% 26% 26% 13% 17%		Page	Geary	Ν	3	0.79	31%	34%	27%	34%	26%	26%	13%	17%		
Geary Bush/Euclid N 3 0.20 82% 46% 29% 31% 41% 44% 20% 26%		Geary	Bush/Euclid	Ν	3	0.20	82%	46%	29%	31%	41%	44%	20%	26%		
Masonic Presidio Geary S 3 0.29 54% 61% 27% 26% 55% 52% 40% 44%	Masonic	Presidio	Geary	S	3	0.29	54%	61%	27%	26%	55%	52%	40%	44%		
Geary Page S 3 0.79 32% 17% 23% 75% 32% 18% 38%		Geary	Page	S	3	0.79	32%	25%	17%	23%	75%	32%	18%	38%		

NAMETOTRAVEL DIRCLASSDIST. (MI)BUFFER INDEX 2017BUFFER INDEX 2019BUFFER INDEX 2021BUFFER INDEX 2023BUFFER INDEX 2023BUFFER INDEX 2023BUFFER INDEX 2021BUFFER INDEX 2023BUFFER INDEX 2017BUFFER INDEX 2019BUFFER INDEX 2021SicklesOceanN31.4528%16%17%17%28%16%12%OceanCesar ChavezN31.9537%30%15%22%24%20%13%Ocean Obume14bN24.2000%14%14%14%14%14%	BUFFER INDEX 2023 13% 14% 10%
Sickles Ocean N 3 1.45 28% 16% 17% 28% 16% 12% Ocean Cesar Chavez N 3 1.95 37% 30% 15% 22% 24% 20% 13%	13% 14% 10%
Ocean Cesar Chavez N 3 1.95 37% 30% 15% 22% 24% 20% 13% Ocean Obsers Obsers	14% 10%
	10%
Cesar criavez 14th N 3 1.39 29% 18% 18% 17% 24% 18% 11%	
14th 9th N 3 0.65 44% 36% 15% 23% 39% 38% 12%	19%
9th 3rd N 3 0.98 37% 27% 17% 24% 36% 33% 13%	26%
3rd Embarcadero N 3 0.74 50% 32% 16% 25% 37% 29% 21%	22%
Embarcadero 3rd S 3 0.74 27% 28% 22% 18% 32% 24% 18%	20%
3rd 9th S 3 0.98 31% 34% 18% 18% 34% 28% 12%	19%
9th 14th S 3 0.68 29% 55% 17% 30% 36% 47% 12%	34%
14th Cesar Chavez S 3 1.39 23% 22% 12% 15% 32% 20% 14%	15%
Cesar Chavez Ocean S 3 1.95 31% 18% 13% 16% 28% 23% 11%	18%
Ocean Sickles S 3 1.45 21% 13% 14% 20% 14%	15%
Montgomery Broadway Bush S 3 0.51 35% 14% 24% 52% 16%	17%
Van Ness Columbus E 3 0.38 37% 28% 18% 38% 19%	19%
Columbus Embarcadero E 3 0.61 39% 36% 19% 43% 26%	18%
North Point Embarcadero Columbus W 3 0.61 38% 18% 18% 35% 15%	18%
Columbus Van Ness W 3 0.38 42% 24% 17% 39% 23%	27%
Stanyan Divisadero E 3 0.92 42% 37% 25% 34% 32% 25% 13%	16%
Divisadero Fillmore E 3 0.37 61% 59% 48% 75% 44% 46% 25%	73%
Dak Fillmore Laguna E 3 0.27 61% 59% 48% 44% 46% 25%	32%
Laguna Franklin E 3 0.27 65% 53% 48% 68% 49% 36% 25%	28%
19th Ave Miramar E 3 1.11 30% 21% 17% 20% 22% 20% 12%	13%
Miramar Howth E 3 0.48 40% 40% 21% 37% 33% 38% 16%	19%
Ucean Howth Miramar W 3 0.48 41% 55% 16% 38% 44% 43% 13%	21%
Miramar 19th Ave W 3 1.11 36% 33% 16% 28% 25% 20% 11%	12%
Market Fell N 3 0.27 51% 40% 22% 8% 40% 30% 24%	25%
Fell Market S 3 0.28 36% 32% 34% 32% 45% 36% 18%	33%
Gough Mason E 3 0.85 32% 32% 14% 16% 29% 25% 12%	19%
Mason Market E 3 0.28 31% 31% 14% 26% 39% 33% 12%	31%
Market Kearny W 3 0.38 35% 36% 30% 25% 29% 24% 19%	29%
Kearny Leavenworth W 3 0.63 36% 55% 30% 38% 40% 39% 19%	32%
Leavenworth Franklin W 3 0.46 44% 27% 26% 33% 20%	35%
Franklin Presidio W 3 1.27 19% 19% 15% 19% 11%	13%
Cesar Chavez 21st N 3 0.61 37% 35% 28% 22% 47% 31% 25%	33%
21st Division N 3 0.80 33% 28% 18% 18% 34% 29% 15%	26%
Potrero Division 21st S 3 0.80 26% 23% 19% 17% 32% 41% 17%	21%
21st Cesar Chavez S 3 0.60 35% 25% 17% 29% 56% 73% 56%	67%
County Line Sloat N 3 1.94 52% 64% 12% 22% 43% 41% 11%	19%
Skyline Sloat County Line S 3 1.94 57% 18% 11% 19% 26% 44% 7%	29%
Skyline Junipero Serra E 1 1.38 36% 41% 14% 24% 27% 25% 10%	13%
Junipero Serra Skyline W 1 1.38 55% 23% 15% 21% 54% 21% 12%	10%
Fulton Turk N 3 0.20 49% 29% 22% 26% 56% 31% 19%	18%
Turk Fulton S 3 0.20 59% 77% 20% 32% 74% 82% 37%	45%

							А	M		PM				
NAME	FROM	то	TRAVEL DIR	CLASS	DIST. (MI)	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023	BUFFER INDEX 2017	BUFFER INDEX 2019	BUFFER INDEX 2021	BUFFER INDEX 2023	
	Divisadero	Gough	E	3	0.82	31%	20%	9%	15%	19%	15%	17%	11%	
Cuttor	Market	Mason	W	3	0.56	33%	22%	17%	21%	32%	21%	25%	17%	
Sutter	Mason	Gough	W	3	0.82	30%	21%	12%	22%	30%	22%	15%	17%	
	Gough	Divisadero	W	3	0.82	21%	16%	11%	14%	22%	16%	8%	14%	
Tauraand	7th	2nd	E	3	0.86	43%	48%	16%	22%	49%	37%	10%	39%	
Iownsend	2nd	7th	W	3	0.86	28%	32%	22%	23%	35%	39%	12%	26%	
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	3	0.91	38%	25%	14%	18%	31%	24%	10%	20%	
	Market	Hyde	W	3	0.38	37%	38%	23%	23%	39%	31%	15%	17%	
Turk	Hyde	Gough	W	3	0.46	41%	44%	23%	20%	31%	29%	15%	17%	
	Gough	Divisadero	W	3	0.82	32%	43%	13%	20%	33%	26%	9%	15%	
	Divisadero	Stanyan	W	3	0.91	32%	35%	14%	19%	54%	23%	13%	15%	
	Cesar Chavez	13th	Ν	3	1.49	25%	19%	17%	31%	26%	25%	15%	25%	
	13th	Golden Gate	Ν	3	0.81	40%	51%	32%	36%	39%	42%	16%	31%	
	Golden Gate	Washington	Ν	3	0.84	36%	38%	23%	24%	44%	40%	18%	27%	
Van Ness/S	Washington	Lombard	Ν	3	0.58	45%	57%	25%	19%	37%	43%	16%	20%	
VanNess	Lombard	Washington	S	3	0.58	51%	44%	34%	35%	50%	38%	19%	27%	
	Washington	Golden Gate	S	3	0.84	67%	88%	23%	47%	66%	45%	24%	37%	
	Golden Gate	13th	S	3	0.80	74%	48%	20%	39%	49%	52%	28%	18%	
	13th	Cesar Chavez	S	3	1.49	16%	20%	16%	15%	23%	25%	17%	18%	
Washington	Drumm	Kearny	W	3	0.44		26%	11%	23%		27%	13%	20%	
S	Sloat	Ulloa	Ν	3	0.54		26%	16%	25%		26%	18%	22%	
West Portai	Ulloa	Sloat	S	3	0.54			16%	26%			20%	25%	
1.000	Junipero Serra	Weldon	E	Fwy	4.03	36%	59%	13%	86%	7%	13%	4%	6%	
1-280	Weldon	6th/Brannan	Ν	Fwy	3.51	37%	54%	79%	37%	39%	55%	41%	74%	
	County Line	Cortland	Ν	Fwy	2.31	52%	51%	137%	58%	34%	53%	5%	56%	
US-101	Cortland	I-80	Ν	Fwy	1.90	29%	44%	102%	23%	78%	92%	90%	34%	
	I-80	Market	Ν	Fwy	1.27	41%	52%	54%	35%	59%	83%	73%	88%	
1.80	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W	Fwy	2.71	44%	44%	41%	40%	32%	27%	135%	32%	
1-80	Fremont Exit	US-101	W	Fwy	1.70	50%	49%	17%	41%	27%	25%	40%	24%	
1.000	6th/Brannan	Weldon	S	Fwy	3.47	10%	9%	7%	6%	66%	32%	12%	83%	
1-280	Weldon	Junipero Serra	S	Fwy	4.07	8%	9%	5%	7%	26%	25%	18%	31%	
	Market	I-80	S	Fwy	1.17	96%	51%	24%	60%	51%	50%	33%	36%	
US-101	I-80	Cortland	S	Fwy	1.97	119%	90%	12%	98%	48%	49%	16%	49%	
	Cortland	Monster Park Exit	S	Fwy	2.30	38%	60%	5%	80%	19%	20%	4%	27%	
1.80	US-101	Fremont Exit	E	Fwy	1.74	80%	77%	125%	25%	62%	39%	22%	20%	
I-ðU	Fremont Exit	Treasure Island	Е	Fwy	2.70	19%	20%	13%	13%	47%	64%	48%	40%	

Deficiency Plans

KEY TOPICS

- Legislative Requirements
- Legislative Intent and Application to San Francisco
- Deficiency Planning Process
- Special Issues

A4.1 Legislative Requirements

The Transportation Authority, as Congestion Management Agency (CMA), is required by state law to ascertain the City's conformance with the CMP, including Deficiency Plans prepared by City departments. If the LOS of roadways on the CMP is not maintained to the established standard and they are not exempt from LOS standards, state CMP legislation requires that the local jurisdiction develop a Deficiency Plan to improve operating conditions on the segment.¹

Deficiency Plans must contain the following components:

- An analysis of the causes of the deficiency;
- A list of improvements that would have to be made to remedy the deficiency, including cost estimates;
- A list of proposed improvements; and
- An implementation plan including a schedule.²

The Deficiency Plan must "measurably improve multimodal performance" on the designated CMP roadway network, and "contribute to significant improvements in air quality." Proposed improvements must be drawn from an inventory of acceptable actions compiled by the air quality management district. The statutes also require that the city or county forward the Deficiency Plan to the CMA, which must hold a public hearing within 60 days of receipt of the Deficiency Plan, and either accept or reject it, but not modify it. Rejection of a Deficiency Plan by the CMA will result in a finding of non-conformance with the CMP.

Unfortunately, the statutes make no provisions for funding City departments' deficiency plans, and similarly, CMAs do not receive state funding for their activities. In the absence of dedicated funding, the deficiency planning process has been designed to use existing data and coordinate with the City's budgetary process.

1 California Government Code section 65089.4(a) states "A local jurisdiction shall prepare a Deficiency Plan when highway or roadway level of service standards are not maintained on segments or intersections of the designated system. The Deficiency Plan shall be adopted by the city or county at a noticed public hearing."

2 65089.4(c)

A4.2 Legislative Intent and Application to San Francisco

This section provides background information on Deficiency Plans and their applicability to San Francisco.

A4.2.1 ABOUT DEFICIENCY PLANS

In 1990, the California voters approved Proposition 111, increasing the gasoline tax by nine cents per gallon of gasoline sold in the state. The year prior to Proposition 111's approval, the State Legislature approved AB 471 (Katz), the original CMP legislation.¹ AB 471 required all local jurisdictions to maintain the adopted LOS standard on all CMP roadways or risk losing their Proposition 111 gas tax revenues. The Legislature then revised the original legislation to allow jurisdictions to continue to receive their share of Proposition 111 gas tax moneys when the level of service (LOS) on a CMP road segment or intersection falls below LOS "E" provided local jurisdictions prepared Deficiency Plans for those segments. Deficiency Planning requirements do not apply for CMP segments that are exempt from the LOS standard.

The intent of Deficiency Plans, therefore, is to allow development to continue as long as any resulting traffic congestion is "offset." Deficiency Plans are reactive solutions applied after the impacts to LOS are actually measured.

The Deficiency Plan legislation offers local jurisdictions two alternatives:

- 1. Eliminate the problem (correct the deficiency where it manifests itself). This is known as *direct remediation*; or
- 2. Implement other actions that improve the overall performance of the CMP network, even if the actions do not directly improve the original deficiency. These are known as *offsetting actions*.

A Deficiency Plan may include both remediation and offsetting actions. Direct mitigation involves removing the deficiency such that the LOS is improved above LOS F. Direct mitigations of LOS impacts may have prohibitive costs, regulatory obstacles, or overwhelming environmental consequences. Offsetting actions provide alternative compensations that may leave the facility no less deficient from an LOS perspective, but provide improvements in other part of the system. Offsetting actions, as opposed to direct remediation, include capital improvements, transportation programs, services, or other activities that improve the average countywide level of service.

¹ The 1989 CMP legislation was part of the AB 471 legislation known as the Katz-Kopp-Baker-Campbell Transportation Blueprint for the 21st Century. Voter approval of Proposition 111 on June 5, 1990 effectively enacted the CMP legislation into law.

One major legislative change to the deficiency plan process is SB 1636 (Figueroa), which was enacted in September 2002 and then amended by SB 743 (Steinberg) in 2013. This bill allows local jurisdictions to designate areas meeting certain land use and transportation requirements as Infill Opportunity Zones (IOZs). Network segments within these zones would be exempt from automobile LOS standards.

In December 2009, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution designating all eligible areas of San Francisco as an IOZ. CMP network segments within a designated IOZ are exempt from deficiency planning requirements.

A4.2.2 DEFICIENCY PLANS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Deficiency Plans are distinct from City processes for review of development projects pursuant to the California Environmental Act (CEQA) and do not replace local Transportation Impact Analyses (TIAs). The San Francisco Planning Department requires project sponsors to prepare TIAs for projects that may have significant negative impacts on transportation conditions. The City's TIA guidelines include some analyses that may be relevant for preparing CMP deficiency plans. However, while environmental analysis conducted pursuant to CEQA may provide information useful in the preparation of Deficiency Plans, these Plans serve a separate and distinct purpose. The Deficiency Plan process should avoid duplicating past CEQA analyses; these guidelines should not create additional review processes for individual development or public construction projects.

One fundamental difference between a TIA and the CMP is that a TIA forecasts the severity of a project's expected impacts on facilities, while a Deficiency Plan implements actions to mitigate – or offset – problems already detected (i.e., deficiencies actually measured on a facility). A TIA or EIR is prepared prior to project implementation, in an attempt to predict a project's future negative impacts.

A TIA or EIR considers the cumulative impacts on a transportation facility of a proposed project in combination with other foreseeable similar projects. The Deficiency Plan, because its focus is on a facility rather than an individual project, considers multiple causes of the existing deficiency.

A4.3 Deficiency Planning Process

This overview accompanies the flow charts in Figures 1, 2, and 3. These three figures represent the Deficiency Plan process from detection through Transportation Authority Board approval of the Plan.

A4.3.1 DEFICIENCY DETECTION AND CITY NOTIFICATION

See Figure A4-1. The Transportation Authority monitors the CMP roadway network and reports a potential deficiency when the level of service (LOS) on any non-exempted segment of the CMP roadway network measures LOS F. LOS F is defined by travel speeds below a threshold set by the 1985 HCM for any of three specified arterial types.

The Transportation Authority determines whether a reported deficiency may have been caused by external, exempt, or temporary causes. State legislation requiring Deficiency Plans has specifically exempted the trips generated by specific activities [Government Code § 65089.4. (f)]. Exempt activities are:

- Inter-regional travel (i.e., pass through trips which have neither origin or destination in San Francisco);
- Construction, rehabilitation, or maintenance of facilities that impact the CMP roadway network;
- Impact of freeway ramp metering;
- Traffic signal coordination by the state or multi-jurisdictional agencies;
- Traffic generated by low- and very low-income housing;
- Traffic generated by high-density residential or mixed-use development located within a quarter mile of a fixed passenger rail station;¹ and
- Roadway segments located within infill opportunity zones.

A detected deficiency may be corrected when a roadway improvement already programmed in the CIP increases the capacity of the deficient roadway. If the lead department determines that the effects of any CIP improvement scheduled to begin within the seven year time horizon of the CIP will remove the deficiency, the Transportation Authority – after review – can make a Finding of No Deficiency. The lead department, however, must demonstrate this CIP improvements will be completed and functioning within ten years of the current CIP.

If any trips are exempt and if the deficiency still exists after removing the exempt trips from the deficient roadway segment, a Deficiency Plan must be prepared. The Transportation Authority will consult with MTC to determine whether external or pass through trips may have caused the deficiency. It will also review all relevant CEQA traffic analysis and/or TIAs of recently completed projects. It will then use the San Francisco Travel Demand Forecasting Model, GIS analysis, sketch planning techniques, and other

^{1 &}quot;High density residential development" means a minimum of 24 dwelling units per acre and equal to 120 percent of the maximum density allowed under the local general plan and zoning ordinance, or a minimum density of 75 dwelling units per acre. "Mixed use development" must have more than one half the land area or floor area used for high-density housing.

means to isolate and examine the cause(s) in more detail. If modeling suggests that a deficiency is not caused by any of the above, then the Transportation Authority Board must adopt a finding of "Deficiency" and notify the City (Mayor's Office) of the nature and cause of the deficiency.

The Mayor's Office assigns a City department to act as the lead department for the preparation of a Deficiency Plan. The timelines in Figure A4-1 assume that LOS is monitored in September and October, and that all follow up verification monitoring is completed by the following April. This schedule allows City Departments to incorporate funding requests for Deficiency Plan activities into the City's budget process in April and May.

A4.3.2 DEFICIENCY ANALYSIS AND REMEDIATION PLAN PREPARATION

Once the cause(s) of the deficiency have been determined, State law [Government Code § 65089.4 (c) (2)] requires that the lead department identify:

"A list of improvements necessary for the deficient segment or intersection to maintain the minimum level of service otherwise required and the estimated costs of the improvements."

The lead department will use sketch-planning methods consistent with both MTC and Transportation Authority practices and data to estimate the effects of capacity improvements on the level of service and whether the improvements provide capacity at an order-of-magnitude commensurate with the deficiency.

State law requires that a Deficiency Plan first seek direct action to correct a roadway LOS deficiency by preparing a Remediation Plan. The lead department prepares a Remediation Plan that includes: a) a description of the causes of the deficiency; b) a list of all improvements necessary to fully remediate the problem on the deficient roadway itself; and c) an estimate of the cost and available funding for those improvements. The lead department includes a statement as to the feasibility of the Remediation Plan (Section 4.2.1). A Remediation Plan usually involves adding sufficient capacity to the roadway to allow traffic to flow at LOS "E" or better. The Remediation Plan should include any relevant projects included in the CIP or CEQA mitigation measures included in specific EIRs as mitigation requirements. A proposed Remediation Plan may include improvements already specified and funded in an EIR, the CIP, or developer exactions or dedications found to be relevant, including scheduled implementation, project characteristics, and funding sources. This gives the City credit for any required EIR mitigation measures to remediate the deficiency.

The lead department should also prepare cost estimates for improvements to mitigate the deficiency as well as of the funding sources.

If the lead department finds that the package of remediation measures is feasible, it must prepare an Implementation Plan.

The lead department submits the Remediation Plan and an Implementation Plan to the Transportation Authority for evaluation and approval. The Transportation Authority will evaluate Deficiency Plans based on effectiveness, financial feasibility, environmental compatibility, and consistency with the City's transportation planning priorities and policies. If the lead department finds it cannot remediate the deficiency and the Transportation Authority concurs, the lead department prepares a Deficiency Plan (presented in Figure A4-3).

The resulting Remediation Plan must include estimates of the following:

- Extra roadway capacity needed to remove the deficiency;
- Total costs of the capacity increases; and
- Improvements already funded through the CIP or developer exactions or dedications.

The Transportation Authority evaluates the feasibility of the Remediation Plan and accepts or rejects the lead department's findings. Within 30 days of receiving the Remediation Plan from the lead department, the Transportation Authority evaluates the adequacy of the Plan conclusions according to the following three criteria:

- Effectiveness: Are the proposed improvements adding sufficient capacity to the roadway in question to increase the LOS to level "E" or better?
- 2. Financially Reasonable: Are the cost estimates for the proposed improvement reasonably accurate?
- 3. **Implementability:** In environmental, regulatory, and community terms? Is the Plan consistent with the General Plan?

The Lead Department prepares an Implementation Plan, identifying responsible departments, funding sources, and regulatory authority. If the Transportation Authority accepts the Implementation Plan, the Transportation Authority modifies the CIP to conform to reflect the remediation measures. All departments called upon to implement portions of the Remediation Plan must enter into an inter-agency agreement stating each department's responsibility and funding sources. If the Transportation Authority finds that the Remediation Plan is feasible, the lead department will prepare an Implementation Plan If the Transportation Authority finds that the Remediation Plan is not feasible, the lead department will prepare a Deficiency Plan Action List.

A4.3.3 DEFICIENCY PLAN EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

If the Transportation Authority determines that the Remediation Plan is infeasible, the lead department prepares a list of offsetting actions that will improve the system-wide multimodal level of service but may have only limited effect on the deficient facility itself.

The lead department prepares a Deficiency Plan Action List. The lead department may select actions that have some direct mitigating effect on the deficiency; and/or actions that will improve system-wide LOS (as measured by the multi-modal performance measures). The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has prepared a list of approved Deficiency Plan actions. The CMP legislation requires that all Deficiency Plan actions come from that list.

The lead department may choose to prepare (or Transportation Authority may request) one or more alternative action plans to explore alternative approaches.

For deficiencies caused by large projects, some of the analysis required in these steps may have been completed through the projects' EIRs. While the analysis and any other relevant documentation may be used verbatim for the Deficiency Plan or Implementation Plan, the Final Deficiency Plan documentation must conform to the requirements outlined in the six steps above and described in more detail below.

The lead department has 60 days to prepare a Preferred Action Plan List. Each action on the list must show its estimated capital (or start-up) and operating (or on-going) costs. The lead department submits this list to the Transportation Authority for its consideration.

The Transportation Authority will review this proposed list and approve or reject it. The Transportation Authority will evaluate the preferred Deficiency Plan Action List, including each action's estimated cost within 30 days of submittal by the lead department. The Transportation Authority evaluates the effectiveness of the Action Plan and confirms General Plan consistency with the Planning Department. If the Transportation Authority accepts the lead department's proposed list of Deficiency Plan actions, the lead department prepares an Implementation Plan and submits this plan for the Transportation Authority's approval.

The Transportation Authority evaluates Implementation Plans using similar adequacy criteria as for Remediation Plans (Figure A4-2). If the Transportation Authority accepts the Implementation Plan, the Transportation Authority Board will hold a noticed public meeting and adopt a Finding of Conformance. If the Transportation Authority and the lead department are unable to agree on an Implementation Plan, the lead department may either try again, or submit its Final Deficiency Plan (including its Implementation Plan) to the Transportation Authority Board for Board action. If the Transportation Authority Board issues a Finding of Non-Conformance, the Transportation Authority must notify the State Controller to withhold funds. The funds are held in escrow for 12 months and then turned over to the Transportation Authority (as the City's Congestion Management Agency). Deficiency Plans must be completed within one year of the CMA's official notice of a deficiency.





Figure A4-2. Deficiency Analysis and Mitigation Plan Preparation



San Francisco County Transportation Authority

A4.3.4 ADEQUACY CRITERIA

The CMP legislation, as amended, includes three transit performance measures (in addition to the LOS performance measure) for the evaluation of current and future system performance and the effectiveness of Deficiency Action Plans [Government Code § 65089. (b)(2)]: transit frequency, routing, and service coordination among separate operators.

As required by CMP legislation, the Transportation Authority has developed multimodal performance measures beyond the traditional roadway Level of Service (LOS) measures. Our emphasis has been on user-based measures that help explain mode choice in the City. The Transportation Authority Board adopted the first set of multimodal performance measures in August 1998 (see Chapter 4). These include bicycle and pedestrian safety, transit speed and reliability and other measures. After these measures have been further refined and fully tested, they will then be used to evaluate the proposed list of Deficiency Plan Actions. Additional measures may be developed in the future.

A4.3.5 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Transportation Authority requires the lead department to prepare an Implementation Plan within 90 days of the Transportation Authority's finding as part of the Deficiency Plan Document. The Implementation Plan identifies the responsible implementing department(s) for each action, and the sources of funding.

I. Implementation Plan Development

The lead department is responsible for developing the Implementation Plan. For each action in the Deficiency Plan, the lead department must specify the following:

- The final cost of the actions and the sources of capital (up-front) and operating (on-going) funds. Note any correspondence with EIR mitigation measures or CIP projects.
- 2. A monitoring program that conforms to CEQA monitoring requirements.
- 3. An implementation schedule. All actions must be implemented within the seven-year time horizon for the current CIP. If a Deficiency Plan action is programmed for funding in the sixth or seventh year of the CIP, it will need to be fully implemented within three years of its initiation in order to be considered a feasible action within the Deficiency Plan's ten-year horizon.
- 4. Identification of city departments responsible for the action's funding, implementation, and on-going operations.

5. Clear identification of all departments responsible for implementation, therefore, is essential for the Transportation Authority's approval of the Final Deficiency Plan. One way for partner agencies to demonstrate this would be through an interdepartmental agreement among all responsible implementing departments stating each department's agreement to fulfill their responsibilities for implementing Deficiency Plan actions.

II. Identification of Funding

The Implementation Plan must include a detailed funding plan.

III. Implementation Plan and Deficiency Plan Approval

Within 30 days of submittal by the lead department, the Transportation Authority will either accept or reject the Implementation Plan. The Transportation Authority will make its determination based on the required elements of the Implementation Plan discussed in 4.4.1. Implementation Plans without a funding plan will be rejected. Once the Transportation Authority has approved the Implementation Plan, the lead department will have additional 30 days to finalize and submit the Final Deficiency Plan for Transportation Authority Board approval. Upon submittal of the final Deficiency Plan by the lead department, the Transportation Authority Board will hold a noticed public meeting and either approve or reject it within 30 days. If the Transportation Authority rejects the Implementation Plan, the lead department may either propose an alternative Implementation Plan within 30 days, or choose to submit the Final Deficiency Plan duthority will notify the Mayor's Office of its intent to reject the Final Deficiency Plan due to Implementation Plan inadequacy.

If the Transportation Authority Board rejects the Final Deficiency Plan and issues a finding of non-conformance, pursuant to the State law (Government Code 65089.5), the Transportation Authority must submit its findings to MTC and the State Controller for the withholding of State funds.

IV. Deficiency Plan Document Structure

A Deficiency Plan Report must include the following sections:

1.0 Introduction Identification of the Deficiency's Causes, including:

- 1.1 Description of the Deficiency (i.e., road segment;
- 1.2 Description of the adjacent facilities;
- 1.3 Analysis of the causes of the deficiency;
- 1.4 Description of the existing traffic conditions within the boundaries;

- 1.5 Projection of future transportation conditions for at least the next 10 years; and
- 1.6 A map of the area, the deficiency, and adjacent facilities and transit routes.

2.0 Remediation Plan, consisting of:

- An estimate of the extra roadway capacity needed to remove the deficiency;
- 2.2 An estimate of the total costs (operating and capital) of the capacity improvements; and
- 2.3 A description of improvements that are already programmed through individual project conditions of approval, the CIP, or developer exactions or dedications.

3.0 List of Actions, broken out into:

- 3.1 Deficiency-Specific Action; and
- 3.2 Global Actions To Improve System-wide LOS.

4.0 Implementation Plan, specifying the following:

- 4.1 The final cost of the actions and the sources of capital (up-front) and operating (on-going) funds;
- 4.2 A monitoring program to verify the action's implementation;
- 4.3 A schedule for implementation; and
- 4.4 Identification of city departments responsible for the action's funding, implementation, and on-going support/operation.
- 5.0 Identification of Other Departments' Responsibilities for Implementation
- 6.0 Identification of Funding

A4.4 Special Issues

The following sections discuss special circumstances where the Deficiency Plan process, as described in Section 4.0, may have to be modified. Treatment of these issues is not intended to be exhaustive.

A4.4.1 MULTI-COUNTY DEFICIENCY PLANS

Deficiencies may occur because of the activities of other counties or they may occur on a regional facility (e.g., the Bay Bridge). Under such circumstances, the Transportation Authority will take the lead in coordinating the preparation of a Deficiency Plan, following MTC's process and mutual agreements with other agencies. More specifically, the Transportation Authority will coordinate with other congestion management agencies (CMAs) and regional agencies (e.g., MTC, BAAQMD, ABAG, etc.). The Transportation Authority may request the Mayor's Office to designate other city departments to prepare the Remediation Plan, Deficiency Plan Action List, or the Implementation Plan. Furthermore, other departments may be designated as the responsible agencies for the implementation of the Deficiency Plan.

A4.4.2 DEFICIENCY PLANS ADDRESSING MULTIPLE DEFICIENCIES

The Mayor's Office may request that the lead department prepare a Deficiency Plan that covers more than one deficient roadway segment.

Multiple deficiencies may be likely if an area or transportation corridor is impacted by large land use projects (e.g., Mission Bay), significant transportation infrastructure projects (e.g., demolition of the Central Freeway), or pronounced socioeconomic trends (e.g., increased commuting from the East Bay). When multiple deficiencies are within close geographical proximity, distributed along a single corridor (or parallel facility), or are functionally related, the Transportation Authority may encourage a single area-wide, or corridor Deficiency Plan.

The process would be similar to that described in Section 4.0. Nevertheless, the lead department must:

- Review relevant EIRs for their assessment of impact and proposed mitigation measures;
- Perform modeling of traffic within the area or corridor to determine the effectiveness of the Remediation Plan improvements;
- Consider funding and/or regulatory feasibility of the proposed Implementation Plan; and
- 4. Coordinate with the CIP and other transportation programming and/or planning documents designed to address transportation planning for a subarea of the city, a specific corridor, or multiple facilities or modes.

A4.4.3 FUTURE DEFICIENCIES

The legislation does not require that local jurisdictions address future anticipated deficiencies. Deficiency Plans are only based on actual CMP network conditions.

Future changes to the transportation infrastructure or services may cause deficiencies. There are many potential causes of deficiencies, particularly changes to the transportation infrastructure in the City as well as land use changes. The Planning Department is responsible for land use planning and development management. This role, stipulated in the City Charter, gives the Planning Department direct or oversight responsibility for every land use project from its initial design stages through environmental impact analysis, to final completion. Large-scale projects may have major impacts. Examples of such projects include, but are not limited to:

- Mission Bay;
- Rincon Point South Beach Redevelopment Area;
- Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Development Plan; and
- Revised South of Market Specific Plan.

In addition, the Planning Department oversees preparation of Transportation Impact Analyses (TIAs) and its Office of Environmental Review (OER) coordinates CEQA review and EIR preparation for development projects. All of these documents are intended to anticipate the impacts of a proposed project on the transportation system; thus, they have direct relevance to the Deficiency Plan if a project's impacts cause a deficiency.
Transit Frequency and Coverage Service Levels

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM 2023

There have been rapid changes in transit frequency and coverage service levels in transit operators across the Bay Area.

Muni

Muni updated its service network in 2022: https://www.sfmta.com/projects/2022-muni-service-network.

BART

BART updated its service plan in September 2023: https://www.bart.gov/news/articles/2023/news20230427.

Caltrain

The current Caltrain schedule as of Fall 2023 can be found at https://www.caltrain.com/news/caltrain-operate-new-schedule-starting-fall. Caltrain is undergoing electrification (slated for completion in Fall 2024) and is proposing service improvements once electrification is complete: https://www.caltrain.com/news/caltrain-unveils-electrified-service-vision-2024.

AC Transit

AC Transit Transbay routes provide service between San Francisco and the East Bay via the Bay Bridge. AC Transit is undergoing a comprehensive review ("AC Transit Realign") of its network to respond to shifts in riders' travel patterns, with its 5 phases slated to be complete in Fall 2024: https://www.actransit.org/realign.

Golden Gate Transit

San Francisco is served by both Golden Gate Transit buses and ferries. Transit service standards can be found in their Short Range Transit Plan (https://www.goldengate.org/bus/history-research/publications), the last version of which was adopted in December 2022 for Fiscal Years 2022/23 - 2027/28.

SamTrans

SamTrans is currently updating its Short Range Transit Plan for FY2023-28 beginning in March 2022. The plan is slated for Board approval in December 2023. (https://www.samtrans.com/projects/samtrans_short_range_transit_plan)

Transit Monitoring Methology & Results

KEY TOPICS

- Methodology
- Transit Speed Results
- Discussion



Photo credit: SFMTA Photo Library

A6.1 Methodology

The transit speed monitoring was conducted using Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) /Automatic Passenger Count (APC) data from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), which tracks transit speeds, boardings, and alightings on SFMTA buses. SFMTA rail vehicles are not included. SFMTA has APC counters on a significant portion of the bus fleet at any given time and rotates the counters between vehicles periodically to collect data on every bus run.

The APC data are valuable for detailed service planning purposes. For broader system performance monitoring and planning purposes, such as the CMP, the APC data can be aggregated to a weekday peak period and have a relatively large sample set. APC data have been used to report transit speeds since CMP 2011 cycle. In 2011, transit speeds were reported on CMP segments for the afternoon peak alone; since the 2013 CMP update, the monitoring effort included both morning and afternoon peak results.

In 2019, the format of the APC data were changed as the SFMTA implemented a new radio-based APC system. The most impactful change from the CMP monitoring perspective was that no records would be generated when a bus passes-by scheduled bus stops, as opposed to generating interpolated time-tramps for the skipped stops as the older system did. To deal with this issue, the processing method was updated to base calculations on individual trips instead of transit stop pairs. This was done by first mapping transit stop pairs to CMP segments as previously did and then aggregating the speeds from the matched transit stop pairs to individual transit trips. Those trip level speeds were lastly processed to compute transit performance measures, including average speed, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation, for CMP segments during AM and PM periods. This approach better reflects overall transit speeds on a CMP segment, and is less susceptible to the impact of localized factors such as traffic signal between stop pairs.

During the analysis, the generated intermediate dataset provided stop-to-stop travel time and speed, inclusive of bus dwell time¹. Specifically, dwell time was assigned to the "upstream" stop: the segment-level data represent upstream stop-arrival point to downstream stop-arrival point. In this way, the processed data correspond with the travel time and through-speed experience by a transit rider as the rider passes multiple stops while on-board. (This is comparable to the manner in which automobile speed is reported by including fully-stopped intersection delay in the calculation of through-travel speed.). The stop-to-stop travel time results with inclusion of upstream dwell time are then aggregated to get travel time of transit trips that are overlapping with the CMP segments.

Following the above methodology, APC data collected on Muni's bus (diesel and trolley coach) fleet in (the entire months of) April and May 2023 were analyzed. Muni light rail vehicles are not currently equipped with APCs, and were thus not included in the analysis. The raw APC transit data utilized corresponded to the same morning and afternoon peak periods as the Automobile LOS monitoring. The monitoring days were examined through a similar data cleaning process that considered the same special events, construction and weather events that informed the cleaning of the automonitoring data.

A6.2 Results

Attachment 8.1 and 8.2 present the Average Transit Speeds for the morning and afternoon peak periods in the current CMP cycle. The morning and afternoon transit speeds from the previous CMP cycles are included for comparison.

Summary statistics for 2023 (Table A6-1) indicate the average speed decreased markedly since 2021 (during the midst of the COVID pandemic) from 11.2 / 11.1 mph

¹ Note that door dwell time was excluded for few bus stop pairs to filter out the layover time corresponding to end of the line operations.

to 8.9 / 8.0 mph (for the AM / PM peaks respectively), to speeds that are slightly higher than pre-COVID (8.7 / 7.7 mph, measured in 2019). However, the changes in the transit speeds compared to 2019 are not statistically significant at p=0.05 under the one-tail two sample t-test.

	NUMBER OF Segments	AVERAGE Speed	STANDARD DEVIATION	MINIMUM SPEED	MAXIMUM SPEED
AM Peak Period	98	8.9	2.3	3.9	14.8
PM Peak Period	97	8.0	2.2	3.8	13.6

Table A6-1. Transit Results Summary Statistics

A6.3 Discussion

This section examine the transit speed variability/reliability, and compares the results between 2019 and 2021 and between 2021 and 2023.

A6.3.1 TRANSIT SPEED VARIABILITY/RELIABILITY

In order to fairly compare the variability of speeds for segments that are fast on average and those that are slow on average, a reliability measure is needed that would not favor one or the other. If the standard deviation alone was used, segments that have higher absolute standard deviations (i.e. most commonly segments with higher average speeds) would be ranked higher than segments that are slower on average. To prevent this, the Coefficient of Variation (CV), the ratio between the standard deviation and the average, is used to measure reliability. The CV is expressed as a percentage of the mean speed, thus both segments with high and low average speeds can be compared on the same scale.

Since it is theoretically possible for segments to be reliably fast, reliably slow, unreliably fast, or unreliably slow, the ideal comparison of these results would show the results in two dimensions at the same time, as is shown in Figure A6-1 below. Most CMP segments have a transit speed between 4 and 14 mph, with a coefficient of variation between 10% and 35%. The figure shows no clear functional relationship between transit reliability (the coefficient of variation) and its speed.

In 2023, 8% of monitored segments had a CV above 30% in the AM peak period, whereas for the PM peak period it was 10%. This is lower than in 2021, when the same metric was at 13% (AM peak) and 16% (PM peak), but still higher than the 6% (AM peak) and 5% (PM peak) in 2019.

The most unreliable segment in the AM period was Folsom from 4th to 1st (CV = 38.0%), followed by Broadway from Powell to Montgomery (CV = 34.6%). The two most unreliable segments in the PM peak period were Mission/Otis from 9th to 14th (CV = 34.5%) and Clay from Kearny to Davis (CV = 34.3%). None of the unreliable (CV > 30%) segments in 2023 had a low sample size (<50).





A6.3.2 COMPARISON OF RESULTS BETWEEN 2019 AND 2023 AND BETWEEN 2021 AND 2023

In general, transit speeds on each CMP segment in 2023 are close to that in 2019 (with the full range of difference being a change of -2/+4 mph from 2019 to 2023). The 2023 transit speeds on each CMP segment are in general slower than that in 2021 (most of the segment speeds are slower by up to 2mph, with the full range of difference being a change of -4.5/+1.5 mph from 2021 to 2023).

Figures A8-2a and A8-2b below illustrate the changes in both auto and transit speeds at individual segment level in both AM and PM peak periods between 2019 and 2023 and between 2021 and 2023. Tables A8-2a and A8-2b show the number of segment within each quadrant for the two figures. The changes can be broken into four scenarios, represented by four quadrants on the graph, as divided by the two halfaxes (marked in grey). The quadrant numbering I-IV goes counter-clockwise starting

from the upper right quadrant. Data in quadrant I (upper right) represent an increase in both auto and transit speeds, and data in quadrant III represent a decrease in both auto and transit speeds.

Between 2019 and 2023, more than half of all segments have an increased transit speed (quadrants I and IV, upper and lower right). Less than a quarter of the segments have a decrease in both automobile and transit speed (quadrant III, lower left). This indicates a general increase in speed for both automobiles and transit compared to pre-COVID conditions, with the increase more pronounced for transit than automobiles.

Between 2021 and 2023, the vast majority of segments have a have a decrease in both automobile and transit speed (quadrant III, lower left), as people began to return to pre-pandemic activity levels.







Figure A6-3. Change in Auto & Transit Speeds between 2021 and 2023

 Table A6-2.
 Number of Segments within Each Quadrant (between 2019 and 2023)
 Particular
 Particula

PERIOD	I.	II.	III	IV
AM	34	17	20	22
PM	30	13	21	28
Both peak periods	64	30	41	50

Table A6-3. Number of Segments within Each Quadrant (between 2021 and 2023)

PERIOD	I.	П	111	IV
AM	2	9	58	10
РМ	2	1	70	8
Both peak periods	4	10	128	18

Attachment 6-1. CMP Segments Transit Speeds (AM Peak) (2006 - 2023)

				2006	2007		2009		2	011			2	013				2015				20:	L7			2	019				20	21			1	2023	
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	T AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSI SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT	S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANS SPEED (MP	HT COEFFICIEN H) VARIATIO	T OF AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANS	H) SPEED (MI	SIT COEFFI PH) VARI	IENT OF AUTO:TRANS	AVG. TRAN	NSIT S.D TR APH) SPEED	RANSIT COEFF D (MPH) VAR	CIENT OF AUTO:TRAN ATION SPEED RA	NSIT AVG.	TRANSIT S. D (MPH) SF	D TRANSIT C EED (MPH)	DEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANS	IT S.D TRAN H) SPEED (N	ISIT COEFFIC	IENT OF AUTO:TR TION SPEED	RANSIT AV	G. TRANSIT PEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	VARIATION	T OF AUTO:TRAN N SPEED RAT	SIT AVG. TRA	NSIT S.D TRA MPH) SPEED (NSIT COEFFICIE (MPH) VARIATI	ENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT TION SPEED RATIO
1st St	Market	Harrison	S																																		
and St	Brannan	Market	Ν			9.0	1.3	7.3	2.0	28.	1 1.9	6.7	2.4	35	.8 1.7	7.2	2 2.	.7 3	7.5 1.3	7	.8	0.9	11.9	1.2	6.2	2.1	34	.1 1.	4								
2nd St	Market	Brannan	S			9.1	1.8	7.7	1.9	24.	1 2.7	9.3	1.9	20	.4 1.0	7.5	5 1.	.5 20).0 1.6	8	.2	0.9	11.4	1.3	7.7	2.5	5 32	.9 1.	4								
	Jamestown	Evans	Ν					5.7	2.6	45.	5 4.2																			8.5	1.5	17.7	′ 1.8				
	Evans	Terry Francois	Ν					7.7	3.1	39.	7 3.6														7.2	1.1	. 14	.6 1.	9	9.6	2.7	27.9	1.9	12.	.5 2.	1 16.	.6 1.4
3rd St	Terry Francois	Market	Ν					6.0	2.5	41.:	1 2.5	7.4	0.5	6	8 1.8	7.7	7 0.	.6 7	.8 1.6	7	.7	0.4	5.7	1.4	6.8	1.2	2 17	.4 1.	6	9.4	2.2	23.7	7 1.5	8.	1 1.0	6 19.	.0 1.2
	Terry Francois	Evans	S					8.7	2.8	32.	6 3.2																		:	11.2	2.8	24.9) 1.7	13.	0 2.	5 19.	.1 1.4
	Evans	Jamestown	S					5.9	3.4	58.	4 4.3																			8.2	2.3	28.1	L 1.9				
4th St/	O'Farrell	Harrison	S	6.2 1.8	5.1 1.8	5.6	2.4	5.6	1.6	28.	7 3.0														5.0	1.2	23	.7 2.	1	6.3	2.2	35.7	7 2.1	6.9	э 1.4	4 20.	.5 1.5
Stockton	Harrison	Channel	S		7.3 2.2			7.9	1.8	22.	3 2.1	8.1	2.1	. 25	.9 1.6																						
	Brannan	Market	N			7.6	1.9	7.7	2.2	28.	8 2.1	6.5	2.0	30	.8 1.5	5.5	5 0.	.7 1	2.7 1.8	5	.5	0.6	10.2	1.6													
5th St	Market	Brannan	S			7.2	2.7	6.3	2.1	33.	6 2.6	7.1	0.5	7.	0 1.6	5.9	9 0.	.4 6	.8 1.8	6	.4	0.5	7.5	1.8	5.7	1.4	25	.6 1.	9								
	Brannan	Market	N																						7.2	1.8	3 24	.7 1.	5								
6th St	Market	Brannan	S																																		
7th St	Brannan	Market	N			7.8	2.4	7.0	2.3	33.	2 2.7	5.8	1.3	22	.4 2.7	6.6	5 1.	.4 2	L.2 1.6	6	.2	1.2	20.0	1.4	5.5	1.3	3 23	.6 1.	8	8.8	1.9	22.1	L 1.5	7.1	L 1.!	9 27.	.2 1.4
8th St	Market	Bryant	S			7.9	1.9	7.2	2.2	30.	1 2.5	6.7	1.3	19	.4 2.4	6.7	7 1.	.5 22	2.4 2.0	6	.8	1.3	18.9	1.8	6.8	1.1	. 15	.9 1.	9	8.3	1.7	20.5	5 1.5	8.:	1 1.	7 20.	.8 1.4
9th St	Brannan	Market	N																																		
10th St	Market	Brannan	S					7.6	1.8	23.	5 2.8														-					_							
	Market	Mission	E	5.8 3.3	6.1 3.0	7.6	1.6	6.5	2.3	35.	6 2.1	6.3	1.0	15	.9 2.6	5.9	9 0.	.7 1:	.9 2.2	5	.3	0.5	10.0	1.8	5.8	1.6	5 27	.8 1.	4	8.5	2.4	27.9	1.8	6.8	3 2.	1 30.	.6 1.8
	Mission	Potrero	E	7.0 2.3	6.5 2.1	7.8	1.8	7.4	1.9	25.	1 1.8	6.4	0.8	12	.5 2.3	7.3	3 1.	.6 2	.9 1.8	6	.1	0.6	10.3	1.7	7.1	1.7	23	.3 1.	5	8.9	1.9	21.5	5 1.7	8.3	3 1.0	6 19.	.4 1.6
16th St	Potrero	Mission	W	7.7 1.7	6.8 1.7	8.7	1.6	8.4	2.3	27.3	3 1.4	7.6	0.6	7.	9 1.9	8.0	0.0.	.6 7	.5 1.6	7	.7	0.3	4.4	1.5	7.4	2.0) 27	.3 1.	6	9.6	4.4	45.7	7 1.5	8.	7 1.'	9 21.	.7 1.5
	Mission	Market	W	7.0 1.8	7.2 1.9	7.7	1.7	6.4	1.9	30.	1 2.0	6.3	0.7	11	.1 2.5	6.4	4 0.	.7 10).9 2.1	6	.0	0.6	10.5	1.8	5.7	1.0) 17	.8 1.	9	7.2	1.4	19.5	5 1.8	6.	7 1.	3 18.	.8 2.1
	Junipero Serra	Sloat	N	1.0	112 210	12.6	1.4	9.8	2.5	25.	6 1.7	9.8	1.4	14	3 1.6	12.3	2 2	6 2	3 1.4	. 13	2.3	0.8	6.9	1.4	10.6	2.4	. 22	4 1	6	14.1	2.8	20.1	1.6	12	4 3	0 24	3 1.5
	Sloat		N			11.9	1.2	10.3	2.8	27.4	4 1.5	9.8	0.8	- 8	2 1.7	7.9	2	.3 2	9.1 1.7	8	4	0.7	8.9	1.6	8.0	1.5	. –– i 18	5 2	0	9.6	2.4	25.0) 2.2	9.3	3 2	2 23	2 1.7
		Lake	N			11 7	1.7	13.6	2.0	17 3	2 1 6	12.1	0.5	4	1 2 0	12	5 1	6 1	8 17	' 11	1.8	0.9	7.9	1 7	13.2	1.5		1 1	5	17.2	2.8	16.3	16	0.0			
	Lake	US-101	N			26.4	1.7	10.0	2.1	11.2	1.0	19.3	0.0	4	1 26	19.0	9 <u>1</u> . 9 3	3 16	6 19	23	3.8	15	6.5	1.9	10.2	1.0	, <u> </u>				2.0	10.0	, 1.0				
Park Presidio		Lake	9			26.3	1.5	18.2	1.2	23	1 1 3	173	35	20	2 25	17 0	0 0. 0 3	1 10	10 22	2	13	3.4	15.0	1.5													
		Lincoln	5			13.3	2.0	15.6	+.2 2.7	17 3	2 1 8	14.5	5.5	10	3 1 8	13	3 J.	7 1	7.0 2.2	· 2-	1 7	0.7	63	1.0	14.0	21	1/	R 1	5 /	1/ 9	25	16.9	2 1 0	13	1 3	0 22	7 1 7
		Sloat	5			11.0	1.7	10.5	2.7	10.9	R 1.0	11.0	, 1.0 1.1	10	7 16	11 (- 1. 0 1	., <u> </u>	07 16	10	13	0.7	4.2	1.9	10.4	1.6	. 15	.0 1.	2 ·	10.6	1.0	12.7	7 20	10.	1 3.0	9 22. 9 21	0 16
	Sloot	Juninoro Sorra	6			12.0	1.7	12.0	2.1	25	1 1 0	11.0	1.4	1/	1 21	120	0 1. 0 2		. 0 17	11		1 7	1/ 2	2.1	10.4	17	, 10 , 10	.+ 1.	0 - 2 -	10.0	2.6	20.6	2.0	1.4	0 2	2 22.	2 1 7
	Juninero Serra	Jumpero Serra	F			15.0	1.1	10.4 8 /	2.4	20.	- <u>-</u>	11.1	. 1.0	14	.4 2.1	10.	5 2.	.2 1.		1.		1.1	14.5	2.1	12.2		10	.5 2.	~ .	-2.1	5.0	23.0	2.5	14.			
		Bay Shore						0.4	2.5	25	7 2.0																										
Alemany	Boy Shoro	bay Shore						15 1	2.0	20.	1 1 0																										
	Bay Shore	Lyeii	VV					10.0	3.1	20.	1 1.9 0 1 7																										
	Lyen Nees							12.0	4.2		0 1.7					-				_									-					_			
Bay		Emparcadero	E																																		
	Embarcadero	van ness	N			40.4	4 7	F 0	0.4	10															_				-								
	County Line	industrial	N			10.1	1.7	5.9	2.4	40.0	0 3.2	0.0	4.0	4-	0 4 7	0.0		0 1		-	0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0			0 (0	4 5 7	0.7	47.0					
Bayshore	industrial	Cesar Chavez	N			11.9	1.5	11.4	3.3	28.	0 1.1	9.3	1.6	1/	.2 1.7	9.0) 1.) c	.0 1	.8 1.8		.0	0.9	12.8	2.2	10.6	1.9	1/	.8 1.	-	10.0	2.7	17.0	1.1	40			F 1.6
	Jerrola	industrial	S			16.4	1.6	13.2	3.3	25.0	0 1.5	7.1	2.0	28	.2 3.1	8.9	s 2.	.7 30	0.3 2.7	(. /	1.2	10.1	2.5	11.1	. 2.1	24	.3 1.	1 2	.2.0	3.7	30.5	5 1.9	10.	5 2.8	5 26.	.o 1.9
	Industrial	County Line	S			12.0	2.3	9.2	3.3	35.	8 2.6					-		-																			
Beale/Davis	Clay	Mission	S			6.8	1.9	6.2	2.7	43.9	9 2.0	7.2	1.5	20	.8 1.2	6.8	3 1.	.0 14	1.7 1.4	6	.3	1.4	22.4	1.5	5.3	1.0) 19	.1 1.	8								

					2006	2007		2009		2011			20	13			20	15			20	17			2()19			2(021			20	23	
ind	NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSI SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	IT AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TR/ SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED R	NSIT AVG. TRANSIT TIO SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT SPEED (MPH) VARIATION	T OF AUTO:TRANSIT N SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF A VARIATION S	UTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH	COEFFICIENT VARIATION	OF AUTO:TRANS SPEED RATI	AVG. TRANSIT	S.D TRANSIT	COEFFICIENT O VARIATION	F AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF AUT VARIATION SP	UTO:TRANSIT
PAP 1000000000000000000000		Division	6th	Е																															
	Brannan	6th	3rd	Е																															
	Draiman	3rd	6th	W																															
		6th	Division	W																															
image image <td></td> <td>Gough</td> <td>Larkin</td> <td>Е</td> <td></td>		Gough	Larkin	Е																															
Phy Phy Phy Phy Phy Phy Phy Phy Phy Phy Phy <td></td> <td>Larkin</td> <td>Powell</td> <td>Е</td> <td></td>		Larkin	Powell	Е																															
Physical		Powell	Montgomery	Е			8.2	2.4	6.3	1.9 29.8	3 2.5	6.9	1.2	17.4	1.6	7.2	1.6	22.2	1.5	5.7	0.6	11.3	1.4	6.8	1.9	27.8	1.7	8.5	3.3	38.6	2.1	6.9	2.4	34.6	1.9
norm	Proodwov	Montgomery	Embarcadero	Е			7.1	2.0	6.5	2.2 34.4	1 2.4	5.9	1.6	27.1	1.9	6.0	1.7	28.3	1.7																
1 1 1 1 1 <td>Bioauway</td> <td>Embarcadero</td> <td>Montgomery</td> <td>W</td> <td></td>	Bioauway	Embarcadero	Montgomery	W																															
<table-container> 1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Montgomery</td><td>Powell</td><td>W</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<></table-container>		Montgomery	Powell	W																															
<table-container> 1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Powell</td><td>Larkin</td><td>W</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>6.3</td><td>1.9 29.8</td><td>3 5.0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<></table-container>		Powell	Larkin	W					6.3	1.9 29.8	3 5.0																								
<table-container> here here i i i i< i</table-container>		Larkin	Gough	W																															
<table-container> Image Image<td>Ducthouthood</td><td>Junipero Serra</td><td>Alemany</td><td>Е</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></table-container>	Ducthouthood	Junipero Serra	Alemany	Е																															
<table-container> Photom Photom<</table-container>	Brothernood	Alemany	Junipero Serra	W																															
<table-container> maim main main</table-container>	Durant	Division	4th	Е			8.7	1.5	8.0	2.1 25.6	5 2.4	9.2	1.6	17.4	1.7	9.2	1.9	20.7	1.6	7.2	0.6	8.5	1.6	6.7	1.9	28.9	1.7								
Head Bead Bead <th< td=""><td>Bryant</td><td>4th</td><td>Embarcadero</td><td>Е</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	Bryant	4th	Embarcadero	Е																															
Bind Gend Ref R Ref R	Durah	Masonic	Gough	Е																															
Andret Mander	Bush	Gough	Market	Е					5.7	2.0 34.2	2 2.4																								
And		Market	14th	Ν	10.7 1.5	9.3 1.0	8.5	1.7	7.2	2.1 29.1	L 2.2	6.7	0.9	13.4	2.1	7.1	0.7	9.9	1.8	6.8	1.0	14.6	1.5	6.7	1.3	19.8	1.6	7.9	1.9	24.1	1.8	6.7	1.6	23.3	1.7
Physical Physical <		14th	Geary	Ν	6.9 1.6	6.8 1.7	7.2	2.1	7.3	2.0 27.4	2.0	6.4	0.5	7.8	2.3	6.6	0.5	7.6	1.8	6.4	1.1	16.5	1.6	5.8	1.1	19.3	1.6	7.0	1.0	14.6	1.8	6.3	1.1	17.3	1.8
Pine Gany S 7.4 1.6 7.5 7.6 7.	Castro/	Geary	Pine	Ν	6.0 1.2	6.0 1.0			6.1	1.6 26.0) 1.3	6.6	0.9	13.6	2.0	6.1	1.3	21.3	1.7	5.1	0.7	14.0	1.5	5.3	1.0	18.5	1.7	5.5	1.4	25.3	2.3	4.8	1.0	21.2	2.0
Image: bit of the state state of the state of the state of the state of the st	Divisadero	Pine	Geary	S	7.4 1.6	7.5 2.2	7.8	1.9	7.2	2.1 29.6	5 1.8	6.2	1.7	27.4	2.2	6.8	1.1	16.2	1.6	7.4	1.5	19.8	1.6	6.6	2.1	31.5	1.5	6.0	1.8	29.7	2.1	5.7	1.4	23.8	1.8
India India <th< td=""><td></td><td>Geary</td><td>14th</td><td>S</td><td>7.0 1.8</td><td>7.3 2.2</td><td>7.9</td><td>2.1</td><td>7.3</td><td>2.0 26.7</td><td>7 1.7</td><td>7.1</td><td>0.7</td><td>9.9</td><td>2.1</td><td>6.9</td><td>0.6</td><td>8.7</td><td>1.7</td><td>7.0</td><td>0.6</td><td>8.7</td><td>1.8</td><td>7.0</td><td>0.9</td><td>12.7</td><td>1.7</td><td>7.5</td><td>1.0</td><td>13.9</td><td>1.8</td><td>6.9</td><td>1.0</td><td>14.9</td><td>1.9</td></th<>		Geary	14th	S	7.0 1.8	7.3 2.2	7.9	2.1	7.3	2.0 26.7	7 1.7	7.1	0.7	9.9	2.1	6.9	0.6	8.7	1.7	7.0	0.6	8.7	1.8	7.0	0.9	12.7	1.7	7.5	1.0	13.9	1.8	6.9	1.0	14.9	1.9
Barreno Bayaria E		14th	Market	S	10.1 1.0	10.4 1.6	10.1	1.0	9.1	2.8 30.4	1 1.7	9.7	1.7	17.5	1.5	9.3	1.6	17.2	1.3	8.7	1.3	15.2	1.3	7.9	1.6	20.6	1.4	7.9	1.8	22.1	1.9	7.7	1.8	23.6	1.6
Ansame 6 Masse		Guerrero	Bryant	Е					7.8	2.2 28.4	1 2.2	4.8	2.1	43.8	3.6	8.0	1.3	16.3	1.6	7.6	0.8	10.5	1.7					12.0	2.9	24.6	1.5	7.8	2.3	29.7	1.5
Ansise Signed		Bryant	Kansas	Е					7.5	2.4 32.0	3.6																								
Bard Massa M Massa M Massa M Massa M		Kansas	3rd	Е					11.6	4.0 34.7	7 1.7																								
Image Byand W	Cesar Chavez	3rd	Kansas	W					7.8	3.1 39.7	7 3.0																								
Image: biase interpretation		Kansas	Bryant	W					9.2	3.9 42.0	2.8																								
Clay Kearny Davis E Cease Case		Bryant	Guerrero	W					7.8	2.1 27.1	1.9	3.4	2.2	64.7	4.5	6.0	1.6	26.7	2.2	6.9	0.7	10.8	1.4												
Mongomery Greenwich N Mongomery Greenwich N 8.9 2.1 7.2 2.1 6.7 2.0 2.9 1.1 1.6 1.9 6.6 0.6 9.4 1.8 5.9 1.3 2.1.5 1.8 Unclean Mongomery S 6.9 1.3 1.6 7.0 1.8 1.7 2.3 8.8 1.2 2.1 1.7 2.3 8.8 1.2 2.1 1.9 2.6 1.1 1.6 1.0 <t< td=""><td>Clay</td><td>Kearny</td><td>Davis</td><td>Е</td><td></td><td></td><td>6.8</td><td>2.8</td><td>6.6</td><td>1.9 28.2</td><td>2 2.9</td><td>7.2</td><td>0.7</td><td>9.7</td><td>1.7</td><td>7.5</td><td>1.3</td><td>17.3</td><td>1.3</td><td>7.3</td><td>0.7</td><td>8.9</td><td>1.5</td><td>5.7</td><td>1.0</td><td>17.8</td><td>1.8</td><td>6.0</td><td>1.7</td><td>28.4</td><td>2.0</td><td>5.4</td><td>1.3</td><td>24.9</td><td>1.9</td></t<>	Clay	Kearny	Davis	Е			6.8	2.8	6.6	1.9 28.2	2 2.9	7.2	0.7	9.7	1.7	7.5	1.3	17.3	1.3	7.3	0.7	8.9	1.5	5.7	1.0	17.8	1.8	6.0	1.7	28.4	2.0	5.4	1.3	24.9	1.9
Clumbe North Point N 8.9 2.1 7.1 2.3 8.8 1.0 7.4 7.4		Montgomery	Greenwich	Ν			7.2	2.1	6.7	2.0 29.3	3 1.9	6.1	0.5	8.2	2.2	6.6	1.1	16.7	1.9	6.6	0.6	9.4	1.8	5.9	1.3	21.5	1.8	-							
Columbits North Point Greenwich S S.5 1.9 7.0 1.8 8.1 2.3 7.1 2.2 3.1 2.6 6.6 1.1 1.6 1.0 1.		Greenwich	North Point	Ν	8.9 2.1	7.1 2.3	8.8	1.2	8.1	1.9 23.4	1 1.3	7.4	0.6	8.1	1.8	8.0	1.3	16.3	1.6	7.7	0.8	10.5	1.5	6.4	1.6	24.9	1.4	7.3	1.7	23.8	1.9	6.6	1.7	25.4	1.9
Image: Second View Second Vie	Columbus	North Point	Greenwich	S	8.5 1.9	7.0 1.8	8.1	2.3	7.1	2.2 31.7	7 2.6	6.6	1.1	16.7	2.0	6.5	0.7	10.8	2.0	6.5	1.1	17.0	1.7	4.7	1.0	21.8	2.0	5.2	1.4	27.7	2.8	5.1	1.1	21.4	2.8
Reduct in the second or s		Greenwich	Montgomery	S			6.0	1.9	5.8	1.8 31.0) 2.1	4.7	0.4	8.5	2.7	4.8	0.6	12.5	2.5	5.7	0.8	13.6	2.0												
F Cemetery Lyon/Francisco E Genetery Lyon/Francisco F Cemetery Lyon Lyon Lyon		County Line	SF Cemetery	Е								11.8	2.1	17.8	2.7	9.7	3.1	32.0	2.6	14.4	2.8	19.7	2.1						_						
Doyle Markes Van Ness E Markes E Markes B Date		SF Cemetery	Lyon/Francisco	Е								11.8	2.1	17.8	2.1	9.7	3.1	32.0	1.6	14.4	2.8	19.7	1.2												
Lombard/ Richardson Van Ness Lyon/Francisco W Lom/Francisco W Lom/Francisco SF Cemetery Qun y Line W Lom/Francisco SF Cemetery Lom/Francisco <thl< td=""><td>Doyle/</td><td>Lyon/Francisco</td><td>Van Ness</td><td>Е</td><td></td><td></td><td>9.8</td><td>2.1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>11.4</td><td>1.4</td><td>12.3</td><td>1.7</td><td>13.7</td><td>3.3</td><td>24.1</td><td>1.4</td><td>11.0</td><td>0.6</td><td>5.8</td><td>1.7</td><td>10.7</td><td>1.3</td><td>11.7</td><td>1.6</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>11.8</td><td>1.6</td><td>13.6</td><td>1.5</td></thl<>	Doyle/	Lyon/Francisco	Van Ness	Е			9.8	2.1				11.4	1.4	12.3	1.7	13.7	3.3	24.1	1.4	11.0	0.6	5.8	1.7	10.7	1.3	11.7	1.6					11.8	1.6	13.6	1.5
Lyon/Francisco SF Cemetery W SF Cemetery County Line W	Lombard/ Richardson	Van Ness	Lyon/Francisco	W			12.2	1.4				9.4	0.9	9.6	2.2	9.5	2.1	22.1	1.7	9.1	0.4	4.3	1.5	9.5	1.2	12.3	1.0					11.0	1.4	13.1	1.7
SF Cemetery County Line W 21.8 2.0 9.2 1.8 16.2 6.5 40.1 2.2 29.2 2.6 9.1 1.7		Lyon/Francisco	SF Cemetery	W								21.8	2.0	9.2	1.7	16.2	6.5	40.1	2.0	29.2	2.6	9.1	1.6												
		SF Cemetery	County Line	W								21.8	2.0	9.2	1.8	16.2	6.5	40.1	2.2	29.2	2.6	9.1	1.7												
Market Washington N 5.7 2.9 4.3 5.4 125.4 3.7		Market	Washington	N			5.7	2.9	4.3	5.4 125.4	4 3.7													-											
Drumm Washington Market S 7.3 1.2	Drumm	Washington	Market	S			7.3	1.2																											

				2006	2007	2009			20	11			20	13			20:	15			201	7			20	19			2(021			20	23	
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANS SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RAT	IT AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRAN: O SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RAT	IT AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFIC O SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIA	TIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT ATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF A VARIATION	UTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF A	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT (SPEED (MPH)	OEFFICIENT OF AUTO:T VARIATION SPEED	RANSIT AVO RATIO SPE	. TRANSIT S.E EED (MPH) SPE	TRANSIT COE ED (MPH) V	FICIENT OF AUTO: ARIATION SPEED	TRANSIT AV D RATIO SP	. TRANSIT (EED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSIT	S.D TRANSIT	COEFFICIENT C	OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF AU VARIATION SF	JTO:TRANSIT
	Market	Mission	Е																																
Duboce/	Mission	Potrero	Е					9.7	2.4	24.5	2.4																								
Division	Potrero	Mission	W					8.4	1.9	22.9	2.1																								
	Mission	Market	W																																
Embarcadero	Townsend	North Point	Ν																																
Embarcadero	North Point	Townsend	S																																
Evans	Cesar Chavez	3rd	S			13.8	1.5	10.8	3.9	36.1	1.5	11.2	2.0	17.9	1.3	9.8	4.4	44.9 1.	3 9	9.9	2.1 2	20.9 1	.1 1	.0.5	3.0	28.2	1.5	9.7	3.6	37.1	2.0	9.4	2.8	29.5	1.7
Evano	3rd	Cesar Chavez	Ν			16.7	1.3	14.4	4.2	29.1	1.1	12.8	2.6	20.3	1.2	13.5	1.7	12.6 1.	0 1	2.5	8 1	.4.5 1	.3 1	.6.1	2.8	17.3	0.9	13.9	3.2	23.1	1.2	13.3	3.5	25.9	1.0
	Gough	Market	Е																																
Fell	Gough	Laguna	W																																
	Laguna	Stanyan	W																																
	13th	8th	Е									9.2	2.4	26.1	2.1	8.6	1.9	22.1 1	7	7.6 3	0 1	.3.2 1	.6	3.6	2.7	31.6	1.4					8.9	1.9	21.7	1.4
Folsom	8th	4th	Е			9.8	1.5	9.1	2.2	23.7	1.9	7.5	1.4	18.7	2.4	7.1	2.1	29.6 1.	8 8	8.2 3	L.2 1	.4.7 1	.6	3.2	2.0	23.9	1.6					7.3	1.4	19.4	1.9
10130111	4th	1st	Е			8.9	2.3	9.1	2.8	31.1	2.1																					6.5	2.5	38.0	1.7
	1st	Embarcadero	Е			7.8	1.7	8.4	5.7	67.0	1.3																								
Franklin	Market	Pine	Ν																																
	Pine	Lombard	Ν																																
Fremont	Harrison	Market	Ν			7.6	1.7																												
	Park Presidio	10th Ave	Е		8.0 3.8	11.6	2.4					8.7	1.2	13.8	2.5	9.2	2.9	31.5 2	1					3.5	2.0	23.6	1.9	13.4	3.4	25.6	1.6	12.0	2.5	20.6	1.6
	10th Ave	Arguello	Е		8.0 3.7	11.6	1.7					6.7	1.7	25.4	2.7	8.8	1.6	18.2 1.	98	B.O :	9 2	3.5 2	.0	Э.1	2.2	24.1	1.9	9.5	2.8	29.4	2.3	10.0	3.3	32.8	1.9
Fulton	Arguello	Masonic	Е	10.2 1.5	9.6 1.3	10.9	1.5	9.4	2.7	29.0	1.4	8.6	0.5	5.8	1.8	7.8	0.8	10.3 1.	9	7.8 2	0 1	.2.6 1	.7	8.1	1.5	18.3	1.6	11.3	2.5	21.9	1.6	9.6	2.1	21.6	1.8
1 uitoii	Masonic	Arguello	W	11.6 1.6	10.9 2.2	10.8	1.9	10.1	2.7	26.9	1.6	8.6	1.1	12.8	2.1	9.9	1.0	10.1 1	7 9	9.5 ().8	8.3 1	.6	3.9	1.6	18.0	1.7	7.7	1.8	22.9	2.2	8.5	1.3	14.8	2.1
	Arguello	10th Ave	W		10.2 2.1	12.2	2.2	7.6	1.9	24.5	2.3	10.9	2.3	21.1	1.8	13.8	2.3	16.7 1.	5 1	6.9	3.7 2	21.9 1	.2 1	.1.5	2.5	21.8	1.7	9.6	2.4	24.4	2.3	11.1	2.6	23.7	2.1
	10th Ave	Park Presidio	W		10.2 1.6	12.2	1.3	7.6	1.9	24.5	1.5	11.5	3.5	30.4	1.7	12.1	3.5	28.9 1.	6				1	.1.0	3.2	28.8	1.7	10.5	2.6	24.8	2.1	9.8	3.1	31.2	2.0
	Great Hwy	25th Ave	Е			11.6	2.2	11.6	3.0	26.0	2.0	9.5	0.8	8.4	1.9	10.6	1.0	9.4 1.	4 9	9.2 2	0 1	.1.1 1	.9 1	.1.5	1.7	14.6	1.8	12.8	2.0	15.3	1.8	11.5	1.4	11.9	1.8
	25th Ave	Arguello	Е			9.9	2.4	9.4	2.2	23.2	2.2	9.4	1.0	10.6	1.8	8.6	0.6	7.0 1.	6 8	8.3	0.7	8.0 1	.8	9.0	1.6	17.8	1.8	10.1	1.5	14.6	2.2	9.6	1.5	15.2	1.9
	Arguello	Gough	Е			10.7	2.7	10.1	2.5	25.0	2.2	9.4	0.7	7.4	2.2	9.2	0.5	5.4 1.	8	7.8 2	0 1	.3.2 2	.5 1	.0.9	1.5	13.7	1.6	10.8	1.7	15.9	2.1	10.2	1.5	15.0	1.7
Geary	Kearny	Gough	W			8.3	1.8	8.0	2.2	28.2	1.8	8.3	0.6	7.2	1.6	8.4	0.9	10.7 1.	3 8	3.9 2	2.2 2	24.8 1	.2	8.1	1.4	17.5	1.2	8.2	1.5	17.9	1.6	8.0	1.5	18.4	1.4
	Gough	Arguello	W			10.2	2.0	9.8	2.3	22.9	2.1	8.8	1.1	12.5	2.4	9.3	0.6	6.5 1	7 9	9.6 3	6 1	.6.7 1	.8 1	.0.4	1.5	14.3	1.6	10.3	1.5	14.7	1.8	10.1	1.5	14.8	1.9
	Arguello	25th Ave	W			9.7	2.3	8.8	1.9	21.7	2.3	8.0	0.5	6.3	2.1	8.9	0.6	6.7 1.	6	8.7 ().8	8.8 1	.5	3.9	1.3	14.8	1.4	8.9	1.4	15.6	1.8	8.6	1.1	13.1	1.8
	25th Ave	Great Hwy	W			11.6	2.1	8.1	1.9	23.0	3.0	11.0	0.7	6.4	1.7	10.7	0.8	7.5 1.	4 8	8.5 2	2.1 2	24.8 2	.0 1	.1.0	1.7	15.4	1.7	11.3	1.7	14.8	1.8	10.9	1.6	14.4	1.8
	Ocean	Cayuga	Е			8.3	1.1	7.7	2.3	29.9	1.6	7.4	0.6	8.1	1.9	6.9	1.1	15.9 1.	6	7.1 ().8 1	.0.9 1	.4	7.8	1.6	20.4	1.3	8.8	1.9	21.7	2.0	8.9	1.8	20.4	1.6
	Cayuga	Paris	Е			8.6	1.6	7.8	2.2	27.9	2.0	6.3	1.1	17.5	2.3	6.9	1.2	17.4 1	7 (6.8 ().5	7.8 1	.8	5.9	1.6	27.1	1.9	6.8	1.9	27.5	2.5	6.6	1.9	28.6	2.1
Geneva	Paris	Santos	Е			15.1	1.4	11.2	2.9	25.4	2.0	10.4	1.2	11.5	2.2	10.0	1.4	14.0 1.	6 1	1.3	2.4 2	21.3 1	.6 1	.0.8	1.9	17.2	1.7	13.5	2.2	16.2	1.7	11.0	2.8	25.5	1.9
Geneva	Santos	Paris	W			13.9	1.7	10.2	3.1	30.4	2.2	10.3	1.2	11.7	1.9	10.2	0.7	6.9 1.	6 8	8.3 3	0 1	.2.4 2	.2 1	.0.2	1.5	15.0	1.6	11.4	1.7	15.0	2.0	10.9	2.0	18.5	1.9
	Paris	Cayuga	W			6.8	1.2	6.6	1.8	26.4	1.3	4.3	0.6	14.0	3.0	4.9	0.6	12.2 2	2 4	4.8 ().5	9.5 1	.8	5.3	1.5	27.8	1.7	6.9	1.8	25.3	2.4	6.7	1.6	24.3	1.9
	Cayuga	Ocean	W			8.8	1.1	7.3	2.2	30.5	1.2	7.2	0.7	9.7	1.9	6.6	0.6	9.1 1.	5 !	5.4 ().7 1	.3.9 1	.5	ô.4	1.3	20.7	1.3	7.0	1.2	17.7	2.1	6.7	1.4	20.5	1.7
Golden Gate	Masonic	Franklin	Е																																
	Franklin	Market	Е									9.3	1.8	19.4	1.2	7.5	1.9	25.3 1	1 (6.2 :	0 1	.6.3 1	.6	ō.5	1.2	21.2	1.4								
	Pine	Geary	S																																
Gough	Geary	Golden Gate	S																																
	Golden Gate	Market	S																																

				2006			2007		2009		20	011			2	2013	8		2	015			20	17			20	19	-		2()21			20	23	
NAME	FROM	10	DIR	SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIA	TION SPEED RATI	O SPEED (MPH)	SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	SPEED (MPH)	SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	SPEED (MPH)	SPEED (MPH	H) VARIATI	ON SPEED RATI	IO SPEED (MPH) SPEED (I	MPH) VAR	IATION SPEED RATI	IO SPEED (M	PH) SPEED (MP)	PH) VARIATION	SPEED RATIO	SPEED (MPH)	SPEED (MPH)	VARIATION	SPEED RATIO	SPEED (MPH)	SPEED (MPH)		SPEED RATIO	SPEED (MPH)	SPEED (MPH) VARIATION	SPEED RATIO	SPEED (MPH)	SPEED (MPH)	VARIATION SPE	EED RATIO
	Monterey	29th	IN																							19.9	4.9	24.5	0.6	21.5	0.1	28.0	1.3				
Guerrero/	29th	Cesar Chavez	IN .																																		
5an 5636	Cesar Chavez	29th	S																																		
	29th	Monterey	S			_												_								21.0	5.7	27.1	1.0								
	Embarcadero	1st	W					10.8	1.9																												
Harrison	1st	4th	W					11.0	1.0					9.3	3 2.9	9 3:	1.2 1.9	8.5	5 2.2	25.9	1.4	7.7	0.9	11.8	1.5	7.9	2.0	25.1	1.4					10.3	1.9	18.6 1	1.2
	4th	8th	W					10.0	1.6	9.6	2.3	23.	6 2.0	9.2	2 1.2	2 13	3.0 1.9	8.6	5 1.4	16.3	2.0	8.8	0.5	6.0	1.9	9.4	2.2	23.0	1.5	10.5	2.9	28.0	1.4	9.7	3.0	30.7 1	1.6
	8th	Division	W					8.4	1.6	7.5	2.5	33.	1 1.9	6.4	4 0.8	8 12	2.5 2.5	6.0) 1.1	18.3	2.3	6.6	0.7	10.9	1.5	5.5	1.0	18.0	1.8	5.7	0.9	16.6	2.2				
Hayes	Market	Gough	W	7.2	2.3	6.5	2.8	6.9	1.8	5.7	1.8	31.	6 2.2	6.6	5 1.5	5 2	2.7 2.3	6.6	0.8	12.1	2.0	6.5	1.1	17.1	1.4	6.7	1.6	23.8	1.4					6.8	1.9	28.2 1	1.6
Howard	Embarcadero	S Van Ness	W							25.1	5.6	22.	2 0.6																								
	County Line	Brotherhood	Ν							5.1	1.6	31.	2 8.7					9.8	3 7.7	78.6	2.8	7.9	2.6	32.5	2.4												
	Brotherhood	19th	Ν					17.6	1.3	7.3	2.5	34.	3 1.5	8.0	0 1.2	2 1	5.0 1.6	7.2	4.3	59.7	1.8	9.1	1.7	18.7	1.1	9.8	4.7	48.3	0.8	12.4	4.0	32.3	2.0				
luninoro Corro	19th	Sloat	Ν																																		
Juliipelo Sella	Sloat	19th	S																																		
	19th	Brotherhood	S					16.7	2.4					18.	2 1.8	8 9	.9 2.3	18.9	9 12.2	2 64.6	2.1	23.8	6.7	28.0	1.8	15.2	4.4	29.1	2.8	12.9	3.8	29.7	3.5				
	Brotherhood	County Line	S							17.2	3.1	17.	7 2.6									14.5	0.7	5.0	3.8												
Kearny	Market	Columbus	Ν					6.7	2.1	5.2	2.1	40.	4 2.9	7.2	2 0.8	8 1	1.1 1.6	6.1	. 0.4	6.6	1.4	5.6	1.3	22.7	1.3	5.0	1.1	21.5	1.6	5.3	1.3	25.1	2.2	4.7	1.0	22.1	2.1
	4th	2nd	E																																		
King	2nd	4th	W																											7.0	2.0	28.7	3.1				
	19th Ave	5th Ave	Е					11.4	2.0	11.3	3.3	29.	6 2.4	10.	8 1.9	9 1 [.]	7.6 1.9	10.	5 1.1	10.5	1.5	10.0	1.2	12.3	1.8	9.6	2.9	30.1	1.5	13.4	2.6	19.7	1.7	11.7	2.1	18.1	1.7
	5th Ave	Stanyan	Е							13.2	5.1	38.	8 1.6																								
Lincoln/Kezar	Stanyan	5th Ave	W							11.2	2.8	25.	2 2.2																								
	5th Ave	19th Ave	W							14.1	4.4	31.	0 2.1	14.	0 2.3	3 10	5.4 1.7	13.9	9 0.9	6.5	1.6	14.5	2.2	15.4	1.3	12.1	2.8	23.3	1.6	13.7	3.1	22.7	1.7	12.7	3.7	28.7	1.7
Main	Mission	Market	N	4.5	3.1	4.4	3.8		·	3.3	1.7	50.	6 6.6	5.8	3 6.3	3 10	8.6 2.1	8.0	2.5	31.3	0.7	4.9	1.0	20.3	1.8												
	Sloat	Santa Clara	E							5.6	3.9	70.	5 4.5																								
	Santa Clara	Burnett	E							12.6	4.4	34.	5 1.5	10.	0 3.3	1 3	1.0 2.1	12.4	4 1.3	10.5	1.3	10.4	1.4	13.3	1.5	12.2	3.5	28.5	1.3					10.9	3.0	27.3	1.9
	Burnett	Castro	E							9.2	2.7	29.	2 2.3																	21.0	3.1	14.7	1.2				
	Castro	Guerrero	F	7.5	1.8	6.9	1.5			6.7	1.7	25	6 1.4	6.6	5 1.2	2 18	3.2 2.1	6.1	0.9	14.8	1.7	6.5	1.1	17.4	2.0					9.1	2.6	28.8	1.8				
	Guerrero	Van Ness	F	5.8	1.2	6.2	1.4			6.7	1.7	25	6 1.9	10	1 1.8	8 1 [.]	7.8 1.6	5.9	0.9	15.3	1.8	4.6	0.5	11.7	2.2					9.2	3.1	33.2	1.4				
Maryland (Van Ness	Drumm	F	7.0	1 3	6.8	1.8	8.6	1 4	7.6	1.9	25	5 1 5	7 5	5 0 3	3 4	0 16	6.7	7 0 3	4 5	1.5	6.0	0.2	4.0	1.3	65	12	18.4	1 1	7.6	1.2	15.9	1 5	6.6	0.9	13.7	16
Portola	Drumm	Van Ness	W	7.4	1.0	7.3	1.0	8.4	1.1	6.7	2.0	20.	4 23	8	1 0 4	о , д д	9 16	7.9	0.0	2.5	1.5	6.8	0.2	3.8	1.0	6.0	0.7	12.0	1.1	7.1	0.8	11.2	1.0	6.7	0.0	13.5	1.0
	Van Ness	Guerrero	10/	8.2	1 7	8.3	1.3	0.4	1.0	6.9	2.0	20.	4 2.0	6.6	5 1 (- 11	54 23	6.4	2.2	2.0	2.2	7.4	1.3	17.3	1.0	0.0	0.1	12.0	1.4	7.6	1 7	22.5	1.2	0.1	0.0	10.0	1.2
	Guerrere	Castro	10/	6.2	2.7	6.2	2.5			6.0	2.4	24	1 1 0	6.6	5 1.0	7 10	2.3	5.4	1 5	07.0	2.2	5.6	1.5	27.7	2.0					7.5	1.5	22.0	2.0				
	Costro	Burnott	VV	0.5	2.1	0.2	2.0			5.0	2.4	20	4 1.0 0 0 0	0.0	5 0.	1 10	0.0 2.1	5.4	· 1.5	21.0	2.0	5.0	1.5	21.1	2.2					10.0	2.1	16.7	1.0	12.1	1.0	0.1	1 0
	Durn att	Santa Clara	VV							5.9	2.3	30.	2 3.0 1 0.0	10	0 0 0	c 0/	20.00	44.4		00 F	1 7	0.0	1.0	10 F	4 7	11.0	0.0	20.0	4 5	10.0	3.1	10.7	1.2	10.2	2.4	9.1 1	1.0
	Burriett		VV							11.9	5.7	51.	1 2.0	10.	0 2.0	0 21	5.0 2.0	11	2 2.3	20.5	1.1	9.9	1.0	10.5	1.1	11.0	2.3	20.0	1.5	14.4	1.4	9.9	1.0	12.5	5.4	21.4	1.1
	Santa Clara	Sloat	W					0.0		0.0	0 -	0.1	0 1 5			4				44.0	4 7	0.0	1.0	44.4	4 7	7.0	0.1	00.0	4.0	4.4 -	0.0	22.5	4.0	0.0			4.0
	Page	Geary	N					9.0	2.2	8.6	2.7	31.	2 1.5	7.5	0 1.4	4 18	5.7 2.7	7.4	3.1	41.9	1./	8.6	1.0	11.4	1.7	1.0	2.1	29.6	1.6	11.7	3.8	32.7	1.3	8.8	2.7	30.7 1	1.6
Masonic	Geary	Bush/Euclid	N							10.7	2.0	19.	U 1.4																								
	Presidio	Geary	S							5.4	2.0	37.	5 1.9																								
	Geary	Page	S							7.7	1.8	23.	8 1.4	7.5	5 0.6	6 8	.0 2.6	7.7	1.1	14.3	1.9	7.7	0.4	5.2	1.8	8.2	1.7	21.2	1.5	10.3	2.0	19.0	1.5	9.0	1.8	19.5 1	1.6

					2006		2007		2009		2	011				201	L3			2	015				2017				201	9			20)21			2	023	
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	IT S.D.TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT I) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	IT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT H) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	IT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT H) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	S.D TRANSI SPEED (MPI	IT COEFFICII H) VARIAT	ENT OF AUTO:TRAN: ION SPEED RAT	SIT AVG. TH	TRANSIT S.D.T D (MPH) SPEED	RANSIT CO D (MPH)	VARIATION S	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	IT S.D TRANS H) SPEED (MP	SIT COEFFICIEN PH) VARIATIO	NT OF AUTO:TRANS	AVG. TRA	ANSIT S.D.T. MPH) SPEED	RANSIT COEFFIC (MPH) VARIA	ENT OF AUTO:TRA TION SPEED R	NSIT AVG. T	TRANSIT S. D (MPH) SP	TRANSIT CO	EFFICIENT OF A	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT VARIATION	OF AUTO:TRANSI N SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANS	IT S.D TRAN I) SPEED (M	ISIT COEFFICIEN IPH) VARIATIO	T OF AUTO:TRANSIT
	Sickles	Ocean	Ν	9.3	2.8	8.1	2.7	9.6	2.3	10.0	2.4	24.	0 2.2	9.	.5 1	.0	10.5	1.8	9.9	0.6	6.1	1.4	9.9	96	.0 60	.6 1.4	9	.6	1.6	16.3	1.2	12.5	2.3	18.7	1.4	11.1	2.1	. 19.2	1 1.6
	Ocean	Cesar Chavez	Ν	9.1	2.0	8.0	1.8	8.9	2.2	9.4	2.1	22.	3 1.8	7.	.7 0	.5	6.5	1.8	7.5	0.7	9.3	3 1.7	8.9	91	.3 14	.6 1.3	8 8	.6	1.5	16.9	1.4	11.8	2.0	16.7	1.5	10.3	1.9	18.6	э 1.6
	Cesar Chavez	14th	Ν	8.1	1.7	7.7	1.9	7.6	2.4	8.1	1.9	23.	.2 1.9	8.	.0 0	.6	7.5	1.7	7.8	0.4	5.1	. 1.6	9.	1 1	.3 14	.4 1.3	8	.7	1.5	17.2	1.1	9.1	1.6	17.3	1.5	8.6	1.5	17.2	2 1.5
	14th	9th	Ν	6.7	1.6	6.2	1.9	6.9	2.2	7.8	2.2	28.	3 2.1	5.	.8 0	.8	13.8	2.5	5.4	0.5	9.3	2.3	6.	53	.4 52	.1 1.6	6	.4	1.3	20.9	1.5	7.1	1.5	21.2	2.0	6.1	1.3	21.	7 2.0
	9th	3rd	Ν	9.1	2.0	8.5	1.5	8.7	2.0	9.5	1.9	20.	.2 1.7	9.	.6 0	.8	8.3	1.7	8.4	1.2	14.3	3 1.6	10.	.6 1	.5 14	.1 1.3	9	.6	1.9	19.4	1.4	9.4	1.6	17.0	1.6	9.0	1.3	14.4	4 1.6
Missian (Otio	3rd	Embarcadero	Ν	5.5	2.1	5.2	2.0	8.0	2.1	6.9	2.1	30	.7 1.8	6.	.7 0	.9	13.4	2.2	6.8	0.9	13.	2 1.5	6.3	1 1	.7 27	.9 1.2	6	.0	1.4	23.3	1.2	7.0	1.7	24.7	1.8	6.4	1.3	20.8	8 1.6
MISSION/OUS	Embarcadero	3rd	S	6.9	1.9	6.2	2.1	7.7	1.8	4.7	3.3	69.	.6 2.2	3.	.8 1	.3	34.2	3.9	6.2	0.8	12.9	9 1.7	6.4	4 2	.4 37	.6 1.4	5	.2	1.1	22.2	1.6	5.6	2.0	36.7	2.4	5.5	1.3	24.2	1 2.0
	3rd	9th	S	9.1	1.8	8.2	2.0	8.8	1.7	9.6	2.4	25.	3 1.6	8.	.2 1	.0	12.2	2.0	9.3	0.9	9.7	1.5	11.	.4 1	.6 14	.4 1.3	. 9	.6	1.8	18.5	1.3	11.2	2.6	23.2	2 1.3	9.4	2.2	2 23.0	0 1.7
	9th	14th	S	7.9	1.8	7.0	2.2	7.9	2.0	8.4	2.3	27.	4 2.3	6.	.8 0	.9	13.2	2.1	6.8	0.7	10.3	3 1.8	3.0	6 0	.8 21	.3 2.9)									8.6	1.8	20.9	9 1.4
	14th	Cesar Chavez	S	8.7	1.8	7.8	1.7	8.4	2.1	8.8	2.1	24.	.1 1.7	8.	.6 0	.9	10.5	1.6	8.9	0.5	5.6	5 1.5	9.3	3 1	.8 19	.6 1.5	10	0.6	2.1	20.2	1.2	11.0	2.3	21.2	2 1.4	9.5	1.8	19.2	1 1.7
	Cesar Chavez	Ocean	S	10.6	1.8	9.6	1.7	9.8	2.1	9.8	2.1	21.	8 1.9	8.	.7 0	.9	10.3	1.9	8.7	0.5	5.7	1.7	10.	5 1	.8 17	4 1.2	10	0.4	1.9	18.3	1.2	11.7	2.3	19.5	5 1.4	10.5	2.1	. 19.6	ô 1.6
	Ocean	Sickles	S	12.3	1.7	10.2	2.5	13.4	1.7	12.1	2.3	19.	4 1.8	10	0.1 0	.9	8.9	1.7	9.6	0.9	9.4	1.6	12.	.7 1	.3 10	.4 1.3	11	L.5	2.3	20.5	1.4	12.0	2.0	16.8	1.5	10.4	1.7	16.2	2 1.7
Montgomery	Broadway	Bush	S							6.2	1.7	27.	4 1.8																										
	Van Ness	Columbus	E	8.7	2.2	5.9	2.2	11.0	1.6	10.0	3.2	31.	8 1.9	9.	.9 1	.7	17.2	1.5	10.2	2.0	19.0	6 1.3	9.	5 0	.9 9.	9 1.4	7.	.7	2.1	27.2	2.2					7.5	2.4	32.0	0 2.2
	Columbus	Embarcadero	Е					11.2	1.7	10.8	2.6	23.	9 2.0	7.	.9 3	.6	45.6	2.7	9.4	2.7	28.	7 1.3	11.	.0 1	.8 16	.5 1.2	9	.3	3.4	37.0	1.5	9.8	4.1	41.3	1.7				
North Point	Embarcadero	Columbus	W					11.1	1.4	6.5	2.7	41.	2 2.8	9.	.2 1	.9	20.7	1.6	6.4	1.4	21.9	9 2.2	7.6	51	.4 18	.8 1.6	;												
	Columbus	Van Ness	W	9.7	1.8	7.7	2.2	9.8	1.7	7.7	2.2	28.	.7 2.1	7.	.5 1	.2	16.0	2.1	7.7	1.9	24.	7 1.6	8.0	0 0	.7 8	2 1.5	7.	.8	1.9	24.9	1.1	7.3	2.2	29.6	5 1.8	8.1	1.7	21.5	5 1.6
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E																																				
	Divisadero	Fillmore	E																																				
Oak	Fillmore	Laguna	E																																				
	Laguna	Franklin	E																																				
	19th Ave	Miramar	E	12.2	1.2	9.4	1.4																				8	.8	2.5	27.9	1.5	13.2	4.0	30.5	5 1.2				
	Miramar	Howth	E	10.0	1.3	8.2	1.6			1.7	0.9	57.	0 6.9	5.	.5 1	.6	29.1	2.6	5.5	0.6	10.9	9 2.2	5.	7 0	.6 11	.1 2.2	. 6	.7	1.5	21.8	1.8	8.7	2.3	26.2	2 1.7	7.6	2.1	. 27.1	1 1.7
Ocean	Howth	Miramar	W	9.0	1.5	7.4	1.5			8.6	2.9	34.	.2 1.8	7.	.1 1	.6	22.5	1.9	5.7	1.6	28.	1 2.0	6.0	0 0	.8 13	.7 1.7	7.	.4	1.4	18.7	1.5	6.8	1.7	24.3	2.2				
	Miramar	19th Ave	W	9.6	1.4	8.0	1.7																				7.	.5	1.0	13.4	1.6	10.0	2.7	26.6	5 1.6				
	Market	Fell	N			_													_																	_			
Octavia	Fell	Market	S																																				
	Gough	Mason	E			-		9.4	1.4	8.1	2.0	24.	9 1.5	9.	.1 0	.8	8.8	1.6	8.6	0.8	9.3	3 1.4	6.8	8 2	.1 31	.0 1.5	9	.2	1.6	17.6	1.0	9.2	1.7	18.0) 1.4	9.0	2.1	23.2	2 1.3
O'Farrell	Mason	Market	E					7.6	1.5	6.3	1.8	28	.5 1.5	10).1 1	.0	9.9	1.3	7.0	1.6	22.9	9 1.4	6.4	43	.5 55	.4 1.4	7.	.0	1.7	24.3	1.2	9.2	1.9	21.1	1.4				
	Market	Kearny	W			-								-								-														-			
	Kearny	Leavenworth	W																																				
Pine	Leavenworth	Franklin	W																																				
	Franklin	Presidio	W																																				
	Cesar Chavez	21st	N	7.1	2.5	6.4	4.2	7.5	2.8	9.2	2.8	30.	.6 2.5	8.	.3 2	.0	24.1	1.8	7.1	1.0	14.:	1 1.5	7.4	4 1	.3 17	5 1.9	6	.9	1.3	18.7	2.4	7.2	1.3	18.1	2.1	6.8	1.3	19.3	3 2.0
	21st	Division	N	11.7	1.5	10.9	2.4	9.9	2.3	9.9	2.5	25	.5 2.5	9.	.3 1	.0	10.8	2.0	9.3	1.9	20.4	4 2.1	9.1	5 1	.1 11	.7 1.2	9	.7	2.4	25.1	1.5	11.9	3.7	31.3	3 1.6	9.3	2.0) 21.8	8 1.8
Potrero	Division	21st	S	9.4	2.3	11.1	1.8	10.4	2.3	10.5	2.5	23	8 1.8	10) 2 1	6	15.7	1.9	10.0	1.4	14 (0 1.4	9.3	3 0	8 8	8 1.7	· 9	7	1.6	16.8	1.6	10.4	2.6	24.6	5 1.7	9.6	2.0	204	4 1.7
	21st	Cesar Chavez	S	8.8	2.0	8.9	2.9	6.8	3.2	9.7	2.0	30	0 24	7	<u> </u>	2	16.2	2.3	6.8	1.1	17.6	5 21	8.	4 1	0 12	3 2	7	4	1.2	16.7	2.4	8.1	1.4	17.6	26	8.0	1 5	193	3 2 3
	County Line	Sloat	N	0.0		0.0	2.0	0.0	012	28.5	4 9	17	2 1 6	19	987	3	36.9	1.9	19.8	4.5	22	7 1 8	21	3 3	8 17	9 1 7	,					0.1			2.0	0.0			
Skyline	Sloat	County Line	S							19.7	3.7	18	8 21	10		.0	00.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	22.	1 1.0	15	0 1	9 13	0 23	10	93	15	77	18								
	Skyline	Juninero Serra	F					15.5	1.5	13.2	3.1	23	5 1 4	11	5 1	4	12.2	2.1	11 1	1 9	17 4	1 2 1	11	5 2	0 17	5 1 8	11	1.4	2.7	23.7	1.9					13 3	37	7 27 9	8 1 8
Sloat	luninero Serra	Skyline	\M/					16.2	1.5	15.2	3.1	25.	7 2 1	12	391	8	12 9	2.1	14.0	1 /	10 (· · ·	10	5 2	2 21	2 2	1/	1.0	2 1	14 9	1.8					14 1	2 5	5 24.9	8 1 8
	Fulton	Turk	N			-		10.2	1.0	55	2.0	20.	0 26	12	I	.0	12.9	2.0	14.0	1.4	TO:(J 1.1	10.	.J Z			г <u>1</u> 4	T.U	۲.۲	14.3	1.0					14.1	3.0	, 24.0	, 1.0
Stanyan	Turk	Fulton	N C							0.0	2.0	50.	.0 2.0																										
	TUTK	FUILOII	5																																				

				200)6		2007		2009		20	11			20	13			20	15			20	L7			201	9			20	21			20)23	
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT C SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH)	DEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANS VARIATION SPEED RATI	AVG. TRANSI	IT S.D.TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT I) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT VARIATION	OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	VARIATION	UTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT CO SPEED (MPH)	FFICIENT OF AUTO ARIATION SPEE	TRANSIT AV	/G. TRANSIT PEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	F AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF (AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO
	Divisadero	Gough	Е	11.0	1.4	9.1	1.6			8.2	2.1	25.4	1.8	9.0	2.3	25.6	1.8	9.0	1.5	16.7	1.2	8.8	0.7	7.6	1.3	8.2	1.4	L6.7 1	3					8.2	0.9	11.5	1.7
0	Market	Mason	W	7.3	1.5	6.7	2.5	7.1	2.5	6.6	2.3	35.3	2.7	7.2	1.4	19.4	1.9	6.6	1.7	25.8	1.9	7.3	0.9	12.6	1.2	5.9	1.5	24.5 1	5					7.0	1.3	19.1	1.4
Sutter	Mason	Gough	W	7.1	1.8	6.8	1.3	7.4	1.2	6.4	1.6	25.2	1.6	6.6	0.7	10.6	1.7	6.8	1.0	14.7	1.6	6.7	0.4	6.5	1.7	6.0	0.9	15.6 1	6					6.4	1.0	15.4	1.8
	Gough	Divisadero	W	10.2	1.5	9.0	1.7	8.8	1.7	7.7	2.1	27.7	1.8	8.1	0.8	9.9	1.7	8.7	1.2	13.8	1.3	8.7	0.7	7.9	1.3	7.9	1.3	.6.8 1	5					8.1	1.2	14.8	1.6
	7th	2nd	E					10.5	1.9	8.9	2.4	26.3	1.9	8.2	1.3	15.9	2.1	8.4	1.5	17.9	1.7	8.0	1.0	12.8	1.4	8.1	2.3	28.2 1	4								
lownsend	2nd	7th	W					11.0	1.7	10.3	2.8	26.7	1.3	9.7	1.5	15.5	1.8	9.2	3.9	42.4	1.3	8.2	1.3	16.3	1.3	9.6	1.3	.3.3 1	0								
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E	10.2	1.7	9.3	2.2	10.7	1.7	9.7	3.2	33.1	1.8	9.3	2.8	30.1	1.9	7.4	2.1	28.4	2.1	8.5	0.6	7.6	1.5	8.5	1.7	20.2 1	4					8.8	1.6	17.8	1.8
	Market	Hyde	W					6.1	2.4	6.0	1.9	30.9	2.1	6.3	1.3	20.6	1.6	7.0	1.3	18.6	1.8	6.4	2.2	34.0	1.6	4.5	0.7	.6.0 1	9					3.9	0.6	15.9	2.3
Turk	Hyde	Gough	W							6.7	1.8	27.1	1.9	9.7	2.8	28.9	1.5																				
	Gough	Divisadero	W																																		
	Divisadero	Stanyan	W	11.4	1.5	10.9	1.8	11.6	1.8	10.8	3.3	30.8	1.5	11.4	1.3	11.4	1.6	9.9	1.8	18.2	1.9	10.4	1.5	14.8	1.6	9.9	1.9	9.6 1	8					9.3	2.0	22.0	2.0
	Cesar Chavez	13th	Ν																																		
	13th	Golden Gate	Ν	6.1	1.9	6.1	2.4	6.8	2.2	6.8	1.9	28.4	3.0	6.7	0.8	11.9	2.1	6.4	0.8	12.5	2.0	6.8	0.8	11.2	1.3	7.1	1.7	24.0 1	3	7.6	2.6	33.6	1.6				
	Golden Gate	Washington	Ν	5.7	2.0	5.9	2.0	5.8	2.6	5.4	1.3	24.6	3.1	5.4	0.4	7.4	2.2	5.4	0.3	5.6	2.1	6.2	0.4	6.8	1.6	6.4	0.7	1.0 1	4	6.4	1.2	18.4	1.9	8.1	1.7	20.6	1.5
Van Ness/	Washington	Lombard	Ν	6.6	1.4	6.6	1.5	7.2	1.9	6.5	2.0	30.3	1.7	5.3	0.6	11.3	2.5	5.2	0.4	7.7	2.4	5.1	0.5	10.0	2.0	4.9	0.7	L4.4 1	8	5.2	1.0	18.9	2.4				
S Van Ness	Lombard	Washington	S	7.0	1.8	7.7	2.3	6.9	2.4	6.8	2.5	37.1	2.4	7.0	0.6	8.6	1.7	6.6	0.9	13.6	2.0	8.0	0.9	11.0	1.4	7.9	1.7	21.8 1	5	8.4	2.5	29.4	1.9	7.8	1.6	20.7	1.0
	Washington	Golden Gate	S	6.0	2.7	6.4	2.7	6.7	3.2	6.2	2.4	39.1	3.5	5.9	0.7	11.9	2.4	5.7	0.4	7.0	2.2	6.0	0.6	10.2	1.9	6.4	1.5	23.2 2	2.2	7.7	1.4	18.8	2.1	8.0	1.2	15.0	1.8
	Golden Gate	13th	S	6.5	2.0	6.4	1.8	6.5	2.4	6.6	1.7	25.5	2.1	6.8	1.0	14.7	2.3	6.2	0.6	9.7	1.9	5.2	0.8	15.0	2.1	4.9	1.2	24.7 1	6								
	13th	Cesar Chavez	S							6.5	2.1	31.9	2.0																								
Washington	Drumm	Kearny	W							7.7	2.6	33.5	1.7																								
	Sloat	Ulloa	Ν	7.9	2.4	7.1	2.2			7.2	2.5	34.8	2.3	9.7	2.3	23.7	1.5	11.4	1.9	16.7	1.4	10.6	1.4	12.8	1.1					9.2	3.2	34.8	1.6				
West Portal	Ulloa	Sloat	S	10.6	1.5	8.1	1.9			4.7	1.4	30.8	3.7	11.2	1.8	16.1	1.5	7.0	1.8	25.7	2.1	6.3	1.1	18.1	2.5	7.7	2.2	28.1 2	2.1	6.9	2.1	30.4	2.0				
	Junipero Serra	Weldon	E																											_							
1-280	Weldon	6th/Brannan	Ν																							20.2	5.3	26.3 1	4								
	County Line	Cortland	Ν																																		
US-101	Cortland	I-80	Ν																																		
	I-80	Market	Ν																																		
	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W																			25.6	2.0	7.9	1.8												
1-80	Fremont Exit	US-101	W																																		
	6th/Brannan	Weldon	S																																		
1-280	Weldon	Junipero Serra	S																																		
	Market	I-80	S																																		
US-101	I-80	Cortland	S																																		
	Cortland	Monster Park Exit	t S																																		
	US-101	Fremont Exit	E																																		
I-80	Fremont Exit	Treasure Island	E																			21.2	2.3	10.7	2.8												

Attachment 6-2. CMP Segments Transit Speeds (PM Peak) (2006 - 2023)

				2006	2007		2009		201	1			20	13			2(015			2	017				201	9			20	21			202	23
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	T AVG. TRANSIT S.I SPEED (MPH) SP	D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT EED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT CO SPEED (MPH)	EFFICIENT OF AUTO VARIATION SPEI	O:TRANSIT A	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH	COEFFICIENT C	F AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	S.D TRANSI SPEED (MP)	T COEFFICIEN I) VARIATIO	OF AUTO:TRANS	IT AVG. TRAN O SPEED (M	(SIT S.D TR PH) SPEED	ANSIT COEF (MPH) VA	FICIENT OF AL	ITO:TRANSIT PEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT CO SPEED (MPH)	VEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANS VARIATION SPEED RATE
1st St	Market	Harrison	S																																
0.101	Brannan	Market	Ν			7.3	1.4	6.3	2.6	40.8 2	2.1	6.5	1.8	27.7	0.5	5.7	2.5	43.9	0.9	6.5	1.5	22.9	1.0	6.8	3 1.	.7 2	4.6	1.2							
2nd St	Market	Brannan	S			7.4	1.4	6.8	2.7	39.7 1	1.8	7.1	1.3	18.3	0.8	4.6	1.5	32.6	1.5	6.4	1.2	18.7	1.7	7.1	1.	8 2	5.4	1.2							
	Jamestown	Evans	Ν					5.4	2.6	47.1 4	4.4																		7.9	1.1	14.3	2.1			
	Evans	Terry Francois	Ν					8.3	3.2	38.9 3	3.6																		11.1	3.6	32.8	1.6	12.4	2.5	19.9 1.2
3rd St	Terry Francois	Market	Ν					5.6	2.0	36.1 2	2.3	6.6	1.0	15.2	1.9	7.1	1.3	18.3	1.4	6.6	0.6	8.8	1.3	6.6	5 1.	0 1	5.4	1.6	8.5	2.2	25.8	1.7	7.4	1.9	26.2 1.3
	Terry Francois	Evans	S					8.1	2.9	36.1 3	3.7																		12.3	3.4	27.6	1.6	11.8	1.9	16.0 1.5
	Evans	Jamestown	S					5.0	2.7	54.6 4	4.6																		8.3	1.2	14.9	1.8			
4th St/	O'Farrell	Harrison	S	5.1 1.7		4.8	1.8	4.6	1.7	37.0 3	3.3													3.4	0.	.7 2	1.6	2.2	6.0	1.8	29.3	1.8	5.9	1.3	21.6 1.3
Stockton	Harrison	Channel	S			7.3	1.9	6.5	1.7	26.3 2	2.3	7.4	3.4	45.9	1.7																				
	Brannan	Market	Ν			6.8	2.3	6.3	2.2	34.4 2	2.5	4.7	1.9	40.4	0.9	3.8	1.7	44.7	1.7	2.8	0.6	22.5	5 1.3												
5th St	Market	Brannan	S			6.3	2.1	5.2	1.5	29.2 2	2.6	5.5	0.5	9.1	1.0	4.2	0.4	9.5	1.6	4.6	0.5	11.0	1.5	4.7	0.	.8 1	.7.7	1.6							
	Brannan	Market	Ν								_																								
6th St	Market	Brannan	S																																
7th St	Brannan	Market	N			7.7	2.1	7.4	2.5	33.4 2	2.8	6.2	1.0	16.1	2.2	4.7	0.9	19.1	1.8	5.5	1.2	21.8	1.5	5.1	. 1.	5 2	9.4	1.7	8.8	1.6	18.0	1.5	7.3	1.7	22.7 1.4
8th St	Market	Bryant	S			8.0	2.1	7.0	2.1	30.7 3	3.4	7.2	1.6	22.2	2.2	5.7	1.3	22.8	1.5	6.1	1.2	19.1	. 1.4	5.4	1.	.1 2	0.3	2.2	8.2	2.3	27.4	1.3	7.1	1.9	26.2 1.3
9th St	Brannan	Market	N																																
10th St	Market	Brannan	S					7.7	1.7	22.5 2	2.7																								
	Market	Mission	Е	5.5 2.0	8.1 1.3	7.1	1.5	6.1	1.6	25.9 2	2.0	6.1	0.5	8.2	2.4	6.0	0.6	10.0	2.3	5.8	0.6	9.7	1.6	5.5	i 1.	.1 1	9.3	1.4	7.3	1.5	20.9	1.6	6.1	1.5	24.5 1.8
	Mission	Potrero	Е	6.5 2.0	6.3 1.5	8.1	1.6	7.3	2.1	29.1 1	1.6	6.2	0.9	14.5	2.4	6.3	1.1	17.5	1.9	5.7	0.4	7.6	1.4	6.0) 1.	.1 1	8.4	1.3	7.7	1.5	19.2	1.7	6.8	1.3	18.5 1.6
16th St	Potrero	Mission	W	5.9 1.9	10.0 1.4	6.9	2.2	6.8	1.8	27.0 2	2.0	6.0	0.8	13.3	2.1	6.1	0.8	13.1	1.8	5.5	0.7	11.9	1.7	5.6	5 1.	6 2	8.8	1.5	9.3	3.9	41.9	1.5	7.6	1.6	21.4 1.5
	Mission	Market	W	5.9 1.8	10.2 1.4	6.4	1.9	6.1	1.8	29.4 1	1.4	6.6	1.0	15.2	2.6	6.0	0.6	10.0	2.0	5.1	0.5	10.2	2.0	5.6	5 1.	0 1	.7.6	1.9	7.1	1.4	19.9	2.0	6.2	1.1	17.5 1.9
	Junipero Serra	Sloat	N			10.4	1.3	8.4	2.4	28.4 2	2.8	10.0	1.3	13.0	1.7	9.5	1.1	11.6	1.6	11.5	1.0	9.0	1.5	10.3	1 1.	.7 1	6.5	1.7	12.9	2.9	22.2	1.9	10.9	2.0	17.8 1.8
	Sloat	Lincoln	N			13.7	1.7	11.7	2.5	21.1 1	1.8	9.0	2.0	22.2	1.9	10.0	2.0	20.0	2.0	10.4	0.9	8.7	1.8	10.	7 1.	9 1	.7.9	1.7	11.2	2.0	17.5	1.9	10.2	1.4	14.2 1.6
	Lincoln	Lake	N			13.3	2.2	14.6	2.6	17.6 2	2.0	13.3	1.2	9.0	2.1	13.1	2.2	16.8	1.7	11.6	1.8	15.2	1.7	14.3	3 1.	8 1	2.6	0.9	17.6	2.7	15.7	1.6			
10th Ave/	Lake	US-101	Ν			26.7	1.7					18.9	1.8	9.5	2.4	11.3	4.8	42.5	1.6	23.2	2.3	10.0	1.8												
Park Presidio	US-101	Lake	S			25.0	1.4	18.1	4.5	24.8 1	1.7	19.0	1.7	8.9	2.3	18.8	3.6	19.1	2.0	16.3	4.9	30.3	3 1.4												
	Lake	Lincoln	S			11.2	1.8	13.3	2.8	20.9 1	1.8	9.9	2.2	22.2	1.9	10.0	1.8	18.0	1.6	8.0	1.4	17.9	1.7	10.0	0 1.	8 1	8.3	1.3	9.1	2.7	29.8	1.8	8.5	2.0	24.0 1.5
	Lincoln	Sloat	S			10.9	2.2	10.7	2.7	25.3 2	2.6	11.3	1.0	8.8	1.8	11.1	1.1	9.9	1.8	10.3	0.5	4.6	2.0	10.2	2 1.	6 1	5.5	1.9	11.1	1.8	16.2	1.8	9.4	1.6	17.0 1.7
	Sloat	Junipero Serra	S			12.0	1.0	11.5	3.1	26.6 1	1.5	9.0	1.8	20.0	2.0	9.4	1.1	11.7	1.7	9.1	1.0	10.7	′ 1.8	9.2	2 1.	5 1	6.3	2.3	12.2	2.6	21.3	1.8	9.5	2.1	21.7 1.8
	Junipero Serra	Lyell	E					5.6	2.7	48.0 3	3.9																								
	Lyell	Bay Shore	Е					8.8	1.9	21.5 3	3.4																								
Alemany	Bay Shore	Lyell	W					13.2	3.7	28.3 1	1.9																								
	Lyell	Junipero Serra	W					11.3	3.4	30.1 2	2.0																								
	Van Ness	Embarcadero	E								-																	_							
Bay	Embarcadero	Van Ness	W																																
	County Line	Industrial	N			11.4	1.9	6.7	3.3	49.3 3	3.5																	_							
	Industrial	Cesar Chavez	Ν			12.3	1.2	11.3	3.0	26.8 1	1.4	9.5	1.2	12.6	1.9	9.7	3.1	32.0	1.8	8.1	1.1	14.0	1.9	11.0	0 1.	6 1	4.5	1.2	14.1	3.8	27.4	1.4			
Bayshore	Jerrold	Industrial	S			15.1	1.5	10.8	2.8	26.4 1	1.4	6.9	2.3	33.3	3.0	7.5	2.8	37.3	2.6	8.0	1.2	15.5	2.0	9.4	2.	.3 2	3.9	1.6	11.5	3.3	28.7	1.9	9.4	2.4	25.7 2.1
	Industrial	County Line	S			10.6	2.5	8.3	2.5	30.0 2	2.6																								
Beale/Davis	Clay	Mission	S			8.9	1.3	5.8	2.2	38.0 2	2.0	6.6	1.4	21.2	0.8	7.1	2.6	36.6	0.8	6.0	1.3	22.4	1.4	4.8	1.	2 2	4.4	1.3							

				2006	2007	2009			201	1		2(013			20	015			20	17			20	19			20	21			2023	
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	T AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSI SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	IT AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIEN SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATIO	T OF AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT COL SPEED (MPH)	EFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANS VARIATION SPEED RATE	IT AVG. TRANSI O SPEED (MPH	IT S.D TRANSIT H) SPEED (MPH	T COEFFICIENT C	DF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	T COEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF AUTO VARIATION SPE	ED RATIO SP	2. TRANSIT S. EED (MPH) SI	D TRANSIT COEFFICIF EED (MPH) VARIAT	ENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT TION SPEED RATIO
	Division	6th	Е																														
Bronnon	6th	3rd	Е																														
Didilidii	3rd	6th	W																														
	6th	Division	W																														
	Gough	Larkin	E																														
	Larkin	Powell	Е																														
	Powell	Montgomery	Е			6.7	2.0	6.1	1.5	23.8 2.3	6.1	0.9	14.8	1.5	6.8	1.4	20.6	1.6	5.6	0.5	9.5	1.7	5.6	1.1	19.2	1.8	6.8	1.9	28.8 2	2.2	5.3	1.3 24.	.2 2.3
Durandurau	Montgomery	Embarcadero	Е			7.1	2.1	6.1	1.5	24.5 2.2	6.2	1.6	25.8	1.1	5.6	1.7	30.4	0.9															
Broadway	Embarcadero	Montgomery	W																														
	Montgomery	Powell	W												3.0	0.8	26.7	1.8	3.5	1.4	40.5	1.3											
	Powell	Larkin	W																														
	Larkin	Gough	W																														
	Junipero Serra	Alemany	E																														
Brotherhood	Alemany	Junipero Serra	W																														
	Division	4th	E			8.3	1.5	7.5	2.4	32.6 1.9	8.4	1.5	17.9	1.7	6.1	1.5	24.6	1.4	5.9	0.7	12.1	1.4	5.8	1.1	19.4	1.4							
Bryant	4th	Embarcadero	E																														
	Masonic	Gough	E																														
Bush	Gough	Market	Е					6.2	2.4	38.0 1.8																							
	Market	14th	Ν	9.6 1.6	9.2 1.1	8.5	1.8	6.9	1.9	27.9 2.2	6.9	0.9	13.0	2.1	7.6	0.7	9.2	1.7	6.8	1.2	17.5	1.8	7.0	1.4	20.1	1.7	7.5	1.8	24.8 1	9	6.7	1.4 20.	.6 1.8
	14th	Geary	Ν	6.7 1.4	7.9 1.7	7.6	1.6	6.9	1.6	22.9 1.7	6.1	0.4	6.6	2.3	6.7	0.6	9.0	1.7	6.5	0.6	8.7	1.6	6.1	0.7	12.2	1.6	7.0	0.8	12.1 1	8	6.4	0.7 11.	.1 1.8
Castro/	Geary	Pine	Ν	5.5 1.4	8.2 1.3	6.6	1.6	6.2	2.2	35.0 1.5	7.6	1.1	14.5	1.8	6.6	1.4	21.2	1.7	5.2	1.5	28.8	1.8	5.3	1.5	28.2	1.8	5.4	1.4	25.4 2	2.3	5.3	1.3 24.	.4 1.9
Divisadero	Pine	Geary	S	5.6 2.1	5.8 1.5	6.2	2.2	5.8	1.4	23.5 1.7	5.4	0.9	16.7	2.4	5.5	1.1	20.0	1.9	5.7	1.2	21.2	1.6	5.3	1.5	28.6	1.7	5.3	1.5	27.4 2	2.1	5.1	1.3 26.	.0 1.9
	Geary	14th	S	5.5 2.2	5.7 1.7	6.4	1.7	5.9	1.4	23.9 1.8	5.7	0.5	8.8	2.2	5.6	0.5	8.9	1.7	5.3	1.0	19.6	1.8	5.6	0.7	13.3	1.7	6.1	1.1	17.8 1	L.7	5.6	1.1 19.	.3 1.6
	14th	Market	S	9.1 1.3	6.1 1.9	9.0	1.7	8.0	2.2	28.1 1.5	8.6	1.1	12.8	1.6	8.3	1.4	16.9	1.3	7.3	1.9	26.3	1.3	6.4	1.6	25.4	1.5	7.6	1.6	20.8 1	L.5	6.6	1.4 21.	.9 1.4
	Guerrero	Bryant	E					7.6	2.4	31.3 1.4	6.0	1.2	20.0	2.6	6.8	2.2	32.4	1.6	6.5	1.1	16.2	1.5					8.9	2.5	28.6 1	L.5	7.9	1.9 24.	.0 1.5
	Bryant	Kansas	E					7.6	2.4	31.7 4.0																							
	Kansas	3rd	E					9.6	2.4	24.8 2.4																							
Cesar Chavez	3rd	Kansas	W					8.7	2.9	33.8 2.3																							
	Kansas	Bryant	W					8.7	2.7	31.5 2.7																							
	Bryant	Guerrero	W					7.4	2.4	32.4 1.6	5.4	1.4	25.9	3.0	6.3	1.6	25.4	1.9	5.2	0.9	16.6	2.0											
Clay	Kearny	Davis	E			7.1	1.6	6.1	1.9 3	30.6 2.6	6.5	0.6	9.2	1.0	6.6	1.9	28.8	1.3	7.7	0.9	12.2	1.1	6.6	1.2	18.0	1.3	8.0	2.4	30.0 1	L.5	6.8	2.3 34.	.3 1.5
	Montgomery	Greenwich	Ν			6.1	2.3	5.8	1.9 3	32.4 2.2	4.5	0.7	15.6	2.8	4.4	1.0	22.7	2.8	5.5	0.5	9.3	2.2	4.8	0.9	18.2	2.5		_					
	Greenwich	North Point	Ν	8.1 1.6	6.7 2.5	8.5	1.1	7.8	2.3	30.1 1.7	7.3	0.7	9.6	1.8	7.0	0.9	12.9	1.8	6.6	0.7	9.9	1.9	6.2	1.5	24.1	1.7	7.5	1.8	23.7 2	2.0	6.1	1.6 26.	.0 2.2
Columbus	North Point	Greenwich	S	7.3 2.2	8.5 1.5	7.8	1.7	6.2	1.8 2	28.4 2.3	6.7	0.7	10.4	1.7	6.3	0.7	11.1	1.7	6.7	0.6	9.2	1.3	4.8	1.0	20.5	1.6	5.5	1.2	22.1 2	2.3	4.5	0.9 19.	.9 2.8
	Greenwich	Montgomery	S			5.6	1.3	5.2	1.7 3	32.8 2.4	4.1	0.5	12.2	2.9	4.2	0.5	11.9	2.4	5.7	2.1	37.2	1.6											
	County Line	SF Cemetery	E								19.7	1.9	9.6	1.7	18.5	3.0	16.2	2.2	21.3	4.9	22.8	1.8											
	SF Cemetery	Lyon/Francisco	E								19.7	1.9	9.6	2.0	18.5	3.0	16.2	1.9	21.3	4.9	22.8	1.4											
Doyle/	Lyon/Francisco	Van Ness	E			8.1	2.3				10.3	1.4	13.6	1.8	12.5	2.3	18.4	1.1	8.2	0.6	7.2	1.5	7.9	1.0	12.8	1.5					9.0	1.3 14.	.5 1.9
Lombard/ Richardson	Van Ness	Lyon/Francisco	W			11.6	1.4				8.9	1.0	11.2	2.0	8.1	2.0	24.7	1.6	8.9	0.7	8.4	1.5	7.8	1.2	15.3	1.7				1	1.1	1.6 14.	.8 1.4
	Lyon/Francisco	SF Cemetery	W								13.5	4.1	30.4	1.9	10.8	4.0	37.0	1.2	24.5	2.9	11.7	1.6											
	SF Cemetery	County Line	W								13.5	4.1	30.4	1.7	10.8	4.0	37.0	1.3	24.5	2.9	11.7	1.5											
	Market	Washington	Ν			5.4	3.0	4.9	2.7	54.6 3.5																							
Drumm	Washington	Market	S			6.3	1.2																										
	0																																

				2006	20	007	2009			20	11			20	13			20	15			20:	17			2	019				202	1			2023	\$
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANS SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATE	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT O SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION	F AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF A	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF AUT VARIATION SPE	TRANSIT	VG. TRANSIT PEED (MPH)	.D TRANSIT C PEED (MPH)	OEFFICIENT OF VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	T S.D TRANS	H) VARIATIO	T OF AUTO:TRAP	SIT AVG. TRA	ANSIT S.D.T. MPH) SPEED	TRANSIT COEF	FICIENT OF AUTO:T	RATIO SPEE	RANSIT S.D D (MPH) SPEI	RANSIT COEFFIC D (MPH) VARIA	CIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT
	Market	Mission	Е																																	
Duboce/	Mission	Potrero	Е						9.7	2.6	27.0	1.9																								
Division	Potrero	Mission	W						6.9	1.7	24.9	2.3																								
	Mission	Market	W																																	
Embargadoro	Townsend	North Point	Ν																																	
Embarcadero	North Point	Townsend	S																																	
Evans	Cesar Chavez	3rd	S				16.7	1.3	13.3	4.4	33.3	1.3	13.6	3.6	26.5	1.2	10.5	2.2	21.0	2	11.4	1.5	12.8	1.2	10.7	2.7	25.	1 1.5	10.	.7 3	.9 3	6.4 2	1 10).1 2	7 26	<i>3</i> .2 1.8
Evans	3rd	Cesar Chavez	Ν				14.8	1.4	14.2	3.6	25.5	1.5	11.8	2.7	22.9	1.4	12.0	2.0	16.7 1	0	12.4	3.9	31.5	2.0	15.4	3.9	25.	1 1.0	15.	.4 3	.5 2	3.0 1.	4 13	3.6 3	3.1 22	2.8 1.3
	Gough	Market	Е																																	
Fell	Gough	Laguna	W																																	
	Laguna	Stanyan	W																																	
	13th	8th	E										9.4	1.6	17.0	2.0	7.8	2.3	29.5	7	5.5	0.9	17.2	1.7	6.5	1.5	23.	6 1.5	7.1	1 1	4 2	0.0 1.	8 7	.2 1	7 23	3.0 1.4
Falaam	8th	4th	Е				10.2	1.7	9.5	2.7	28.1	2.0	7.3	1.3	17.8	2.4	4.6	1.6	34.8	2.1	6.0	0.9	15.1	1.4	6.4	1.2	19.:	1 1.3					6	.6 1	9 28	3.7 1.8
FUISUITI	4th	1st	Е				8.0	1.9	7.0	2.4	34.8	2.4																					4	.5 1	1 24	4.8 1.7
	1st	Embarcadero	Е				8.4	1.4	6.7	8.9	133.0	1.8																								
Frenklin	Market	Pine	Ν																																	
Franklin	Pine	Lombard	Ν																																	
Fremont	Harrison	Market	Ν				8.2	1.2																												
	Park Presidio	10th Ave	E				11.2	2.3					10.2	2.2	21.6	2.3	8.8	3.3	37.5 2	2.3	8.6	5.3	61.8	2.2	8.1	1.9	22.9	9 2.1	15.	.5 2	.9 1	8.6 1.	2 12	2.0 2	.6 21	1.4 1.6
	10th Ave	Arguello	Е				11.2	2.1					4.5	2.8	62.2	4.1	9.9	1.6	16.2 1	8	7.5	2.4	31.5	1.9	9.4	2.5	26.3	3 2.0	9.3	3 2	.9 3	31.1 2.	0 9	.9 3	3.1 31	L.O 1.8
E. Han	Arguello	Masonic	E	9.6 1.6	6.2	1.8	10.4	1.3	8.9	2.7	30.1	1.4	8.3	1.5	18.1	1.8	8.6	1.0	11.6 1	8	7.9	1.4	18.0	1.5	8.9	1.6	18.0	0 1.2	11.	.0 3	.0 2	27.6 1.	5 8	.1 1	8 22	2.3 1.7
Fuiton	Masonic	Arguello	W	10.3 2.0	6.4	3.7	9.2	2.2	8.8	2.5	28.4	1.6	7.3	0.5	6.8	2.5	8.5	0.7	8.2	9	8.3	1.3	16.1	1.6	8.0	1.0	12.3	3 1.7	7.3	31	4 1	.8.7 2	2 7	.8 1	4 17	1.9 2.2
	Arguello	10th Ave	W				9.7	2.3	6.2	2.0	31.9	2.9	10.6	1.0	9.4	1.7	11.3	1.8	15.9 1	6	10.0	2.1	20.7	1.6	9.2	1.5	16.2	2 1.6	9.0	0 1	9 2	1.2 2	2 9	.5 1	9 19).6 2.1
	10th Ave	Park Presidio	W				9.7	0.9	6.2	2.0	31.9	1.8	8.7	1.6	18.4	2.1	6.7	3.1	46.3	2.2	7.2	4.2	58.8	1.9	7.6	2.4	31.9	9 1.8	8.5	53	.0 3	5.7 2	4 7	.2 2	.2 30).6 2.0
	Great Hwy	25th Ave	E				11.4	1.9	11.3	3.2	28.2	2.1	9.4	0.6	6.4	1.9	10.2	1.1	10.8	4	12.3	5.0	40.8	1.3	11.2	1.5	13.8	3 1.6	11.	5 1	9 1	.6.2 1.	7 10).7 1	4 13	3.5 1.6
	25th Ave	Arguello	E				8.6	2.7	8.4	1.8	21.6	2.6	8.3	0.6	7.2	2.0	8.4	0.4	4.8	5	8.7	1.9	21.6	1.7	8.5	1.2	14.:	1 1.8	8.7	7 1	3 1	5.2 2.	0 8	.3 1	3 16	3.0 2.0
	Arguello	Gough	E				9.1	2.2	8.6	2.1	24.4	2.3	8.2	0.4	4.9	2.3	8.3	0.3	3.6 1	8	7.9	1.5	19.0	2.2	9.2	1.1	12.4	4 1.6	9.2	1 1	3 1	4.4 2	0 8	.8 1	2 13	3.6 1.8
Geary	Kearny	Gough	W				7.1	1.4	6.9	1.9	27.3	1.9	6.9	0.6	8.7	1.7	7.3	0.7	9.6	4	7.0	0.9	12.6	1.1	7.2	1.2	16.0	5 1.2	8.0	0 1	6 2	0.3 1.	6 7	.3 1	4 19	9.8 1.4
	Gough	Arguello	W				9.0	2.8	9.6	2.6	27.5	2.6	9.6	0.6	6.3	2.3	8.5	0.6	7.1 1	8	8.8	1.3	15.1	2.1	10.0	1.5	15.4	4 1.7	10.	.7 1	6 1	.4.7 1.	9 10).0 1	7 16	j.8 1.7
	Arguello	25th Ave	W				8.6	2.0	8.2	1.8	21.5	2.1	8.0	0.5	6.3	2.0	7.8	0.3	3.8	5	7.7	0.6	7.9	1.7	8.2	1.3	15.	7 1.7	8.7	7 1	3 1	5.4 2	0 8	.3 1	4 16	6 1.8
	25th Ave	Great Hwy	W				11.3	2.0	10.8	2.6	23.7	2.1	11.0	0.5	4.5	1.5	10.7	0.8	7.5	4	9.1	0.6	7.0	1.9	9.6	1.2	12.4	4 1.9	10.	.3 2	.0 1	9.3 1.	9 10).1 1	4 14	↓.0 1.9
	Ocean	Cayuga	E				6.9	1.2	6.2	1.9	30.1	2.1	5.7	1.2	21.1	2.5	5.9	0.9	15.3 1	6	6.5	1.0	15.0	1.5	6.5	1.2	19.0	0 1.4	8.2	1 1	4 1	6.9 1.	9 7	.7 1	8 23	3.2 1.6
	Cayuga	Paris	Е				6.7	1.6	6.3	1.8	29.1	1.8	5.0	0.6	12.0	2.9	5.3	1.0	18.9 2	2.0	4.9	0.5	9.4	2.2	4.4	1.1	25.0	0 2.2	5.3	1 1	9 3	37.2 2.	9 5	.1 1	5 30).6 2.2
0	Paris	Santos	Е				13.4	1.6	9.9	2.5	25.3	2.2	9.1	1.1	12.1	2.5	9.4	0.9	9.6	7	11.2	1.2	10.9	1.7	10.8	1.8	16.4	4 1.7	12.	.7 2	.5 1	9.9 1.	7 1:	L.1 2	.4 21	1.4 1.8
Geneva	Santos	Paris	W				14.6	1.6	10.8	2.6	23.8	2.2	10.3	0.8	7.8	2.0	11.1	0.9	8.1 1	4	10.8	2.8	25.6	1.6	11.2	2.0	17.9	9 1.3	11.	.8 2	2.1 1	.7.9 1.	8 11	.0 2	.0 17	7.8 1.8
	Paris	Cayuga	W				7.2	1.4	6.8	1.8	26.5	1.2	4.8	0.7	14.6	2.8	5.6	0.7	12.5	9	5.6	0.6	11.3	1.7	5.8	1.4	23.	2 1.7	6.6	6 1	7 2	6.5 2	4 6	.9 1	6 23	3.5 1.8
	Cayuga	Ocean	W				8.4	1.1	6.8	1.6	23.8	1.5	6.5	0.8	12.3	2.0	6.4	0.6	9.4	5	6.2	1.0	16.5	1.5	7.0	1.3	18.0	6 1.4	6.9	91	.4 2	0.7 2	1 7	.1 1	6 22	2.7 1.5
0.11.0.1	Masonic	Franklin	E																																	
Golden Gate	Franklin	Market	E																																	
	Pine	Geary	S																																	
Gough	Geary	Golden Gate	S																																	
	Golden Gate	Market	S																																	

				2006		2007		2009		2	2011	L			201	L3			2	015			2)17			:	2019	1			20	21			2	023	
NAME	FROM	TO	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO: SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEE	RANSIT D RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSI SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	T AVG. TRANSIT	T S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANS	IT S.D TRAP I) SPEED (N	ISIT COEFFI IPH) VARI	ICIENT OF AUTO:TRA HATION SPEED RA	ATIO SPEE	. TRANSIT S.I ED (MPH) SP	D TRANSIT C EED (MPH)	VARIATION	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	SPEED (MP)	H) SPEED (MP	IT COEFFICIENT H) VARIATION	OF AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANS SPEED (MP)	f S.D TRANSI) SPEED (MPH	VARIATION	SPEED RATI	IT AVG. TRA	NSIT S.D TR. APH) SPEED	ANSIT COEFF (MPH) VAF	ATION SPEED	RATIO SP	G. TRANSIT PEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	VARIATION	SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSI SPEED (MP	H) VARIATION	N SPEED RATIO
	Monterey	29th	N																							18.	2 3.	9 2		8 2	21.2	5.0	23.6	1.4				
Guerrero/	29th	Cesar Chavez	N																																			
San Jose	Cesar Chavez	29th	S																																			
	29th	Monterey	S																							18.	2 2.	3 1	2.5 0.	9 3	32.6	14.4	44.2	0.8				
	Embarcadero	1st	W				9.1	1.3																														
Harrison	1st	4th	W				8.5	2.0					7	7.2	1.8	25.0	2.3	5.6	2.0	35.7	2.3	5.4	1.5	26.9	1.4	6.	7 2.	2 3	2.0 1.	4					7.4	1.9	25.9) 1.6
	4th	8th	W				9.5	1.2	8.9	2.7	7 30	0.0 1.7	8	3.4	0.8	9.5	1.9	8.4	1.5	17.9	1.7	8.3	0.7	8.3	1.7	7.4	- 1.	5 2).7 1.	7 1	10.2	2.8	27.3	1.4	8.9	2.8	30.9) 1.6
	8th	Division	W				7.1	1.9	7.3	2.4	1 32	2.9 1.6	5 5	5.4	1.0	18.5	3.0	6.2	1.8	29.0	2.1	6.3	0.5	8.2	1.7	5.5	5 1.	0 1	3.7 1.	9	6.6	2.5	37.8	1.9				
Hayes	Market	Gough	W	6.1 1	.9	5.3 2.5	4.8	2.0	4.3	1.5	5 34	4.0 2.0) 4	1.5	0.9	20.0	2.6	5.4	1.1	20.4	2.1	4.8	0.8	17.3	1.6	4.9	9 0.	8 1	5.4 1.	6					5.2	1.1	21.8	3 1.7
Howard	Embarcadero	S Van Ness	W						21.7	4.2	2 19	9.5 0.6	6																									
	County Line	Brotherhood	Ν															13.2	4.9	37.1	1.6	6.6	1.0	15.2	2.6													
	Brotherhood	19th	Ν				14.8	1.0	9.3	4.2	2 45	5.2 1.1	8	3.8	1.5	17.0	1.6	7.9	1.7	21.5	1.6	9.2	1.3	13.9	1.2	7.8	3 1.	7 2		2 1	L2.9	3.7	29.0	1.9				
	19th	Sloat	Ν																																			
Junipero Serra	Sloat	19th	S																																			
	19th	Brotherhood	S				13.4	2.9					14	4.5	1.3	9.0	2.6	17.2	6.2	36.0	2.0	14.7	6.0	40.5	2.5	12.	73.	1 2	1.5 3.	1 1	L2.9	3.9	30.2	3.3				
	Brotherhood	County Line	S						16.3	5.0) 30	0.4 2.8	3									14.1	0.7	4.7	3.8													
Kearny	Market	Columbus	Ν				6.8	1.9	5.4	2.9	9 53	3.5 2.8	3 7	7.5	1.2	16.0	1.6	6.8	0.6	8.8	1.3	6.6	1.7	25.7	1.3	5.	7 0.	9 10	6.4 1.	6	6.8	2.2	32.5	1.9	5.3	1.0	19.3	3 1.8
King	4th	2nd	E																																			
	2nd	4th	W																																			
	19th Ave	5th Ave	E				11.9	1.9	10.6	3.2	2 30	0.0 1.9	9 9	9.9	1.3	13.1	2.2	10.1	. 0.9	8.9	1.9	9.4	2.1	22.8	1.9	10.	2 2.	5 24	1.2 1.	6 1	L2.3	3.4	27.6	1.6	10.5	2.3	21.8	3 1.7
	5th Ave	Stanvan	E						11.7	3.7	7 31	1.1 1.9)																									
Lincoln/ Kezar	Stanvan	5th Ave	W						6.3	0.6	3 9	.6 3.9	9																									
	5th Ave	19th Ave	W				12.2	1 1	11.1	3 1	28	82 17	7 1 ·	11	22	19.8	1.6	11 7	7 1 0	85	14	10.0	15	15.0	15	8.8	3 2	1 2	88 1	6	98	27	28.0	18	10.0	23	23.0	2 1 7
Main	Mission	Market	N	4.1 3	5	4.1 4.0	12.2		3.6	1.5	2 4 2	86 30	2 5	5.5	1 4	25.5	0.6	6.0	5.5	91 7	0.8	4.8	1.0	21.1	2.3	0.0	. 2.		1.	0	0.0	2.1	20.0	1.0	10.0			
Main	Sloat	Santa Clara	F	7.1 0		4.0			1.8	1.0) 4C	13 4 A	1		1.4	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.7	0.0	4.0	1.0	21.1	2.5	_				_								
	Sonta Clara	Burnott	-						101	1.3) - (12 16	• 1/	1.0	2.0	17.0	2.1	12.4	24	27.4	1.6	11 1	1.0	0 0	17	10	1 2	1 2	71 1	6 1	16.6	2.7	16.0	1 2	10.1	2.0	263	2 1 7
	Burnott	Costro							10.5	4.2	- 32	+.5 1.0) <u> </u>	1.2 .	2.0	11.9	2.1	12.4	. 5.4	21.4	1.0	11.1	1.0	0.0	1.1	12.	4 3.	4 2	·.⊥ ⊥.		10.0	2.1	15.0	1.0	12.1	5.2	20.3) 1.7
	Burnett	Custro		7.0	4	6.6 1.6			10.5	2.0		5.5 Z.Z	2 7	7.0	0.0	11 1	1.0	6.0	0.7	44.0	1.0	E 4	0.5	0.4	1.0					2	20.5	3.1	15.1	1.0				
	Castro	Guerrero	E	7.0 1	.4	6.6 1.6			5.8	1.4	+ 24	4.0 1.8	s /	.2	0.8	11.1	1.9	6.2	0.7	11.3	1.8	5.4	0.5	8.4	1.9						6.6	1.0	15.7	2.1				
	Guerrero	Van Ness	E	5.5 1	.3	5.4 1.9	0.4	1.0	5.8	1.4	24	4.0 2.6	> 9	1.6	3.3	34.4	2.1	5.3	1.2	22.6	2.3	3.8	1.1	30.2	2.4		7 0	0 4		4	6.5	0.9	14.4	1.9	5.0	0.0	40.0	- 4.0
Market/	Van Ness	Drumm	E	6.6 1	. /	7.8 1.2	8.1	1.2	6.7	2.3	3 34	4.2 1.6	o 6	0.6	0.5	7.6	1.8	6.0	0.7	11.7	1.5	5.7	0.3	5.6	1.1	5.	0.	8 1.	3.5 1.	1	6.5	0.9	14.7	1.9	5.9	0.6	10.8	3 1.8
1011018	Drumm	Van Ness	W	6.2 1	.6	5.4 2.1	6.8	2.0	6.1	1.9) 31	1.4 2.0) (.0	0.3	4.3	1.7	7.0	0.5	7.1	1.3	6.1	0.2	3.6	0.9	5.5	o 0.	9 1	.0 1.	3	7.8	1.0	13.1	1.3	7.0	0.9	13.1	. 1.3
	Van Ness	Guerrero	W	6.5 1	.9	7.2 1.2			5.2	1.4	27	7.0 2.2	2 4	.6	0.9	19.6	2.8	4.8	1.2	25.0	2.3	5.8	0.8	13.8	1.9						7.3	2.5	33.9	2.1				
	Guerrero	Castro	W	6.3 3	.1	5.1 2.9			5.2	1.4	27	7.0 2.4	1 6	5.1	0.7	11.5	2.6	4.8	0.7	14.6	2.7	5.5	0.9	15.6	2.8						7.9	1.6	19.9	2.2				
	Castro	Burnett	W						6.1	1.8	3 30	0.1 5.0)																	1	19.3	2.6	13.4	1.2				
	Burnett	Santa Clara	W						13.0	3.8	3 29	9.3 1.7	10	0.6	1.1	10.4	2.1	11.3	2.4	21.2	1.5	11.3	2.0	17.9	1.5	13.	7 3.	0 2	2.0 1.	2 1	15.4	4.4	28.7	1.5	12.8	2.8	22.2	2 1.6
	Santa Clara	Sloat	W																																			
	Page	Geary	Ν				9.5	2.0	8.1	2.0) 24	4.9 2.1	L 7	7.6	1.0	13.2	2.3	6.6	1.2	18.2	1.9	8.0	1.1	13.7	1.6	7.6	õ 1.	0 1	3.1 1.	5	8.8	1.6	18.2	1.6	7.2	1.6	21.8	3 1.8
Masonic	Geary	Bush/Euclid	Ν						9.7	2.9	9 29	9.8 2.3	3																									
MUSUIIU	Presidio	Geary	S						3.1	1.0) 31	1.3 2.9)																									
	Geary	Page	S				8.9	1.9	7.2	1.7	22	2.8 1.9	7	7.8	0.8	10.3	2.5	7.4	1.5	20.3	1.8	7.1	1.5	21.3	1.8	7.5	5 1.	7 2	2.3 1.	7	8.0	2.9	36.9	1.5	6.5	2.2	33.8	3 1.4

					2006		2007		2009		2	011				201	3			2	015				2017				20	19			2	021				20	23	
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANS	SIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT H) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	T AVG. TRANSI	HT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT H) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRAN	SIT COEFFIC	IENT OF AUTO:TRA TION SPEED RA	NSIT AVG. ATIO SPEE	TRANSIT S.C ED (MPH) SPI	D TRANSIT C	OEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANS	SIT S.D TRAN	SIT COEFFICIE	IT OF AUTO:TRANS	IT AVG. TRA	NSIT S.D.TR IPH) SPEED	ANSIT COEFFI (MPH) VAR	TENT OF AUTO:	RANSIT AV	G. TRANSIT EED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSIT	T S.D TRANS	IT COEFFICI	IENT OF AUTO:TE TION SPEED	RANSIT AV	G. TRANSIT FEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT	COEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT
	Sickles	Ocean	Ν	9.4	2.4	7.1	2.8	10.0	2.2	10.2	2.4	23	.9 2.0) 7	.2	1.7	23.6	2.4	9.8	0.5	5.1	1.4	12.	1 1.	2 9	9 1	.2 1	L0.2	1.7	16.8	1.2	11.9	2.0	16	.8 1.	.4 1	L0.4	1.8	17.1	1.6
	Ocean	Cesar Chavez	Ν	8.8	2.2	5.3	2.9	9.0	2.0	9.1	2.1	. 22	.6 1.8	8 8	3.1	0.4	4.9	1.7	8.2	0.4	4.9	1.7	9.	7 1.	8 18	.9 1	.4	9.4	1.6	17.5	1.4	11.8	2.1	17.	.5 1.	.4	9.9	1.6	16.2	1.5
	Cesar Chavez	14th	Ν	7.0	1.8	7.1	1.9	7.1	1.9	7.1	1.7	24	.4 2.0	6	6.8	0.4	5.9	1.7	6.8	0.3	3 4.4	1.6	7.9	0.	7 8	.8 1	.2	7.6	1.2	16.3	1.2	8.2	1.2	15	.0 1.	.5	7.2	1.0	14.6	1.6
	14th	9th	Ν	6.6	1.9	5.7	2.2	7.5	1.8	7.4	2.1	. 28	.4 1.7	7 5	5.4 (0.6	11.1	2.7	5.4	0.9	16.	7 2.5	3.8	3 1.	3 34	.1 2	.4	5.4	1.1	20.3	1.7	7.0	1.7	23	.9 1.	.9	6.1	1.2	20.0	2.1
	9th	3rd	Ν	8.5	1.5	6.4	2.2	9.1	1.5	8.0	1.8	22	.3 1.6	8	3.1 (0.5	6.2	1.9	7.0	0.7	10.0) 1.5	7.9	1.	1 14	.4 1	.3	7.0	1.4	20.8	1.4	9.1	1.9	21	.2 1.	.5	7.6	1.8	24.0	1.5
	3rd	Embarcadero	Ν	5.6	1.4	6.5	1.4	8.2	1.6	6.9	2.3	33	.5 1.6	6	5.8	1.3	19.1	2.1	6.0	1.6	26.	7 1.4	7.6	2.	2 29	.5 0	.9	5.0	1.4	28.5	1.2	6.6	2.0	30	.7 1.	.8	5.2	1.7	32.5	1.6
Mission/Otis	Embarcadero	3rd	S	7.0	1.9	8.6	1.3	7.1	2.0	4.0	3.6	89	.9 2.8	3 3	8.5	0.7	20.0	3.7	6.9	0.9	13.	0 1.3	8.9) 2.	7 30	.0 0	.8	4.8	1.0	20.1	1.6	5.7	3.2	55	.6 2.	.3 4	4.5	1.3	29.1	2.0
	3rd	9th	S	8.4	2.2	4.2	3.1	7.6	2.0	7.8	2.1	. 27	.5 1.9	6	6.9 (0.8	11.6	2.1	7.0	0.8	3 11.4	4 1.6	9.8	3 1.	2 12	.5 1	.2	7.5	1.6	21.8	1.4	9.8	2.0	20	.6 1.	.3	8.1	1.8	21.7	1.4
	9th	14th	S	6.7	1.9	5.7	2.3	6.8	2.0	7.2	2.1	. 29	.1 1.9	9 4	.9	1.0	20.4	2.5	5.6	0.8	3 14.3	3 1.9	2.3	. 0.	5 21	8 5	.0										7.5	2.6	34.5	1.2
	14th	Cesar Chavez	S	6.5	2.0	5.4	2.5	6.6	2.3	6.9	1.7	24	.3 2.0	6	6.6	0.6	9.1	1.9	6.7	0.3	4.5	1.7	7.3	0.	9 11	7 1	.4	7.9	1.6	19.8	1.2	9.1	1.6	17.	.3 1.	.5	7.6	1.3	16.5	1.6
	Cesar Chavez	Ocean	S	8.2	1.8	7.5	1.9	8.1	1.7	8.2	1.9	23	.2 1.9) 7	.2	0.4	5.6	1.8	7.0	0.4	5.7	1.7	9.3	1.	3 14	.6 1	.2	8.4	1.5	17.2	1.2	9.8	1.7	16	.9 1.	.5 (9.0	1.5	17.0	1.6
	Ocean	Sickles	S	9.7	2.2	9.3	1.8	10.9	1.9	9.8	2.1	21	.2 2.0) 9	0.0	0.5	5.6	1.8	8.5	0.6	6 7.1	1.6	8.8	3 1.	8 19	.9 1	.6	9.1	1.8	19.4	1.4	10.8	2.0	18	.5 1.	.6 (9.0	2.3	25.9	1.9
Montgomery	Broadway	Bush	S							6.8	2.1	. 30	.7 1.1	L																										
	Van Ness	Columbus	E	6.8	1.7	6.1	2.5	8.9	1.7	7.8	2.8	35	.5 1.8	3 2	2.7 (0.9	33.3	3.4	8.0	1.5	18.	3 1.1	8.2	2 0.	9 11	1 1	.2	5.9	2.5	42.7	2.2	6.6	3.3	49	.0 2.	.3	6.1	1.8	29.8	2.2
	Columbus	Embarcadero	Е					9.6	1.7	8.4	2.4	28	.8 1.9	9 7	.8 :	3.6	46.2	2.3	7.9	3.8	48.	1 1.1	7.5	3.	3 44	.1 1	.2 2	LO.1	2.8	27.8	1.5	11.9	3.6	30	.4 1.	.4				
North Point	Embarcadero	Columbus	W					10.3	1.5	5.3	2.1	. 38	.7 3.8	3 7	.8 :	1.8	23.1	2.3	6.6	1.1	. 16.	7 1.9	8.0) 1.	3 15	.7 2	.0													
	Columbus	Van Ness	W	7.4	2.6	5.5	2.3	8.2	2.0	5.6	2.2	39	.3 2.4	1 5	5.2	1.2	23.1	2.0	5.7	1.1	. 19.	3 2.3	6.3	L 0.	7 12	.2 2	.0	6.6	2.3	35.0	1.4	7.8	2.9	37	.2 1.	.9	6.8	2.1	31.0	2.0
	Stanyan	Divisadero	E																																					
	Divisadero	Fillmore	E																																					
Oak	Fillmore	Laguna	Е																																					
	Laguna	Franklin	Е																																					
	19th Ave	Miramar	E	9.5	1.3	5.5	2.7																					6.8	1.3	19.1	1.7	12.2	3.3	27	.2 1.	.3				
	Miramar	Howth	Е	9.0	1.6	5.4	2.5			1.5	0.9	59	.2 8.6	5 5	5.4	1.1	20.4	2.6	5.5	0.7	12.	7 2.0	6.0) 0.	69	9 1	.8	7.3	1.9	25.6	1.4	8.4	2.3	26	.8 1.	.6	7.6	1.7	22.4	1.6
Ocean	Howth	Miramar	W	8.3	1.0	6.0	1.8			8.4	2.3	27	.5 1.4	4 5	5.5	1.2	21.8	2.3	4.3	0.6	6 14.0	2.0	4.8	3 1.	1 22	.1 1	.7	6.1	1.1	18.2	1.3	5.2	2.1	39	.7 2.	.7				
	Miramar	19th Ave	W	9.5	1.3	7.6	2.0																					7.3	0.9	12.0	1.7	11.2	2.8	25	.3 1.	.4				
	Market	Fell	N			-													-												-					_				
Octavia	Fell	Market	S																																					
	Gough	Mason	E			-		8.7	1.3	7.7	1.8	23	.4 1.5	5 8	3.5	0.7	8.2	1.6	8.0	0.9) 11.3	3 1.4	4.6	6 1.	8 38	.2 1	.9	8.6	1.5	17.4	1.0	8.9	1.9	21	.1 1.	.3	8.7	2.7	31.0	1.2
O'Farrell	Mason	Market	E					6.9	1.3	5.7	1.7	30	.6 1.4	1 8	3.1	1.1	13.6	1.5	5.3	1.1	20.	3 1.6	5.3	3 3.	1 5	.7 1	.3	5.7	1.5	26.2	1.3	8.1	1.9	23	.7 1.	.4				
	Market	Kearny	W																8.9	4.2	47.2	2 0.8	6.0) 1.	1 18	.5 0	.9	4.7	1.3	26.6	1.4					_				
	Kearny	Leavenworth	W																																					
Pine	Leavenworth	Franklin	W																																					
	Franklin	Presidio	W																																					
	Cesar Chavez	21st	N	6.4	2.7	5.8	4.1	7.3	2.6	8.9	2.3	25	.7 2.4	1 8	3.4	1.6	19.0	1.8	7.9	0.9) 11.4	4 1.0	7.1	. 1.	6 22	2.7 1	.8	6.4	1.5	23.1	2.2	8.5	1.8	20	.9 2.	.0	6.7	1.7	25.6	1.9
	21st	Division	Ν	9.7	1.5	6.1	3.5	9.9	1.6	8.9	2.0	22	.5 2.6	5 7	.8 :	1.0	12.8	2.0	9.0	1.0	11.	1 0.7	9.4	l 1.	5 15	.5 1	.4	9.0	2.8	30.8	1.4	11.3	3.7	32	.7 1.	.5	8.6	1.8	21.4	1.6
Potrero	Division	21st	S	9.4	1.8	7.6	2.7	10.0	2.5	9.6	2.7	28	.2 2.4	1 9	0.0	1.8	20.0	1.6	8.2	1.5	18.	3 1.0	8.8	3 0.	9 10	.3 1	.8	8.9	1.6	18.0	1.5	10.2	2.6	25	.3 1.	.6	8.7	1.5	16.9	1.7
	21st	Cesar Chavez	S	7.4	2.1	5.7	2.8	7.0	2.8	8.6	2.7	31	.0 2.1	L 6	5.0	1.2	20.0	1.4	6.0	1.2	20.	0.7	8.0) 1.	6 20	0.1 2	.2	7.9	2.0	24.6	1.4	8.5	2.1	24	.5 1.	.8	8.2	2.4	28.8	1.5
	County Line	Sloat	N			-				25.9	4.6	17	.9 1.6	5 2:	1.7	3.1	14.3	2.0	16.4	4 3.0) 18.	3 2.2	24.	93.	0 11	.9 1	.4													
Skyline	Sloat	County Line	S							20.0	3.8	19	.0 1.9)									13.	8 1.	6 11	.8 2	.5													
	Skyline	Junipero Serra	E					15.4	1.3	12.4	4.4	35	.8 1.4	1:	1.5 !	5.6	48.7	2.2	11.2	2 10.8	8 96.	4 2.0	10.	5 1.	4 13	.6 1	.9 1	L1.0	2.5	22.4	1.8					1	L1.9	3.5	28.9	1.8
Sloat	Junipero Serra	Skyline	W					14.2	1.9	13.7	4.2	31	.0 2.2	2 1:	2.8	1.9	14.8	2.3	13.2	2 1.5	11.	4 1.9	10.	8 1.	8 16	.4 2	.3 1	L2.6	2.6	20.4	1.8					1	13.2	2.8	21.1	1.8
	Fulton	Turk	N							5.4	1.3	24	.4 2.9)														-	-		-							-		
Stanyan	Turk	Fulton	S								-																													
	-		-																																					

				200)6		2007		2009		20)11			2	013				201	5			20	17			20	19			2	021				202	23
NAME	FROM	то	DIR	AVG. TRANSIT S.D TRANSIT C SPEED (MPH) SPEED (MPH)	DEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANS	IT AVG. TRANS	SIT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT PH) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	IT S.D TRANSIT COEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSIT I) SPEED (MPH) VARIATION SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	T S.D TRANSIT) SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT	OF AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	IT S.D TRANS	SIT COEFFIC	IENT OF AUTO:TRA	ANSIT AVG. TI	RANSIT S.D (MPH) SPE	TRANSIT COE	FFICIENT OF AUT	O:TRANSIT A	VG. TRANSIT PEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	OEFFICIENT OF	AUTO:TRANSIT SPEED RATIO	AVG. TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	S.D TRANSIT SPEED (MPH)	COEFFICIENT	OF AUTO:TRANSIT	AVG. TRANSI SPEED (MPH	S.D TRANS	SIT COEFFIC PH) VARIA	DIENT OF AUTO:T	RANSIT AVG. RATIO SPEE	TRANSIT S	LD TRANSIT CO	VEFFICIENT OF AUTO:TRANSI VARIATION SPEED RATIF
	Divisadero	Gough	Е	11.4	1.4	5.2	3.1	8.2	1.9	7.2	1.7	23.2	1.9	8.1	1.0	12	.3 1.9	7.	.9 1	1.1 1	L3.9 1	1.5	7.7	0.5	6.7	1.4	7.5	1.0	13.0	1.3					8	i.2	1.0	12.0 1.4
_	Market	Mason	W	5.7	2.0	5.8	2.3	6.1	1.9	5.4	2.0	37.6	2.3	5.7	1.4	24	.6 2.1	L 5.	.7 1	1.0 1	17.5 1	1.8	6.3	0.6	9.9	1.3	4.9	0.9	18.7	1.7					5	.5	0.9	17.1 1.8
Sutter	Mason	Gough	W	6.5	2.0	8.4	1.5	6.6	2.2	6.1	1.6	26.2	1.9	6.6	0.9	13	.6 1.9	6.	.4 1	1.4 2	21.9 2	1.7	6.9	0.4	6.0	1.6	5.7	0.9	15.8	1.9					5	.5	0.7	12.0 2.2
	Gough	Divisadero	W	9.1	1.5	6.6	2.4	7.9	1.9	6.8	1.3	19.1	2.0	7.6	1.2	15	.8 1.7	7.	6 0	0.8 1	10.5 1	1.6	7.9	0.7	9.2	1.4	6.8	1.0	15.0	1.8					7	.6	0.8	10.1 1.8
	7th	2nd	Е					10.4	1.1	9.2	2.4	25.6	1.7	7.5	2.0	26	.7 2.3	3 5.	.1 1	1.7 3	33.3 1	1.6	5.5	1.6	29.8	1.6	6.6	2.4	36.9	1.3								
lownsend	2nd	7th	W					10.3	1.3	7.9	2.3	29.2	1.5	5.7	1.2	21	1 2.9	9 5.	.7 3	3.5 6	61.4 1	1.6	5.2	1.1	20.8	1.8	8.0	1.3	15.7	1.1								
	Stanyan	Divisadero	Е	10.5	1.8	5.4	3.5	11.7	1.5	9.8	3.1	32.0	1.8	10.5	2.3	21	.9 1.9) 10).1 1	1.2 1	L1.9 1	1.8	9.5	1.5	16.0	1.5	8.4	1.8	21.1	1.6					8	.4	1.6	18.7 1.7
	Market	Hyde	W					5.8	1.9	5.5	1.6	29.4	2.1	7.0	1.6	22	.9 1.9	6.	.7 1	1.6 2	23.9 2	1.9	6.0	0.8	12.8	1.5	4.5	1.0	23.0	1.9					3	.8	0.6	15.9 2.6
Turk	Hyde	Gough	W							6.6	2.1	31.5	1.7	8.0	1.5	18	.8 1.8	3									4.6	0.9	19.4	1.9								
	Gough	Divisadero	W																																			
	Divisadero	Stanyan	W	10.2	2.1	10.3	3 1.8	10.4	2.5	9.1	3.2	35.5	1.9	8.0	1.8	22	.5 2.4	1 9.	.0 1	1.7 1	L8.9 1	1.9	8.5	1.2	13.6	1.9	8.2	1.8	21.4	2.2					9	1.1	1.6	17.2 1.9
	Cesar Chavez	13th	Ν																																			
	13th	Golden Gate	Ν	5.0	2.0	5.1	2.5	6.4	2.3	5.9	1.8	31.1	2.3	5.7	0.9	15	.8 2.4	1 5.	.7 (0.7 1	L2.3 :	1.7	6.2	0.6	10.0	1.4	6.3	1.4	21.6	1.2	9.2	2.3	24	I.7 1.	6			
	Golden Gate	Washington	Ν	5.3	3.1	7.2	2.4	6.2	2.8	5.5	1.7	30.7	4.0	5.4	0.4	7.	4 2.7	7 5.	.2 (0.4	7.7 2	2.3	6.4	0.6	8.8	2.1	6.1	0.9	14.1	2.2	8.1	1.7	20).6 2.	0 8	.9	1.6	17.7 1.3
Van Ness/S VanNess	Washington	Lombard	Ν	7.9	2.8	6.1	4.4	8.5	3.1	7.8	2.1	26.8	3.2	7.6	0.9	11	.8 2.3	3 7.	4 (0.7	9.5 2	2.2	6.8	1.0	14.7	2.3	5.6	1.3	22.7	3.0	7.0	1.7	24	.6 2	.7			
	Lombard	Washington	S	6.4	2.1	5.4	3.7	6.6	1.9	6.6	2.2	32.8	2.6	6.4	0.7	10	.9 2.1	L 6.	.2 (0.4	6.5 2	2.0	6.6	0.8	12.2	1.7	6.4	1.0	15.7	1.6	6.8	1.4	20).4 1.	9 6	i.6	1.5	22.1 1.5
	Washington	Golden Gate	S	4.1	2.0	7.6	1.4	6.0	2.0	5.6	1.3	23.9	2.1	5.4	0.6	11	.1 2.4	1 5.	.2 (0.6 1	11.5 1	1.9	5.2	0.9	17.5	1.5	5.1	0.7	12.9	1.8	6.4	1.2	19	.5 1.	8 6	i.8	0.8	12.2 1.3
	Golden Gate	13th	S	11.4	0.8	7.7	1.6	6.5	1.9	6.2	1.9	30.0	2.7	6.1	1.0	16	.4 2.3	3 4.	.7 (0.6 1	L2.8 :	1.7	4.2	0.4	9.2	1.6	4.5	0.9	19.6	1.6	7.1	1.7	24	.5 1.	6			
	13th	Cesar Chavez	S							7.1	1.7	24.2	2.6																									
Washington	Drumm	Kearny	W							6.2	2.0	32.3	2.4																									
	Sloat	Ulloa	Ν	6.6	2.3	7.1	2.1			6.1	2.2	36.0	2.5	7.8	3.3	42	.3 1.8	3 11	4 2	2.4 2	21.1 1	1.0	10.9	1.2	11.1	1.1					8.6	2.5	29	9.0 1.	5			
West Portal	Ulloa	Sloat	S	8.9	1.9	6.6	2.3			4.1	1.4	35.3	4.1	8.5	1.8	21	.2 1.6	5 5.	.8 (0.8 1	L3.8 2	2.5	5.7	1.3	22.8	2.3	6.3	1.8	28.8	1.8	6.7	1.9	29).1 2.	0			
	Junipero Serra	Weldon	Е																																			
I-280	Weldon	6th/Brannan	Ν																																			
	County Line	Cortland	Ν		·																																	
US-101	Cortland	I-80	Ν																																			
	I-80	Market	Ν																																			
	Treasure Island	Fremont Exit	W																				17.4	3.5	20.3	1.2												
1-80	Fremont Exit	US-101	W																																			
	6th/Brannan	Weldon	S																	·																		
1-280	Weldon	Junipero Serra	S																																			
	Market	I-80	S																																			
US-101	I-80	Cortland	S																																			
	Cortland	Monster Park Exit	S																																			
	US-101	Fremont Exit	E																																			
1-80	Fremont Exit	Treasure Island	Е																				18.9	2.3	12.3	1.9												

Multimodal Counts Data

KEY TOPICS

- Turning Movement Counts
- Mid-block Counts

In 2023, the Transportation Authority continued to conduct its biennial mid-block and intersection multimodal volume counts. These counts are in addition to the legislatively required CMP performance measures and are therefore not subject to deficiency analyses. Two types of field volume counts were conducted at key locations across San Francisco: turning movement counts and mid-block counts (Figure A7-1). The data collected with these counts are used by agencies for planning and operations activities. Refer to section X.X for the analysis of these volume counts. Note that construction and other activities at individual sites can affect count numbers.





A7.1 Turning Movement Counts

Turning Movement Counts for three modes (vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycle) were conducted at 14 intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods on a single day within the monitoring period (Table A7-1).

	AM P	PEAK (7:00 -	9:00 A.M.)	PM P	PEAK (4:30 -	6:30 P.M.)
LOCATION	VEHICLE TRAFFIC	BICYCLES	PEDESTRIANS	VEHICLE TRAFFIC	BICYCLES	PEDESTRIANS
3rd St and 16th St	1934	52	531	2493	79	576
3rd St and Evans Ave	3053	7	202	2926	10	165
3rd St and Palou Ave	2219	24	507	2562	18	807
6th St and Howard St	2475	72	458	4012	336	856
19th Ave and Holloway Ave	7838	21	770	8991	21	1165
Geneva Ave and Alemany Blvd	4630	8	132	5140	18	187
Leavenworth St and Eddy St	1247	37	963	1208	37	1424
Mission St and 16th St	1882	39	2612	2888	87	4462
Montgomery St and Bush St	2693	39	3596	2155	95	4155
Park Presidio Blvd and Geary Blvd	10748	1	542	11891	10	636
Portola Dr and O'Shaughnessy/Woodside	6702	33	423	7595	52	214
Potrero Ave and 16th St	3582	67	478	4628	81	744
South Van Ness Ave and 13th St	7674	11	175	7626	16	277
Stockton St and Broadway	3458	36	1717	4099	54	3287
Total	60135	447	13106	68214	914	18955

Table A7-1. Average Weekday Multimodal Volumes at Intersection Count Locations 2023

A7.2 Mid-block Counts

Mid-block counts were recorded at 29 locations (of which 16 are one-ways and 13 are two-ways) for at least three consecutive weekdays (Tuesday to Thursday) within the monitoring period. For the CMP 2023, three locations (19th Ave between Moraga and Noriega, Mission St between 24th and 25th, and Van Ness Ave between California and Pine) were extended beyond the 3-day monitoring period to record the following Friday, Saturday and Sunday for a total of six days. Results of weekday¹ average midblock traffic counts from 2015 to 2023 are shown in Table A7-2.²

2 The CMP 2023 corrects and publishes previously unreported mid-block average weekday traffic counts from the CMP 2017 to 2021.

¹ I.e. the data were averaged over Tuesday to Thursday/Friday only.

Table A7-2. Average Weekday Traffic Volumes at Mid-block Count Locations 2015-2023

	DIDECTION	N 2015				2017			2019			2021			2023	
LUCATION	DIRECTION	AM PEAK	PM PEAK	DAILY												
19th Ave Between Moraga And Noriega	NB	2,895.8	4,225.0	32,591.3	4,002.8	4,623.3	35,578.3	3,351.2	4,067.6	30,917.6	2,773.3	4,003.5	25,830.5	3,785.0	4,247.5	29,689.0
19th Ave Between Moraga And Noriega	SB	4,251.8	4,840.8	36,196.8	4,117.8	4,752.3	36,214.0	4,148.6	4,649.2	35,162.2	3,140.0	4,372.8	29,136.0	2,496.8	3,226.8	24,018.5
1St St Between Mission And Minna	SB	2,001.0	1,236.3	15,061.0	2,791.7	1,493.0	21,313.0	2,407.7	2,322.3	21,242.7	1,858.0	1,900.0	17,479.7	844.3	2,213.0	19,440.3
3rd St Between Fitzgerald And Gilman	NB	1,754.0	1,270.3	11,169.3	1,833.7	1,473.7	12,500.7	1,363.3	1,157.0	10,483.0	1,114.7	955.7	8,145.7	1,186.7	1,037.7	9,067.7
3rd St Between Fitzgerald And Gilman	SB	1,217.0	1,501.3	9,892.0	1,052.0	1,682.0	10,751.0	1,360.0	854.7	8,097.0	1,063.0	1,217.3	8,601.0	494.3	1,178.7	8,284.3
3rd St Between Minna And Howard	NB	3,660.7	3,274.0	29,231.0	3,369.7	3,187.7	28,696.0	3,428.7	3,116.0	28,570.0	3,028.3	2,443.3	21,430.7	2,954.0	3,151.3	26,397.0
4th St Between Minna And Howard	SB	1,241.7	2,273.7	14,858.7	1,487.0	2,255.7	16,028.3	1,625.3	2,230.3	18,396.7	1,192.3	2,195.0	14,229.3	751.3	2,076.3	15,055.7
7th St Between Howard And Folsom	NB	2,718.7	2,980.0	22,434.3	2,543.3	2,513.0	20,520.3	2,565.0	2,471.3	20,221.0	1,806.3	1,277.3	11,052.7	2,066.7	1,716.3	14,380.3
8th St Between Tehama And Celementina	SB	2,454.3	1,920.3	19,720.7	2,270.3	2,445.7	18,773.7	1,760.0	1,607.0	12,768.3	846.7	1,570.7	9,574.3	1,451.3	1,712.3	11,651.0
Columbus Ave Between Broadway And Pacific	NB	1,410.7	1,676.7	11,797.7	750.3	1,555.0	9,290.3	774.7	1,666.3	9,457.0	627.0	893.3	5,921.7	748.7	1,029.3	7,124.3
Columbus Ave Between Broadway And Pacific	SB	2,018.3	1,326.7	13,102.0	1,442.0	704.0	8,132.3	1,429.3	844.0	8,591.7	952.7	1,021.7	8,398.0	988.7	1,085.7	8,911.7
Fremont St Between Mission And Natoma	NB	2,493.3	2,109.0	19,928.0	2,520.3	2,116.3	20,011.3	2,596.7	2,393.0	19,458.0	2,666.0	2,146.0	18,384.0	1,403.7	2,431.0	21,823.0
Junipero Serra Blvd Between Font And Brotherhood Ramps	NB	5,930.7	6,234.3	50,643.7	5,147.0	5,382.7	44,693.0	4,663.7	4,964.0	38,361.0	4,947.3	5,565.0	38,614.3	5,005.0	5,398.3	41,785.0
Junipero Serra Blvd Between Font And Brotherhood Ramps	SB	6,408.0	6,720.3	49,438.3	5,664.3	5,870.3	46,211.7	6,335.0	6,448.0	48,518.3	4,640.3	6,037.7	39,574.0	5,737.7	6,327.7	45,505.3
Mission St Between 24th And 25th	NB	1,029.3	986.5	7,607.8	359.5	409.3	3,527.3	719.0	981.0	7,161.2	282.0	460.8	3,167.0	421.3	831.0	5,617.5
Mission St Between 24th And 25th	SB	508.0	1,090.3	7,066.8	399.0	757.8	5,220.8	501.0	848.8	6,215.8	469.5	1,099.0	6,802.8	511.8	1,243.0	7,771.5
San Jose Ave Between Randall And Saint Mary'S	NB	3,398.7	2,867.3	20,457.0	3,201.7	2,915.3	20,002.3	2,988.0	2,445.7	18,536.0	2,571.0	2,234.3	15,367.7	2,942.3	2,787.7	17,483.3
San Jose Ave Between Randall And Saint Mary'S	SB	2,354.3	3,247.7	17,792.7	2,683.3	3,566.3	20,001.0	2,217.0	3,525.7	19,520.3	1,485.3	3,065.0	15,429.7	2,001.3	3,151.7	17,034.0
The Embarcadero Between Broadway And Washington	NB	2,575.7	2,202.0	19,132.0	2,739.7	2,697.3	21,111.7	2,518.7	2,514.3	19,287.0	1,450.3	1,326.3	11,122.7	926.7	1,462.0	12,346.7
The Embarcadero Between Broadway And Washington	SB	2,140.0	1,664.0	16,424.0	2,111.3	2,123.3	16,690.7	1,596.7	1,482.3	12,928.3	1,040.3	1,702.7	10,974.7	914.7	2,017.7	14,795.3
Van Ness Ave Between California And Pine	NB	2,975.0	2,807.8	25,609.0	-	-	-	1,770.4	1,960.6	14,953.4	768.0	1,816.3	9,567.5	875.0	1,920.3	10,536.5
Van Ness Ave Between California And Pine	SB	2,061.3	3,087.0	22,205.3	-	-	-	2,469.4	2,043.0	16,468.2	1,628.0	1,490.5	11,334.5	1,736.3	1,594.5	12,368.8
Bay St Between Leavenworth And Columbus	EB	2,562.3	1,324.7	11,571.7	2,381.3	1,321.7	11,872.0	2,500.3	1,350.3	12,424.3	942.0	998.3	6,839.7	2,069.7	1,113.7	8,970.3
Bay St Between Leavenworth And Columbus	WB	947.3	2,357.0	10,806.0	1,121.3	2,690.7	13,054.3	2,237.7	1,641.0	11,776.0	663.0	1,195.7	6,927.0	744.3	1,733.7	8,585.0
Broadway Tunnel Between Larkin And Powell	EB	2,113.7	1,867.0	16,423.3	2,235.7	2,000.0	15,725.3	2,380.3	2,239.7	18,225.0	1,802.0	1,418.0	11,606.0	2,416.7	2,077.0	16,006.3
Broadway Tunnel Between Larkin And Powell	WB	1,295.0	2,412.3	14,345.3	1,167.0	2,181.0	13,182.7	1,167.3	2,099.0	12,733.3	973.0	1,219.7	7,851.0	822.0	1,862.0	9,900.3
Bryant St Between 4th And 3rd	EB	3,227.0	1,680.3	20,518.0	3,328.0	1,923.7	22,227.3	3,410.3	1,765.3	22,195.3	1,786.0	1,367.3	14,708.3	1,876.0	1,463.3	15,574.0
Bush St Between Grant And Kearny	EB	3,693.3	3,244.0	29,037.0	2,343.0	1,770.0	15,757.3	2,471.7	1,607.3	16,196.0	1,352.3	1,351.7	11,503.0	2,030.3	1,615.7	13,903.0
Bush St Between Van Ness And Polk	EB	2,984.7	2,021.0	21,215.0	3,048.3	2,185.3	19,063.7	2,849.0	2,318.0	18,563.3	1,828.0	2,072.3	14,015.0	693.7	1,927.3	16,288.3
Cesar Chavez St Between York And Hampshire	EB	3,287.0	3,782.3	28,494.3	3,538.0	3,275.7	25,209.0	3,194.3	3,106.7	24,363.0	2,444.7	2,955.3	20,300.0	2,979.3	3,105.0	21,084.3
Cesar Chavez St Between York And Hampshire	WB	3,592.0	3,282.3	25,407.3	3,190.7	3,659.0	26,136.3	2,871.0	3,557.7	25,532.7	2,873.3	3,112.3	22,345.0	3,104.0	3,644.7	25,069.3
Fell St Between Divisadero And Scott	WB	2,815.0	4,080.3	28,481.0	3,212.0	4,555.7	32,042.3	3,211.0	4,711.0	31,660.7	2,944.0	3,786.0	26,827.0	1,024.7	2,957.0	26,131.3
Geary Blvd Between Laguna And Gough	EB	3,298.0	2,099.0	18,188.7	2,371.3	1,863.0	15,866.7	2,606.7	1,773.7	15,030.7	1,412.7	1,274.7	10,258.3	1,931.7	1,424.3	12,249.7
Geary Blvd Between Laguna And Gough	WB	1,498.7	2,595.3	16,443.0	1,226.3	2,485.3	13,993.0	1,486.7	2,585.3	15,105.3	1,141.0	1,675.0	10,536.7	1,293.7	2,227.3	12,759.0
Golden Gate Ave Between Van Ness And Polk	EB	1,997.3	1,726.3	13,568.7	1,972.3	1,637.3	13,172.0	1,493.0	1,504.0	10,888.3	685.3	846.0	5,840.7	827.3	1,050.0	5,965.3
Harrison St Between 4th And 3rd	WB	2,489.0	3,177.7	24,093.3	2,753.7	3,275.7	26,424.3	1,625.0	2,181.0	15,291.0	1,293.7	1,790.7	12,948.0	1,445.7	1,861.0	14,131.0
Lombard St Between Broderick And Divisadero	EB	3,919.7	2,938.7	25,346.3	3,890.0	2,253.0	21,848.7	3,767.0	2,453.7	21,362.0	3,262.3	2,082.0	17,101.3	3,846.0	2,930.0	22,578.0
Lombard St Between Broderick And Divisadero	WB	2,214.0	3,819.7	25,452.0	1,926.0	3,073.7	19,532.0	1,882.0	3,184.0	21,952.3	1,499.0	3,428.0	19,351.3	1,797.0	3,193.0	20,062.0
Oak St Between Divisadero And Scott	EB	3,616.3	3,095.3	27,873.3	3,919.7	3,453.3	30,982.0	4,339.7	3,678.7	32,806.0	3,370.7	3,180.3	26,317.0	1,698.7	2,914.0	25,153.3
Pine St Between Grant And Kearny	WB	1,542.0	2,164.0	15,108.7	1,552.3	2,333.3	16,514.0	1,604.3	2,888.7	17,430.0	1,869.3	1,884.0	14,314.7	1,655.3	2,349.3	16,380.0
Pine St Between Van Ness And Polk	WB	1,276.0	2,866.7	18,327.0	1,816.3	3,111.0	21,030.0	1,636.0	3,143.0	18,898.0	1,843.7	2,306.7	15,872.0	1,815.3	2,829.7	18,555.3
Turk St Between Van Ness And Polk	WB	1,230.7	1,825.0	11,917.0	1,173.7	1,787.7	11,348.3	949.3	1,350.7	8,793.7	668.0	700.3	5,395.3	798.3	1,151.7	6,877.3

Notes: NB = northbound, SB = southbound, EB = eastbound, WB = westbound; No data collection at Van Ness Ave Between California And Pine in 2017 due to construction.

Travel Demand Management

KEY TOPICS

- TDM General Plan Objectives
- TDM Requirements
- TDM Policies
- TDM Programs
- TDM Studies and Plans

A8.1 TDM General Plan Objectives

The Transportation Element of the General Plan lays out the City's policy of transitoriented solutions for accommodating growth in travel demand and discouraging single-occupant automobile travel:

Objective 3: Maintain and enhance San Francisco's position as a regional destination without inducing a greater volume of through automobile traffic.

Objective 4: Maintain and enhance San Francisco's position as the hub of a regional, city-centered transit system.

Objective 7: Develop a parking strategy that encourages short-term parking at the periphery of downtown and long-term intercept parking at the periphery of the urbanized bay area to meet the needs of long-distance commuters traveling by automobile to San Francisco or nearby destinations.

Objective 10: Develop and employ methods of measuring the performance of the city's transportation system that respond to its multi-modal nature.

Objective 11: Establish public transit as the primary mode of transportation in San Francisco and as a means through which to guide future development and improve regional mobility and air quality.

Objective 16: Develop and implement programs that will efficiently manage the supply of parking at employment centers throughout the city so as to discourage single-occupant ridership and encourage ridesharing, transit and other alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.

Objective 17: Develop and implement parking management programs in the downtown that will provide alternatives encouraging the efficient use of the area's limited parking supply and abundant transit services.

Objective 20: Give first priority to improving transit service throughout the city, providing a convenient and efficient system as a preferable alternative to automobile use.

Objective 21: Develop transit as the primary mode of travel to and from downtown and all major activity centers within the region.

Objective 23: Improve the city's pedestrian circulation system to provide for efficient, pleasant, and safe movement.

Objective 27: Ensure that bicycles can be used safely and conveniently as a primary means of transportation, as well as for recreational purposes.

Objective 28: Establish parking rates and off-street parking fare structures to reflect the full costs, monetary and environmental, of parking in the city.

Objective 32: Limit parking in downtown to help ensure that the number of auto trips to and from downtown will not be detrimental to the growth or amenity of downtown.

Objective 34: Relate the amount of parking in residential areas and neighborhood commercial districts to the capacity of the city's street system and land use patterns.

A8.2 TDM Requirements

A8.2.1 REGIONAL TDM REQUIREMENTS – TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES

San Francisco is subject to regional air district requirements to implement TDM measures (also referred to as Transportation Control Measures) to address air quality issues. In 1991 as required by the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) jointly prepared the first Bay Area Clean Air Plan, which included measures to reduce the total number of trips and miles traveled, ("Transportation Control Measures," or TCMs). The most recent Plan, the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan, was adopted by BAAQMD in April 2017. The Plan addresses greenhouse gases, as well as ozone, particulate matter, and air toxics. It also included new and revised TCMs. The 2017 Clean Air Plan focuses on laying groundwork for a long-term effort to reduce Bay Area GHG emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. It also updates the 2010 Clean Air Plan, to fulfill state ozone planning requirements and includes all feasible measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors - reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) – and reduce transport of ozone and its precursors to neighboring air basins. In addition, the Plan builds upon and enhances the Air District's efforts to reduce emissions of fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants.

Local agencies are expected to incorporate TCMs into planning and implementation for transportation and land use programs. The region, through the MTC, is held responsible for overall progress toward the stated goals. The CMP process provides an opportunity to integrate local planning and programming into the regional air quality planning process. Appendix 9 lists the currently adopted regional TCMs, and discusses how San Francisco's congestion management strategies contribute to, or reinforce, these measures.

A8.2.2 TDM REQUIREMENTS ON NEW DEVELOPMENT

Area Plans and Development Agreements

Numerous TDM requirements are included within area plans and negotiated agreements for major developments. Significant examples include the following:

- The Transit Center District Plan emphasizes Transportation Demand Management as a means of reducing the reliance on automobiles and encouraging mode shifts to transit, carpooling, bicycling, and walking. The plan goals state that 95 percent of trips should be made by transit, walking, or bicycling. It includes supplementary objectives to reach this goal, such as parking supply and management tools; transit incentives, and expansion of Section 163 requirements (see below).
- The Park Merced Transportation Plan includes shuttles to Daly City BART and a Shopper's Shuttle to local destinations. In addition, a transportation coordinator will coordinate and manage additional TDM programs.
- The Candlestick Point & Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II
 Transportation Plan proposes new bus service and infrastructure, and requires a Transportation Coordinator to manage unbundled parking, bicycle support facilities, provide transit passes (paid by homeowner's dues), and implement dynamic pricing for visitor parking. The TDM Program will target both residents and employers in the area, with employers expected to provide bicycle parking and amenities, carpooling and vanpooling services, Guaranteed Ride Home program, information on transportation alternatives, commuter checks, telecommuting options, and parking cash-out programs.

- The Treasure Island Transportation Implementation Plan includes a congestion pricing program, parking policies, mandatory pre-paid transit vouchers, ramp metering, and special events and emergency access transportation planning. The program will disincentivize residents' use of personal automobiles and increase the appeal of transit, walking, and bicycling. In addition, the parking policies will utilize parking maximums instead of minimums, and unbundle parking prices. Transit passes would also be mandatory for residential units and hotel guests. Additional TDM programs proposed in this plan include Bay Area Bikeshare stations, carshare availability, and employer TDM programs. In 2014, the San Francisco Transportation Authority was designated as the Mobility Management Agency for Treasure Island, and will be responsible for implementation of TDM on Treasure Island.
- The Southern Bayfront Strategy is a collection of neighborhoods and communities along San Francisco's eastern waterfront bounded by Mission Creek to the north and Executive Park to the south. Another 20,000 new households and 38,000 new jobs are planned within four major developments that are moving forward in the next several years through negotiated development agreements (DAs) with the city: Mission Rock, Pier 70, Potrero Power Station, and India Basin. The large DA projects present opportunities to go beyond the framework of the city's TDM Ordinance. Each of the DAs within the Southern Bayfront Strategy includes a "trip cap," a program to monitor and restrict the number of SOV trips allowed to be generated by the projects.

Institutional Master Plans

TDM measures are also present in Institutional Master Plans (IMP), which city planning code requires for all medical and post-secondary educational institutions in the City and County of San Francisco; currently 41 institutions are subject to the requirement. IMPs describe any planned campus expansions and present mitigations for reducing the impact of the expansion on the surrounding neighborhood; this could include TDM measures such as shuttles, changes to parking policy, etc. For example, the IMP prepared by the California Pacific Medical Center in 2008 describes the campus TDM program, which includes elements such as free transit passes, vanpool subsidies, and other measures.

Section 163 Requirements and TMASF

Planning Code Section 163 requires that all new development of over 100,000 square feet of new office space (or 25,000 square feet in some districts), or 100 residential units in specific zoning designations undertake measures to mitigate impacts on the transportation system, for the lifetime of the project. Section 163 was

first added to the Planning Code in 1985 (Ordinance 414-85) as a means to mitigate the transportation impacts, and thus allow a greater density of development than would otherwise be possible. It was subsequently expanded to all new development of over 100,000 square feet in downtown areas zoned C-3, and has more recently been expanded again to include other non-residential, office space outside of the C-3-O, and residential development

Planning Code 163 requires that project sponsors provide onsite transportation brokerage and management service to building occupants that include coordination, encouragement, and promotion of TDM activities, including:

- Transit and ridesharing
- Reduced parking demand and efficient use of parking
- Provision of car-sharing pods and use of carsharing services (per Section 166)
- Flex-time or staggered work hours program
- Other activities determined by the Planning Department to be appropriate to meeting the purpose of this requirement

Buildings can elect to meet Section 163 requirements on their own or by contracting with a City-approved provider (or vendor) of transportation brokerage services or administering TDM services on their own. Currently, TMASF Connects, a non-profit organization, is the only City-approved vendor of transportation brokerage services. TMASF was first incorporated as a non-profit in 1989 and began to provide transportation management services in 1990. TMASF provides information support and promotions to its currently 68 member building tenants to reduce drive alone rates. Its member buildings report a single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) mode share of less than 10 percent in the last several years. TMASF's activities include providing a newsletter, issuing traveler alerts, and organizing periodic campaigns to promote sustainable commute alternatives.

Mission Bay Transportation Management Association

As a condition of the Mission Bay Development Plan, the Mission Bay Transportation Management Association (TMA) was formed and began operating in May 2010. The TMA operates shuttle service to and from BART and Caltrain, facilitates TDM marketing, provides bicycle parking assistance, and provides information via a website. Membership includes all property owners and developers, including the recent addition of the Golden State Warriors with the completion of Chase Arena in Fall 2019. According to the 2017 Mission Bay Annual Report, annual shuttle ridership has experienced declines since peaking at over 375,000 in 2014 to under 325,000 in 2017. Mission Bay TMA shuttles serve multiple areas of the City, not just Mission Bay, and the service area has changed over time as the district has been built out and partnerships with other areas have been established and ended.

Planning Code Requirements

The San Francisco Planning Code contains numerous additional requirements to help ensure new developments include features to support sustainable transportation. For example:

- Unbundled parking is required for residential buildings with ten or more dwelling units
- Carshare parking is required for residential and nonresidential development
- Secure bicycle parking is required across most types of development
- Showers and lockers are required for most commercial uses and for large retail uses.

A8.3 TDM Policies

A8.3.1 COMMUTER BENEFITS ORDINANCE

In August 2008, the City enacted a landmark Commuter Benefits Ordinance (CBO), which became effective on January 19, 2009. The ordinance requires businesses with locations in San Francisco and more than 20 employees to offer commuter benefits such as transit, vanpool, and bicycle programs to their eligible employees. In 2012, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission implemented a similar program on a pilot basis, but focused on employers with fifty or more full-time employees in the region (the local ordinance applies to employers in San Francisco with at least twenty employees nationwide).

The San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) is working with the region to coordinate both the local and regional ordinances for seamless implementation and program management. SFE works with employers with fewer than 50 employees and coordinates with the region when outreaching to employers with 50 or more employees. To date, 2520 employers subject to the SF Commuter Benefits Ordinance have submitted a compliance form, with a cumulative 25,000 employees participating in their employer's commuter benefit program.

A8.3.2 SFMTA COMMUTER SHUTTLE POLICY

Numerous employers, educational institutions, medical facilities, office buildings, and transportation management associations offer shuttle service to their employees, students, and clients. Some buildings are required to provide shuttle service as part of their conditions of approval, and an employer may comply with San Francisco's

Commuter Benefits Ordinance by offering a free commute shuttle to employees. The majority of the commuter shuttles are closed systems that provide service to a specific population and are not open to the general public. Most shuttles are provided for free to employees (or students, tenants, etc.).

In 2014, SFMTA launched the Commuter Shuttles Pilot Program to create clear and enforceable locations and guidelines for private shuttle loading and unloading and reduce conflicts with Muni and other vehicles. In October, 2015, SFMTA released a Commuter Shuttle Policy that permits ongoing use of the shared stops subject to additional requirements. In February 2017, SFMTA approved the continuation of the Commuter Shuttle Program, based in part on a mid-year evaluation and commuter shuttles hub study. The hub study, conducted jointly by SFMTA and the Transportation Authority, found that a "hub" model, which would concentrate commuter shuttle stops at a small number of designated locations in the city, would dramatically reduce shuttle ridership, increase driving by current shuttle riders, and increase the risk for crashes in the city. The mid-year evaluation found that the existing program had led to a lower potential for conflicts with Muni, fewer shuttles on small, residential streets, a cleaner vehicle fleet, a reduced potential for service disruptions, including those arising from labor disputes, and increased enforcement for violations of parking laws. The updated program allows the SFMTA to establish shuttle vehicle accessibility guidelines and to issue higher penalties for repeated violations of the shuttle permit terms and conditions.

A8.3.3 SFMTA CARSHARING POLICY

Carsharing programs are encouraged in San Francisco as a means to reduce car ownership and decrease VMT¹. The precise number of carsharing members in San Francisco is unknown but is likely increasing, as new car sharing vendors like GIG Car Share expand the market.

To further encourage carsharing, SFMTA developed a carsharing policy in 2013. The policy outlines the On-Street Car Sharing Pilot Program whereby private carsharing companies can apply to use on-street parking spaces for carshare vehicles. As of December 2019, 237 on-street parking spaces were reserved for carshare vehicles. A 2017 evaluation of the pilot program found that car share cars enrolled in the program were in use 6 hours a day, relative to 1 hour a day for a private vehicle, and were used on-average by 19 unique users per month.

A8.3.4 PARKING MANAGEMENT

The General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Code guide parking management in San Francisco. San Francisco's existing parking policies are intended to support

1 Cervero, R., Golub, A., & Nee, B. (2007). City CarShare: Longer-term travel demand and car ownership impacts. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 1992, 70-80. the city's development, and have been especially successful in the downtown area by limiting the provision of parking provided with new office development. Parking policies are also designed to support the City's Transit First policy through a combination of regulatory controls, revenue transfers, regulations, and incentives. In November 2007, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, which shifted responsibility for parking regulations, fees, and fines from the Board of Supervisors to SFMTA. In 2007, the Transportation Authority and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) applied for and subsequently received a U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Urban Partnership Program (UPP) grant, which includes \$19.4 million for a demonstration of variable parking pricing as part of the Federal initiative to fight congestion. SFMTA's SFpark program was a demonstration project funded through the Department of Transportation's Urban Partnership Program wherethe SFMTA used several strategies to make it easier to find a space and improve the parking experience, including:

- Demand-responsive pricing
- Making it easier to pay at meters and avoid citations
- Longer time limits
- Improved user interface and product design
- Improved information for drivers, including static directional signs to garages and real-time information about where parking is available on- and off-street
- Highly transparent, rules-based, and data-driven approach to making changes to parking prices

SFpark piloted and cultivated several emerging technologies, including smart meters, parking sensors, and a sophisticated data management tool. The demonstration ran from 2010-2014, after which SFMTA evaluated the program. The evaluation found several benefits including better parking availability, improved ease of payment, and reduced circling for parking and associated reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled, among other benefits. After the end of the pilot demonstration, the SFMTA Board established an ongoing demand-responsive parking policy, with meter rate adjustments made approximately once a quarter. Using meter payment data to estimate parking occupancy, the SFMTA raises the rate by \$0.25 on blocks where average occupancy is above 80%, lowers the rate \$0.25 on blocks that hit the target occupancy between 60% and 80%.

A8.4 TDM Programs

A8.4.1 EMERGENCY RIDE HOME PROGRAM

The San Francisco Department of Environment (SFE)'s Emergency Ride Home (ERH) program promotes sustainable commuting by ensuring a free or low-cost ride home in cases of emergency. The program pays for a ride home for employees of registered businesses in the event of illness, severe crisis, unscheduled overtime, or disruption of carpool or vanpool schedules. The program is designed to remove some of the risks and reliability concerns associated with the choice of carpooling or relying on transit service for the commute trip. SFE promotes the ERH program to City employees and all San Francisco employers and commuters.

A8.4.2 CARPOOLS

SFMTA encourages the use of carpools and vanpools during the morning and evening commutes. The City provides a casual carpool pick-up location on Beale Street between Howard and Folsom, adjacent to the Temporary Transbay Terminal site. At this location, there is signage indicating several East Bay destination locations.

SFMTA also administers a program through which major employers (those with Transportation Brokerage Services described above) may provide parking for employee carpool vehicles (three or more riders) in City-owned garages at a reduced rate. The City also provides a limited amount of designated on-street parking in the downtown area for registered/permitted vanpool vehicles.

A8.4.3 BIKE SHARING

Bay Wheels, formerly known as Ford GoBike and Bay Area Bike Share, opened on August 29, 2013 with 700 bikes at 70 stations in San Francisco and along the peninsula as a pilot program of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Originally operated by Alta Bikeshare, MTC transferred operations to Motivate in May of 2015, and in 2017 Motivate expanded the program to 5 Bay Area Cities with 540 stations and 7,000 bicycles, including a substantial expansion within San Francisco. Currently, there are over 300 stations in San Francisco. The bike share system is integrated with the clipper card program, allowing both individual trips and memberships to be accessed via the clipper card. In 2018, Lyft purchased Motivate and assumed operations of Ford GoBike, changing the name to Bay Wheels in 2019.

During 2018 and 2019, San Francisco also conducted a pilot permit for JUMP (owned by Uber) to provide dockless electric assist bikes (e-bikes) on City streets. In 2019, SFMTA expanded this to other operators. Currently, dockless e-bikes make up half of the Bay Wheels fleet. In 2023, the MTC and Lyft reached an agreement on a \$16 million expansion of the Bay Wheels system. The expansion includes over 1,000 nextgeneration docked-only e-bikes and 19 new stations in San Francisco. Several stations will support in-dock charging to reduce operational vehicle miles travelled due to less battery swapping. The expansion also includes membership price reductions and a discounted student membership pilot.

A8.4.4 E-BIKE DELIVERY PILOT

The City of San Francisco's Department of the Environment is conducting a pilot program that involves providing 35 free electric bikes to delivery drivers. The pilot is designed to reduce carbon emissions and determine the viability of e-bikes for delivery services. Data will be collected from the e-bikes and compared to a control group of delivery drivers using cars, helping the program operators to evaluate the validity of the delivery e-bikes. The one-year pilot program will provide food delivery workers with e-bikes to use for making deliveries. The program will monitor the impact e-bikes have on delivery efficiency and worker revenue while assessing bike safety.

A8.5 TDM Studies and Plans

A8.5.1 TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE

The SFMTA, City Planning Department, and SFCTA partnered to craft the Travel Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance as part of the Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP). The TDM Ordinance introduced TDM requirements on new construction or changes of land use in San Francisco, and provides a toolkit to aid developers in designing an appropriate TDM program. The toolkit will be used to ensure a consistent approach to including TDM in new development and ensuring that the most effective measures are prioritized. The inter-agency team is committed to analyzing the effectiveness of TDM measures, through research, to improve the toolkit by prioritizing the most effective measures. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the ordinance on February 7, 2017.

The SF Moves Pilot was conducted through collecting data on Mission residents' travel habits using daily text-message polls asking participants to report the number of sustainable trips and car trips they took each day during the Challenge. The more sustainable trips a participant reported and the more text polls they responded to, the greater their chances of winning a prize.

The target geographic area of the Challenge was San Francisco's Mission neighborhood – specifically the 4-block radius around the 20th and Shotwell Slow Streets, the latter of which was made permanent in August 2021. SFE chose this area for the pilot due to its ample access to low-carbon transportation options, and high concentration of BIPOC residents.

The target audience of the Challenge was Mission residents with a particular focus on Spanish-speaking and low-income residents. The Challenge was run in both English
and Spanish, and garnered significant participation in both languages with 75% English language participation and 25% Spanish language participation.

A8.5.2 SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The San Francisco Transportation Plan 2050 identifies TDM as a systematic approach to shift how, when, and where people travel through programs and policies and an effective tool to address the rise in congestion associated with population and job growth. The SFTP recommends that San Francisco establish a vision and measurable goals for the future TDM strategy to guide development, implementation, and monitoring; identify priority geographic areas, trip types, travel markets, traveler types, and success metrics to guide program selection and implementation details; and provide guidance for how to incorporate ongoing evaluation to track impacts on modeshift and cost effectiveness and guide future TDM investments. This recommendation is reflected in the upcoming TDM Market Analysis and an upstate to the 2017 TDM Plan.

A8.5.3 SF BUSINESS RELOCATION TDM PROJECT

This is an effort led by SFMTA to develop and operate a program focused on addressing the transportation needs of employees at businesses that are opening in or relocating to new locations in San Francisco. The program was originally scoped to provide transportation planning services and materials to businesses to help their employees travel to work in their new location without driving alone, thus setting a more sustainable commute habit from the get-go, rather than trying to change habits after they have already been set.

The intention of targeting businesses with a TDM intervention as they relocate was to capitalize on a window of opportunity when large numbers of commuters are selecting a new route to work and have not yet formed mode habits that are difficult to influence. The emergence of COVID and resulting health orders changed the business and commute environment such that identifying and targeting businesses as they moved into San Francisco or moved office locations within San Francisco has become infeasible.

However, public health orders requiring office-based businesses to have their employees work-from-home to the greatest extent possible has created a new form of "relocation" – first from the office to remote work locations, followed by a substantial shift of employees returning to their offices when restrictions are eased. After months of working remotely, each returning employee will be selecting a new route and mode(s) to their office, shaped by new motivations and constraints, opening a similar opportunity to influence mode choice as exists when a business relocates their office.

For these reasons SFMTA amended the project scope to shift the target population from businesses as they relocate between offices, to all office-based businesses as changing public health orders allow an increasing number of employees to return to office settings. Given the changes in return to office trends and the city's recovery, this project was paused and will be rescoped to reflect learnings from Phase 2. **APPENDIX 9**

San Francisco Trip Reduction Efforts: Relationship to Regional Transportation Control Measures

REGIONAL TCM	LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION
A-1. Local and Area-wide Bus	The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) is currently implementing MuniForward, a major program to upgrade Muni service throughout the city. It includes service and route changes, capital upgrades, and other enhancements to nearly every major bus and rail transit route in the city. Upgrades are designed to make Muni faster and more reliable, and to improve safety.
Service Improvements.	The city also has several major transit improvement projects underway. The Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project is currently under construction. The Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project has a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) that secured state and federal environmental clearance by 2018. SFMTA is also in the process of replacing its fleet with a goal towards zero emissions.
TCM	LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION
	The Muni Forward project mentioned above includes numerous upgrades to Muni rail service. Five of the seven Muni rail line have capital projects underway (either in the study or implementation phase) to improve service quality and reliability.
A-2. Improve Local & Regional Rail Service	The Transportation Authority continues to advocate and program funds for local and regional rail improvement projects, such as Phase 2 of the Third Street Light Rail Project (Central Subway), Caltrain electrification and signal improvements, BART station improvements, and the downtown extension of Caltrain and High Speed Rail to the rebuilt Transbay Terminal. Construction on Central Subway began in 2011 and the Transbay Terminal opened in 2019. The Transportation Authority completed the feasibility study for a major upgrade to the M-Ocean view line that would underground portions of the line and extend it to Park Merced. The Transportation Authority and SFMTA recently completed a Subway Vision that creates a framework for subway expansion throughout the city and identifies likely corridors. The corridors from the Subway Vision are currently being evaluated as part of the ConnectSF Transit Corridor Study. The Transportation Authority partnered with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and numerous other agencies to complete a Core Capacity Transit Study that recommended a suite of projects to address transit crowding and unreliability in corridors into downtown San Francisco. The Transportation Authority will be partnering with BART and Capitol Corridor to further evaluate new proposed BART and conventional rail alignments across the Bay.
B-1. Freeway & Arterial Operations Strategies	Implementation of this TCM is being coordinated by Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). SFMTA's SFgo program is developing an integrated traffic management system managed from a centralized transportation control center. In addition, the Program is working with Caltrans to coordinate freeway improvements with the City's traffic management systems. As part of this project, SFMTA is working to replace aging signal controllers and install signals with transit priority capabilities on key transit routes.
B-2. Transit Efficiency & Use	Major transit operators in San Francisco, including Muni, BART, AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit, Caltrain, and SamTrans, all accept the Clipper card for fare payment. In addition, BART is upgrading signage at its downtown stations to ease wayfinding. Muni is upgrading signage, lighting, and other architectural aspects of its downtown stations. San Francisco has also worked to have discounted or free transit passes be part of TDM and mitigation programs required of new developers such as Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard, Treasure Island, California Pacific Medical Center, and Park Merced. San Francisco State University has implemented a discount transit pass for trips on BART and Muni.
B-3. Bay Area Express Lane Network	Implementation of this TCM is being led by MTC. An HOV pricing structure exists on the approaches to San Francisco via the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge during peak commute hours, with separate HOV lanes on the Bay Bridge. Express buses will continue to operate in San Francisco and will be prioritized through the new Transbay Terminal. The Transportation Authority completed the Freeway Corridor Management Study and is initiating a Caltrans Project Initiation Document (PID) and environmental clearance process for potential express lanes alternatives that may include high occupancy vehicle or high occupancy toll lanes on portions of U.S. 101 and I-280. These lanes would connect to high occupancy toll lanes being implemented on U.S. 101 in San Mateo County.

тсм	LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION		
B-4. Goods movement Improvements & Emission Reduction Strategies	Implementation of this TCM is being led by MTC and BAAQMD. San Francisco will work with BAAQMD to implement grant programs that fund diesel emission reduction programs. As part of ConnectSF, the Transportation Authority is evaluating changes in the delivery of goods in San Francisco and opportunities to increase the efficiency and sustainability of freight movement in the City.		
C-1. Voluntary Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program.	The San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) currently conducts many of the City's employer based Transportation Demand Management (TDM) activities, funded in part through Prop K. These activities currently include the commuter benefits program; Emergency Ride Home (ERH) program; bicycle fleet (e.g. CityCycle) program; and regional ridesharing program. The San Francisco Planning Department also conducts compliance monitoring of office buildings required to have a TDM program.		
	In 2017, city agencies developed a joint San Francisco TDM Plan: 2017-2020. This workplan, based on the 2014 strategy, identifies the employer-oriented policies, projects, and programs the city can implement to accomplish its TDM goals.		
C-2. Safe Routes to School & Safe Routes to Transit Programs	The San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency manages San Francisco's Safe Routes to Schools program, which conducts education, encouragement, and related programs at elementary, middle and high schools in San Francisco. These programs are designed to encourage schoolchildren to walk and bicycle to school rather than driving in the family car.		
C-3. Ridesharing Services & Incentives	SFE is the MTC-delegated agency that oversees the Regional Rideshare Program in the City, including introducing employers to TDM programs, promoting rideshare, and encouraging and assisting employers to implement rideshare. SFMTA promotes the use of carpools and vanpools during the morning and evening commutes. The City provides a casual carpool pick-up location for evening commutes on Spear Street between Howard and Folsom Streets. SFMTA also administers a program through which major employers may provide parking for employee carpool vehicles (3 or more riders) in City-owned garages at a reduced rate. The City also provides a limited amount of designated on-street parking in the downtown area for registered vanpool vehicles. Finally, buildings subject to Section 163 Planning Code Requirements are required to encourage alternatives to driving alone, including through ridesharing and carpooling.		
C-4. Conduct Public Outreach & Education	Implementation of this TCM (e.g., Spare the Air Days) is occurring through the Air District, MTC, and transit operators throughout the region, as well as through local agency activities, including the ongoing SF Moves pilot project to provide outreach and education to neighborhoods in San Francisco, and the completed TDM Partnership Project which involved employer outreach and education. Additionally, buildings subject to the Section 163 Planning Code requirement must engage in outreach and education activities, such as those provided by the downtown TMA.		
C-5. Smart Driving	Implementation of this TCM is being led by MTC. San Francisco does have a traffic calming program, funded through Prop K and implemented by SFMTA, which includes speed reduction on arterials streets. However, speeding on freeways in San Francisco is generally not a major concern due to relatively dense traffic conditions within the city limits.		
D-1. Bicycle Access and Facilities Improvements.	Since the Bicycle Plan injunction was lifted in 2010, the City and County have moved rapidly to implementation. The SFMTA has installed more than 50 miles of bicycle lanes since 2008, using Prop K as well as regional funding for many projects. Progress on the Plan has also included separated and buffered bike lanes, bike boxes at intersections, colored pavement treatments to increase the visibility and safety of bicycling on City streets, sharrows, and bike racks and bicycle corrals.		
	Several major bicycling improvement projects have been recently completed or will be under construction soon, including implementation of new protected bicycle lanes on Masonic Street, 2nd Street, 7th/8th Street, Division/13th Street, 17th Street, Folsom/ Howard Street, San Jose Avenue, upper Market Street, and others.		

-	~		
Т	С	M	

LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION

D-2.	Pedestrian Access and Facilities Improvements.	The General Plan and Planning Code have supported pedestrian friendly, transit-oriented development for decades, which is referred to as the City's Transit First Policy. The Transportation Authority funds pedestrian-related projects through Prop K and programs other fund sources to support pedestrian improvements. Many of these projects fall under SFMTA's programs related to traffic calming, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and school area safety, and are also implemented through new development compliance with the Better Streets Plan which sets standards for street improvements associated with new development. Multi-agency efforts to coordinate major construction opportunities with pedestrian projects have also improved through the Follow-the-Paving process.
		In 2014, following a directive from the Transportation Authority Board, city agencies launched the Vision Zero program aimed to eliminate traffic injuries and fatalities by 2024. Because pedestrians typically make up more than half of fatalities in the city, work has involved focusing on improving conditions for pedestrians, especially on corridors identified as high injury pedestrian corridors.
D-3.	Local Land Use Strategies.	The Transportation Authority promotes legislative activities that encourage smart growth and more sustainable transportation and development-related investment decisions by the City and developers. ABAG and MTC have been working for years to encourage the region's municipalities to plan for compact, transit-oriented development to meet the region's sustainability goals. The most recent regional transportation plan (Plan Bay Area), called for focused growth around Priority Development Areas (PDAs), which largely center around existing or planned transit hubs. The Transportation Authority continues to work closely with City agencies to plan multimodal transportation improvements to support focused growth in San Francisco's 12 PDAs.
		The Transportation Authority has been designated as the Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (TIMMA). TIMMA is working to implement congestion pricing on Treasure Island, as required in the development agreement prepared for the island.
E-1.	Value Pricing Strategies	Additionally, the Transportation Authority continues to study the potential for congestion pricing or alternative approaches to manage congestion in downtown San Francisco. In 2018, the Transportation Authority began a fresh look at the idea of congestion pricing with updated data and analysis and a full community engagement process.
E-2.	Parking Policies to Reduce VMT	In September 2009, the Transportation Authority adopted the San Francisco On-Street Parking Management and Pricing Study. SFMTA piloted the study's key recommendations through the SFpark program and adopted demand responsive parking pricing for all City-owned garages and street parking in late 2017. The City has also addressed private off-street parking by eliminating minimum parking requirements downtown and in specific neighborhoods and commercial corridors, in some cases replacing them with maximum parking requirements. Unbundled parking, bicycle parking, and carshare parking requirements have also been implemented. In 2016, the Transportation Authority completed a Parking Supply and Utilization Study that considered further parking policy reform to manage auto trip demand. Rather than pursue any of the strategies analyzed, the study recommended that agencies advance existing parking-related initiatives, including the Residential Parking Permit Evaluation and Reform Project and implementation of the city's proposed TDM Ordinance.
E-3.	Transportation Pricing Reform.	The Transportation Authority continues to work with MTC and the Bay Area Partnership to identify new revenue sources. The Authority developed major transportation pricing studies, including the Mobility, Access, and Pricing Study and the Parking Supply and Utilization Study, to examine the potential for pricing to be used in combination with new technology and transportation enhancements to improve system performance and reduce emissions.

APPENDIX 10

Land Use Impacts Analysis Program

KEY TOPICS

- City Land Use Development Process
- CMA-Regional Land Use Coordination
- Neighborhood Transportation Plans and Projects
- Transportation Impact Analysis Studies

A10.1 City Land Use Development Process

The General Plan and the City Charter are the primary policies that guide the City's review of land development impacts on the transportation network. San Francisco is a Charter City, and it has a consolidated city and county government. An eleven-member Board of Supervisors serves as the legislative body for the City's unified city and county government. The City Planning Commission (CPC) has responsibility for land use decision-making throughout the City. The Mayor appoints the seven members of the CPC. Among the responsibilities of the CPC are the following:

- Exclusive authority to act on General Plan policies and area land use plans (per City Charter);
- Holding public hearings on all appeals to Negative Declaration determinations and certification of local Environmental Impact Reports; and
- Discretionary actions on Conditional Use permits, (which can be appealed to the Board of Supervisors) and decisions by the Zoning Administrator, Discretionary Reviews, and others that can be appealed to the Board of Appeals

In addition, both the CPC and the Board of Supervisors must approve all rezoning.

The Planning Department's land use responsibilities include transportation matters. The Planning Department has primary responsibility for assessment of the transportation impacts of development proposals, and to determine consistency with land use and transportation policies in the General Plan. The existing local regulations include measures to mitigate project-specific transportation impacts within the policy and priority framework of the General Plan, the long-range transportation plan, and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of the CMP.

The City already has in place an extensive process for evaluating the transportation impacts of land development proposals. This process, which ensures the City's compliance with State and Federal environmental review requirements, is the responsibility of the Planning Department. With the passage of California Senate Bill 743 (see section A.12.4), the City aligned its CEQA review and development approval process with RTP goals such as a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction target. Nevertheless, as CMA, the Transportation Authority has a role in ensuring that the impacts of land use decisions on the transportation system are analyzed with a uniform methodology, consistent with the long-term strategic goals of the General Plan and the San Francisco Transportation Plan.

A10.1.1 CONSISTENCY WITH LONG TERM STRATEGIC GOALS OF GENERAL PLAN AND SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION PLAN

San Francisco has been able to maintain one of the highest levels of transit use among U.S. cities because of its relatively high-density development and because topography and geography limit vehicular access routes to and from the City.

There have been significant numbers of non-resident commuters into the city for over a century. To improve the balance of housing and jobs, during the 1980s San Francisco actively promoted new residential development. Extensive revisions to the City's General Plan and rezonings were undertaken. Each of these land use plans – the Downtown Plan, Rincon Hill, North of Market, Chinatown, Neighborhood Commercial, Van Ness Avenue, South of Market, and Mission Bay – incorporated measures to retain and enhance opportunities for residential development.

In recent years, several more area plans have been developed or adopted including: the Market/Octavia Plan, Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, Balboa and Glen Park BART Station Area Plans, the Treasure Island Plan, the Transbay Center District Plan, and the Central SoMa Plan. In addition, housing development has been promoted by the policies of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and its successor agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, in various areas, including the Rincon Point/South Beach, Yerba Buena Gardens, Transbay, the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan Areas, Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2, Parkmerced, and Visitacion Valley.

San Francisco's continued role as a regional employment center and its policy of housing development have had an impact on the demand for transportation in the city. A primary mission of the Transportation Authority is to strategize investment in the city's transportation infrastructure and promote the development of demand management tools to address growing travel demand. Infrastructure investment is intended both to address future growth in transportation demand and to improve the city's current transportation system. Demand management is needed to promote a balanced and cost-effective transportation system.

In past decades San Francisco's primary transportation challenge was to absorb new jobs downtown without proportionately increasing the number of workers commuting by car. That challenge was addressed with the construction of BART and MUNI services focused on downtown commuting, combined with limits on parking provision.

Today San Francisco's transportation challenges are more varied. They are numerous and located across the city, throughout the various neighborhoods as well in core areas, which can expect not only employment growth but also extensive residential growth. Challenges include competitive transit service for non-commute and reverse commute trips; neighborhood parking management; safety for pedestrians and bicyclists; improved transit reliability and speed through the development of a transit priority network; and reducing emissions of pollution and greenhouse gases. Recent innovations in transportation are rapidly changing how people navigate our city streets. These emerging mobility services and technologies include ride-hailing services (such as Uber & Lyft), microtransit (Via), app-based ridesharing, bike/e-bike/ car-sharing, courier network services, autonomous vehicle technologies, and more. Additionally, post-pandemic continued remote work for some types of occupations presents further challenges.

Regional efforts to coordinate land use and transportation include Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and development of a regional High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) lane system. In addition, state laws promulgated in 2006 and 2007 require greater integration of land use and transportation planning processes in recognition of the climate change challenge. Climate change issues and initiatives are discussed further in Section 6.3.5, below.

Underlying these needs is the challenge of finding new mechanisms to pay for needed transit and other improvements as development decisions are made. A discussion of the city's initiative to update transportation impact and mitigation fees is provided in Section A.12.4.

NOTE: California Government Code Section 65089(b)(4) requires the land use program to assess the impacts of land development on regional transportation systems. In the 1991 San Francisco CMP this was interpreted to mean impacts on the CMP roadway network. However, the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), passed in 1991, explicitly requires the development of a metropolitan transportation system (MTS), including both transit and highways. As discussed in Chapter 3, MTC contracted with the Transportation Authority, acting as CMA, to help develop the MTS and to use the CMP process to link land development decisions to impacts on the MTS. For purposes of the land use analysis program, the San Francisco CMP will use the San Francisco component of the MTS, but conformance with roadway level of service (LOS) standards will continue to be assessed using the CMP roadway network, which is a subset of the multimodal MTS.

A10.2 CMA-Regional Land Use Coordination

A10.2.1 CMP LAND USE IMPACTS ANALYSIS

One key aspect of the CMP approach to land use impacts analysis is that, pursuant to state law, the Transportation Authority will also be responsible for reviewing transportation analysis of specific development projects under CEQA and determining the consistency of these "sub-area" analyses with the citywide model. Examples of this role include our work to support the Bayview/Hunters Point Redevelopment Area Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the Transbay Center District Plan EIR, and the Market/Octavia Better Neighborhoods Plan EIR, and the Central SoMa Plan and EIR.

A10.2.2 MTC/CMA TRANSPORTATION/LAND USE WORK PLANS

Pursuant to MTC's agreements with county CMAs over coordination of transportation and land use, the Transportation Authority focuses on the following activities to help integrate transportation and land use decisions:

First, the Transportation Authority prioritizes transportation planning funds and capital investments that meet performance criteria or demonstrate a strong vision for coordinated land use and transportation development.

The Transportation Authority provides technical guidance and assistance with the planning process to partner agencies, communities, and project sponsors, including neighborhood planning, thereby facilitating access to discretionary state and regional grants and providing for coordinated county-level input into the regional transportation planning process.

The Transportation Authority promotes legislative activities that encourage smart growth, more sustainable transportation and development-related investment decisions by the City and developers, and more efficient travel decisions by all transportation system users. Examples include the Transportation Authority's support of the State Resources Agency's revisions to the CEQA Guidelines Transportation Checklist and our work with local partner agencies to reform the City's CEQA transportation impact analysis process.

The Transportation Authority coordinates county-level input into the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), the RTP, and related regional land use planning efforts.

Finally, the Transportation Authority conducts project and program delivery oversight to ensure efficient use of funds and effective project delivery.

A10.2.3 PLAN BAY AREA AND PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREAS

ABAG and MTC have been working for years to encourage the region's municipalities to plan for compact, transit-oriented development to meet the region's sustainability goals. This work was previously conducted through the FOCUS program that invited municipalities to nominate locations to be considered as Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) based on regionally established criteria. In 2013, the region adopted Plan Bay Area, the first SCS for the San Francisco Bay Area prepared pursuant to Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg). PDAs and PCAs are key "building blocks" of the region's land use strategy presented in Plan Bay Area. ABAG and MTC approved an update to 2017's Plan Bay Area 2040 (Plan Bay Area 2050) in October 2021.

Prior to 2019, San Francisco had identified twelve PDAs, generally in the eastern part of San Francisco, and generally locations that have been comprehensively planned as part of an Area Plan process. San Francisco's PDAs were first identified and approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2007 and have been updated since then to reflect slight changes to boundaries. In August 2015, ABAG approved three additional regional PCAs that cross San Francisco: California Coast Trail (along the Pacific coast), San Francisco Bay Water Trail (including access points in San Francisco's Marina District), and San Francisco Bay Trail (along the Embarcadero, through the Marina and over the Golden Gate Bridge). Five Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) have been adopted by San Francisco since 2015: Palou Phelps Natural Area, Bayview Hill Natural Area, Green Connections-McLaren Park Pivot, Crosstown Trail-Connecting Twin Peaks Bio-Region/ Glen Canyon, and the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail.

In May 2019, the MTC Commission and Executive Board adopted an update to the Regional Growth Framework, including updated criteria for PDAs and PCAs, and a new Priority Production Area (PPA) pilot program, which promotes middle-wage jobs and support the region's industrial economy. San Francisco worked with MTC to expand the coverage of existing PDAs and identify four new PDAs, eight new PCAs, and one PPA designation as part of the ongoing update to Plan Bay Area. These additional PDAs ensure their eligibility for regional OBAG and other funding, and that more of the region's areas well-served by transit and with high access to opportunity are included in the PDA framework and considered for investment as they grow. In total, fifteen Priority Development Areas (PDAs) have been adopted by the City (a map of the PDAs can be found in Chapter 6).

As a part of Plan Bay Area, the region committed to identify funding incentives for PDAs and PCAs, most significantly through the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program which provides a four or five year framework for the federal Surface Transportation Program and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program funds programmed by MTC. OBAG Cycle 1 covered Fiscal Years 2012/13 through 2016/17; OBAG Cycle 2 covered Fiscal Years 2017/18 through 2021/22, and OBAG Cycle 3 covers Fiscal Years 2022/23 through 2025/26. OBAG Cycle 2 built upon OBAG Cycle 1 with an added focus on affordable housing and anti-displacement policies in light of the region's current housing crisis. OBAG Cycle 3 built further upon OBAG Cycle 2, requiring compliance with state housing laws related to accessory dwelling units, density bonuses, and the Housing Accountability Act. Approximately 50% of OBAG Cycle 3 funds are passed to county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), including the Transportation Authority for San Francisco, to nominate projects that help advance the transportation and land use vision expressed in Plan Bay Area 2050. For the OBAG Cycle 3 county grant program:

- Funds were distributed to the region's nine CMAs using a funding formula that was based 50 percent on population,
 20 percent on future housing growth assigned through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation, and 30 percent on housing production between 2007 and 2019. The formula placed additional emphasis on affordable housing, defined as including very low-, low-, and moderate-income households.
- Scoring methodologies were required to provide a reward for jurisdictions with the most effective affordable housing and anti-displacement policies.
- San Francisco and the other larger CMAs were required to program 70 percent of funds to support PDAs (smaller CMAs were required to program 50 percent of funds to support PDAs).
- To be eligible to receive funds, all jurisdictions were required to have a certified Housing Element, have adopted a Complete Streets policy, and have complied with state housing laws related to surplus lands, accessory dwelling units, density bonuses, and the Housing Accountability Act. .
- Jurisdictions were required to adopt Local Road Safety Plans (e.g. Vision Zero in San Francisco), and priority was given to funding projects that align with and support these plans.
- Fund levels were increased for Healthy, Safe, and Sustainable Streets projects and implementation of projects in Equity Priority Communities that have been prioritized through Community-Based Transportation Plans or Participatory Budgeting processes.

Refer to the Transportation Authority's OBAG page (see the Bibliography) for the list of funded projects.

A10.2.4 MULTI-AGENCY LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION STUDIES

In addition to projects identified to receive PDA Planning Funds, San Francisco is leading or plans to lead several studies in which transportation is closely tied to land use development. All planned development areas are located within PDAs and involve a multi-agency approach in which the Transportation Authority has a supporting role.

New Transbay Rail Crossing – Link21

Following from the long-range recommendations of the Core Capacity Transit study (CCTS), BART is conducting a multi-jurisdictional planning process to identify one or more new potential transbay rail crossings. This study is being conducted jointly with Capitol Corridor and will evaluate both BART and standard gauge rail crossings of the San Francisco Bay. The Transportation Authority, along with other city agencies, will be

coordinating closely with BART, Capitol Corridor, and other agencies, stakeholders, and the public on this study as it unfolds. This study will identify a preferred alternative for a transbay rail crossing.

ConnectSF

The San Francisco Department of Planning, SFMTA, and the Transportation Authority are jointly leading the development of a long-range plan for San Francisco known as ConnectSF. This process includes the development of an updated San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP 2050) by the Transportation Authority and an updated General Plan Transportation Element by the Planning Department. The process began by developing a comprehensive vision for the future of transportation that considers how a combination of transportation and land use policy and investments can provide an effective, sustainable, and equitable future for San Francisco. The effort produced a 50-year roadmap to arrive at that future, including policies, planning, project development, and funding strategies. The key outputs for the program include a vision document 2018, the Transit Strategy, the Streets and Freeways Strategy, the SFTP 2050, and an update to the Transportation Element of the San Francisco General Plan.

The ConnectSF team engaged a diverse set of stakeholders to understand priorities and shape study recommendations.

A10.3 List of Neighborhood Transportation Plans and Projects

A list of plans developed with the support of the Community Based Transportation Planning program and the Neighborhood Transportation Improvement Program is provided below.

The Community Based Transportation Planning program supported development of the following plans:

- Visitacion Valley and Portola Community Based Transportation Plan (2023)
- Lake Merced Pedestrian Safety Project Community Based Transportation Plan (2021)
- Portsmouth Square Community Based Transportation Plan (2021)
- Bayview Community Based Transportation Plan (2020)
- Western Addition Community Based Neighborhood Transportation Plan (also funded with NTIP funds) (2017)

- Chinatown Neighborhood Transportation Plan and Pilot Study (2015)
- Potrero Hill Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2015)
- Western SOMA Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2012)
- Bayview Hunters Point Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2010)
- Columbus Avenue Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2010)
- 19th Avenue Park Presidio Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2008)
- Mission-Geneva Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2007)
- Mission South of Chavez Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2007)
- Tenderloin-Little Saigon Neighborhood Transportation Plan (2007)

The Neighborhood Transportation Program has recently supported the following planning projects (* indicates projects that are underway):

- District 1: Multimodal Transportation Plan (anticipated 2024)*
- District 1: Golden Gate Park Stakeholder Working Group and Action Framework (2021)
- District 1: Fulton Street Safety Project (2020)
- District 3: Walter U Lum Place Public Space Study*
- District 4: District 4 Mobility Improvements Study (2021)
- District 5: Octavia Boulevard Circulation and Accessibility Study Update (2023)
- District 6: Treasure Island Supplemental Transportation Study (2023)
- District 7: Ocean Avenue Action Plan (2023)
- District 7: Inner Sunset Multimodal Safety and Access Study*
- District 9: Alemany Realignment Study (2017)
- District 10: District 10 15 Third Street Bus Study (2020)
- District 11: Alemany Safety Project (2020)

A10.4 Transportation Impact Analysis Studies

A10.4.1 UNIFORM LAND USE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The Transportation Authority uses tools and analysis techniques that use regionally-consistent land use assumptions. For example, in updating the SFTP

the Transportation Authority used land use forecasts developed by the Planning Department (subject to regional requirements for consistency with ABAG), generated new estimates of future travel demand, and tested alternative projects and investment strategies to address those future transportation needs.

A10.4.2 TRANSPORTATION SUSTAINABILITY FEE

In the City and County of San Francisco the only citywide transportation impact fee until recently was the Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF). First enacted in 1981, the Downtown TIDF ordinance was enacted as a means to have new development pay its fair share for expanded transit capacity to serve that development. TIDF assesses a one-time fee per square foot on new or converted office space in the downtown area. The fee was imposed on most nonresidential development in San Francisco and not on residential development. The 2004 TIDF ordinance established a fee schedule, which is subject to annual adjustment without further action by the Board of Supervisors to reflect changes in the relevant Consumer Price Index, as determined by the City Controller. The impact fee levied on developers must be related to providing new or expanded transit service to support peak period travel generated by new development (including any costs associated with operations or capital). The need for transit services as a result of new development must be established. Furthermore, the proposed expenditures of the fee and the dollar amount of the fee must also have a "nexus" to the development project impacts. The fee schedule was updated in February 2013, based on a nexus study completed in 2011, and is shown in Table A10-1.

LAND USE CATEGORY	TIDF PER SQ. FT. OF DEVELOPMENT
Visitor Services	\$12.64
Medical and Health Services	\$13.30
Cultural/Institution/Education	\$13.30
Museums	\$11.05
Retail/Entertainment	\$13.30
Management, Information and Professional	\$12.64
Production/Distribution/Repair	\$6.80

Table A10-1. 2013 TIDF Ordinance Fee Schedule

Based on another nexus study completed in 2015, the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) was adopted and went into effect in December 2015. The TSF replaces TIDF and would raise new revenue to expand the transportation system as San Francisco grows. New commercial developments, market-rate residential developments with more than 20 units, and certain large institutions will be required to pay the TSF. Affordable housing developments, subsidized middle-income housing, market-rate housing with less than 20 units or less and most nonprofit developments are exempt from the fee. Table A10-2 shows the latest fee schedule (San Francisco Planning Code: Section 411A).

Table A10-2. TSF Ordinance Fee Schedule

LAND USE CATEGORY	TIDF PER SQ. FT. OF DEVELOPMENT
Residential, 21-99 units	\$7.74
Residential, all units above 99 units	\$8.74
Non-Residential, except Hospitals and Health Services, 800-99,999 gsf	\$18.04
Non-Residential, except Hospitals and Health Services, all gsf above 99,999 gsf	\$19.04
Hospitals	\$18.74
Health Services, all gsf above 12,000 gsf	\$11.00
Production, Distribution and Repair	\$7.61

Currently, the TIDF generates about \$24 million a year on average. The TSF is projected to add about \$14 million a year, raising nearly \$1.2 billion for transportation improvements over 30 years, or roughly \$430 million in net new revenue. The revenues from the fee may subsidize capital and operating expenses for existing and new transit service. New development generates more transit trips, which add to the already heavily utilized transportation system, especially in the downtown area during peak periods. This, in turn, creates a greater burden on the City transit system. Because transit operates at or near capacity during peak periods, ridership growth must be addressed through increased Muni service frequencies. However, constrained infrastructure (e.g., Market Street tunnel) and reduced operating funding (e.g., from the state) limit the ability of Muni to increase peak-period service.

The TSF is part of a larger effort, the Transit Sustainability Program (TSP), that seeks to improve and expand upon San Francisco's transportation system to help accommodate new growth. It belongs to the "Invest" component of TSP that aims to invest in the transportation network by having developers pay their fair share to help offset the growth created by their project.

A10.4.3 CEQA TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS REFORM

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires California's public agencies to determine the potential for proposed projects to have significant impacts on the environment, including transportation impacts. CEQA also encourages agencies to develop thresholds of significance – the quantitative point at which an environmental effect may be considered significant – to facilitate these determinations. Beginning on September 15, 2020, new projects were required to include a VMT-based transportation impact significance determination, the culmination of a multi-year effort led by the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to implement Senate Bill 743 (SB743). CEQA gives local jurisdictions discretion to adopt impact measures and significance thresholds, and while many agencies in California measure a project's effects on transportation using the Highway Capacity Manual's intersection Level of Service (LOS) measure, which measures delay to automobiles, LOS may no longer be used as a sole measure of transportation impact. These changes better align environmental review with environmental policies, like reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Prior to statewide implementation of SB743, the Transportation Authority had a long history of supporting CEQA reform. In October 2008, the Transportation Authority adopted the Final Report on the Automobile Trip Generation Impact Measure as an alternative to automobile LOS. The Report recommends that the City measure the transportation impacts of projects under CEQA based on the net new automobile trips generated (ATG) by a project. In 2009 the Transportation Authority worked with the State Office of Policy and Research to revise the CEQA Guidelines section on transportation impact analysis, which removed the exclusive reference to automobile LOS and replaced it with an option for local jurisdictions to select an alternative measure of transportation impact. The revisions also deleted references to parking as a transportation impact area.

On September 27, 2013, the governor signed into law SB743, which revised the criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts within transit priority areas. In the fall of 2014, the State of California Office of Planning and Research released draft guidelines for implementation of SB 743, indicating that vehicle miles traveled would be the primary metric for evaluating transportation impacts. In March 2016, San Francisco became the first county to adopt the proposed SB 743, preceding statewide adoption by more than 2 years. The San Francisco Planning Commission adopted a resolution, based on state-proposed guidelines that remove automobile delay as a significant impact on the environment and replaced it with a vehicle miles traveled threshold for all CEQA environmental determinations, including active projects, going forward. In 2018, California adopted CEQA guidelines for implementing SB743, and on September 15, 2020, all new projects were required to include a VMT-based transportation impact significance determination.

APPENDIX 11

Capital Improvement Program

KEY TOPICS

- Relationship to Regional Transportation Plan and Countywide Transportation Plan
- List of Funding Sources
- Capital Improvement Program Amendments

A11.1 Relationship to Regional Transportation Plan and Countywide Transportation Plan

The CMP statute requires that each CMP be consistent with the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), developed by the regional transportation planning agency (the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, or MTC, for the Bay Area), and each county's component of the RTP must be supported by a long-range countywide transportation plan (San Francisco Transportation Plan, or SFTP), developed by the CMA. The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is intended to serve as a short or medium-range implementation vehicle for investment priorities as prioritized in the long-range plans.

Through the RTP, the MTC establishes the Bay Area's vision for transportation with supporting policies and investment strategies, including a list of specific projects and programs. Inclusion of projects and programs in the RTP is a prerequisite for receiving state and federal transportation grants for certain state or federal approvals and a requirement for capacity expanding projects that may have air quality impacts. 2013's Plan Bay Area was the region's first RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that explicitly integrated transportation projects and policies with land-use strategies to meet the SB 375 requirements to accommodate future population growth and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. MTC and the Association of Bay Area of Governments adopted an update to Plan Bay Area, named Plan Bay Area 2050 in fall 2021. An update, Plan Bay Area 2050+, is scheduled to be adopted in late 2025 that will incorporate lessons learned from the pandemic.

The Transportation Authority develops the SFTP (countywide transportation plan) for San Francisco, consistent with MTC guidelines, to guide transportation investment and to serve as a basis for RTP/SCS assumptions. The Transportation Authority updated the SFTP in December 2013, which identified four goals (economic competitiveness, safe and livable neighborhoods, environmental health, and well maintained infrastructure) and proposed scenarios that invest strategically in a diverse set of projects to make progress toward each of the goals. A focused update approved in October 2017 reaffirmed these goals, updated project costs, and reassessed projects previously identified for funding. A major update of the SFTP, named SFTP 2050, was adopted by the Transportation Authority in December 2022. The Transportation Authority ensures the CIP projects, as well as their selection processes, are consistent with the SFTP. The SFTP is discussed in further detail in Chapter 6 (Land Use Impacts Analysis).

A11.2 List of Funding Sources

As a result of the Transportation Authority's role as the Prop L and Prop AA administrator and the CMA, the capital priorities programming process not only involves state and federal funds that are required by state law to be programmed through the CMP but also incorporates the Prop L and Prop AA programming strategy. Listed below are major CIP funding sources administered by the Transportation Authority. Importantly, as described in the section 7.2 of the main report, the Transportation Authority ensures that all CIP projects, as well as the programming and project selection processes, are consistent with the RTP, SFTP, and other requirements attached to the funding.

Evaluation of potential impacts of CIP projects on multimodal system performance is embedded throughout the project selection and monitoring processes. The results of the CMP multimodal system performance analysis and any deficiency findings will also be incorporated into the future CIP development as appropriate. Please refer to Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion of multimodal system performance.

A11.2.1 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM / CONGESTION MITIGATION AIR QUALITY PROGRAM

Conformance with the CMP is required for a local jurisdiction to receive federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds. STP funds are among the most flexible and are used to support a wide range of transportation improvement projects across all modes. CMAQ funds are intended for projects that reduce transportation related emissions. Both funds are distributed mainly by the regional transportation planning agency, i.e. the MTC for the Bay Area. The MTC has divided the Bay Area's share of STP and CMAQ funds into multiple programs under the umbrella of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program. Each of the OBAG programs typically has its own associated policies and guidelines in pursuant of RTP goals. The MTC approved a third cycle of OBAG programming (OBAG 3) for Fiscal Years 22/23 through 25/26. One of the centerpieces of OBAG 3 is the county share program, which is intended to better integrate the region's transportation program with land use and housing policies and to promote transportation investments that support Priority Development Areas (PDAs). PDAs refer to locally-identified, regionally designated infill development opportunity areas within existing communities. A map of PDAs is included in Chapter 6 of the main report. The Transportation Authority recommended and MTC approved \$50,577,000 in county share OBAG 3 funds for projects. The Transportation Authority has also provided monitoring and support for sponsor agencies as San Francisco's OBAG projects advance through the design and construction phases under the federal aid guidelines. The bibliography includes a link to the OBAG funded projects list for Cycles 1 through Cycles 3.

A11.2.2 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Inclusion in the CIP is a prerequisite for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), a five-year program of projects adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) every two years. Priorities for approximately 75% of the STIP programming capacity are set by regional transportation planning agencies, and the remaining 25% is established by the state. The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is the MTC's submittal to the state, which is merged with other regions' RTIPs and additional CTC priorities to become the STIP. In the Bay Area, the practice has been for the CMAs to establish priorities for their county share, subject to the MTC's concurrence and the CTC approval of the region's RTIP. In the draft 2024 RTIP, which is pending CTC approval, the Transportation Authority Board continues to fulfill its long-standing commitments to RTIP priorities. As part of the 2024 RTIP, San Francisco fulfilled the county's outstanding commitment to The Portal, also known as Caltrain Downtown Extension (\$17.8 million) and reduced the commitment to the Central Subway (\$17.08 million). RTIP funds cannot be programmed directly to the Central Subway or Downtown Extension projects because all the contracts have been awarded, so we are honoring the commitment by programming RTIP funds to the other eligible projects.

The STIP used to be a significant, although highly variable source of state funds for highways, local streets and roads, transit rehabilitation and expansion projects, and pedestrian and bicycle projects. With reduced revenues from fuel taxes and lack of an adequately funded multi-year federal transportation bill, the STIP experienced a drastic reduction in available funding. However, the passage of Senate Bill 1 in 2017 has helped to stabilize the program. The 2024 RTIP, which lists the priorities approved by the Transportation Authority Board, is expected to be approved through the CTC's STIP adoption in March 2024.

A11.2.3 PROP L TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX

Since 1990, San Francisco has had a half-cent local sales tax for transportation improvements. San Francisco voters approved the first such sales tax and expenditure plan in November 1989 as Proposition B and the second in November 2003 as Proposition K. In November 2022, voters approved Proposition L and adopted a new 30-year Expenditure Plan, superseding the prior one. At the time of the Expenditure Plan adoption, Prop L was expected to generate \$2.6 billion (in 2020 \$'s) over 30 years and to leverage close to \$23.7 billion in federal, state, and other local funds for transportation projects in San Francisco.

The Expenditure Plan established five overall categories of investment and attached mandatory percentage shares of total Prop L revenues: Transit Maintenance and Enhancements (41.2%), Major Transit Projects (22.6%), Streets and Freeways (18.9%), Paratransit (11.4%), and Transportation System Development and Management (5.9%). The Expenditure Plan details eligible sponsors and project types for 28 programs,

ranging from the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension, to street resurfacing, to pedestrian and bicycle improvements to transit vehicle replacements to transportation demand management. The bibliography provides a link to a summary of the Expenditure Plan, which lists the eligible projects and programs along with their shares of Prop L funds and expected leveraging goals.

As required by the Expenditure Plan, the Transportation Authority Board adopts a Prop L Strategic Plan to guide the day-to-day implementation of the Prop L program, and for each of the programmatic categories, a 5-Year Prioritization Program (5YPP). The Prop L Strategic Plan is the financial tool that guides the timing and allocation of Prop L revenues over the 30-year Expenditure Plan period, and it considers many factors, such as the presence of matching funds and the likelihood of projects to move forward in the year proposed. The 5YPP includes prioritization criteria, a five-year list of projects (with scope, schedule, cost, and funding information), and performance measures. The Strategic Plan and 5YPPs are updated quinquennially and may, between quinquennial updates, be amended as needed. The Transportation Authority is currently in the process of developing the Prop L Strategic Plan (final approval anticipated in early 2024) and the inaugural 5YPPs.

A11.2.4 PROP AA VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE

Prop AA is a \$10 countywide annual vehicle registration fee that was passed by San Francisco voters in 2010. Total revenues are estimated over the 30-year period at approximately \$150 million, or approximately \$5 million annually, to fund smaller, highimpact projects throughout the city on a pay-as-you-go basis. The Prop AA Expenditure Plan established three categories of investment and prescribed percentage shares over 30 years: Street Repair & Reconstruction (50%), Pedestrian Safety (25%), and Transit Reliability & Mobility Improvements (25%). The Expenditure Plan requires that the Transportation Authority adopt a Strategic Plan to guide the timing of expenditures and set policies for day-to-day management of the program and to update it every five years. In 2012, the Transportation Authority Board approved the first Prop AA Strategic Plan with \$25.1 million to projects over the five year period of Fiscal Year 2012/13 through Fiscal Year 2016/17. In 2017, the Board approved the first update to the Strategic Plan, with \$22.8 million programmed to projects over the five year period of Fiscal Year 2017/18 to Fiscal Year 2021/22. The Strategic Plan was updated again in 2022 with \$23.5 million programmed to 15 projects over Fiscal Years 2022/23 through 2026/27. The bibliography provides a link to the 2022 Prop AA Strategic Plan Programming and Allocations.

A11.2.5 TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR

The Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program (TFCA) was established to fund cost effective transportation projects that achieve a reduction in motor vehicle emissions. Funds are generated from a \$4 surcharge on the vehicle registration fee. Forty percent of the funds are set aside for Program Managers for each of the nine counties in the

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The Transportation Authority is the designated TFCA Program Manager for San Francisco. In that capacity, it programs approximately \$800,000 every year to clean air vehicles, shuttle operations, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and other eligible transportation projects that help clean up the air by reducing motor vehicle emissions. The Transportation Authority also provides assistance to project sponsors in applying for Regional TFCA funds, programmed directly by the BAAQMD. The remaining sixty percent of the revenues, referred to as the Regional Fund, is distributed to applicants from the nine Bay Area counties through a variety of grant programs. The bibliography provides a link to the 2023-24 TFCA funded projects summary.

A11.2.6 LIFELINE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

The MTC established the Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) to improve transportation choices for low-income persons as part of the 2005 RTP. For the Cycle 5 LTP, the MTC assigned approximately \$2.69 million in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to the Transportation Authority. Since the adoption of the Cycle 5 LTP program of projects in May 2018, the Transportation Authority has provided monitoring and support for sponsor agencies and created the San Francisco Lifeline Transportation Program (SF LTP).

In February 2018, the MTC established a transit-focused STA County Block Grant program, with funds from the regional paratransit program, the northern counties/ small transit operators program, and the regional LTP, to be administered by CMAs. The STA County Block Grant program allows each county to determine how to invest in paratransit, transit operating and capital needs, including providing lifeline transit services. Funds were distributed among the nine Bay Area counties based on the amount that each county would have received in Fiscal Year 2018/19 under the former regional programs. For the first two years of the new block grant program, Fiscal Years 2018/19 and 2019/20, San Francisco received approximately \$8.3 million.

In December 2018, the Transportation Authority Board approved the San Francisco STA County Block Grant Framework to distribute 40% of the funds to the SFMTA's paratransit program consistent with what SFMTA would have received under the prior regional paratransit program. The Board approved the remaining 60% for the new SF LTP modelled on the former regional LTP. In April 2019, the Transportation Authority Board approved the SF LTP Cycle 1 program of projects to address gaps or barriers identified through equity assessments and collaborative and inclusive communitybased planning processes.

In light of the significant decline in transit fare and other operating revenues due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in April 2020, the Board approved San Francisco's share of Fiscal Year 2020/21 County Block Grant funds to support the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's paratransit operations. In addition, SFTP funds continue to support the Bay Area Rapid Transit District's Elevator Attendant Program at the downtown stations. The bibliography provides a link to the LTP funded projects summary. This funding distribution between paratransit operations and BART's Elevator Attendant Program has continued in Fiscal Year 2021/22 through Fiscal Year 2023/24.

A11.2.7 SENATE BILL 1 LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FORMULAIC SHARES

The Local Partnership Program (LPP), created by the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 or Senate Bill 1, is a program created to reward local or regional transportation agencies that have sought and received voter approval of taxes or fees solely dedicated to transportation. Of the \$200 million appropriated annually, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocates 50% of the program through a Formulaic Program based on both the share of revenues and population of counties with voter-approved sales taxes, tolls, or fees. As administrator of San Francisco's Prop L transportation sales tax, Prop AA annual vehicle registration fee, and TNC Tax, the Transportation Authority is responsible for programming San Francisco's share of the LPP Formulaic Program. The bibliography provides a link to the 2018 through 2022 LPP Formulaic Program of Projects, adopted by the CTC in August 2023. For the current funding cycle covering Fiscal Years 2023/24 - 2024/25, San Francisco will receive \$8.758 million based on Prop K, Prop AA, and the TNC tax revenues as well as a onetime \$5 million bump from LPP incentive funds to reward San Francisco for passing Prop L in November 2022. In November 2023, the Board approved \$2.6 million in LPP formulaic funds for the Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Hillcrest Road Improvement Project to accommodate the YBI Multi-use Path.

A11.2.8 TRAFFIC CONGESTION MITIGATION TAX

On November 5, 2019, San Francisco voters approved Prop D, enabling the City to impose a 1.5% business tax on shared rides and 3.25% business tax on private rides for fares charged by commercial ride-share and driverless-vehicle companies until November 5, 2045. The Traffic Congestion Mitigation Tax, referred to as the TNC Tax, was expected to generate about \$30 million annually, before the COVID-19 pandemic. Half of the revenue goes to the SFMTA for transit improvements. The Transportation Authority administers the other half of the funds for street safety improvements. Revenue collection began on January 1, 2020.

On October 27, 2020, the Transportation Authority Board adopted the TNC Tax Program Guidelines and programmed \$7.5 million to the SFMTA's Vision Zero Quick-Build Program. In March 2023, the Transportation Authority Board adopted the first update to the Program Guidelines and programmed \$21.6 million to the SFMTA for the Vision Zero Quick-Build Program and the new, rolling Application-Based Residential Traffic Calming Program. The bibliography provides a link to the TNC Tax funded projects summary.

A11.3 Capital Improvement Program Amendments

The project sponsor is expected to deliver a project or program as approved by the Board. If a project sponsor anticipates that the scope, schedule, budget or funding plan will change, Transportation Authority staff will assess the need for a CIP amendment. There are two types of CIP amendments – administrative and policy level. Administrative amendments are approved by the Transportation Authority's Executive Director or her designee. Policy-level amendments must be approved by the Transportation Authority Board. The type of approval required by an amendment request depends upon the significance of the proposed changes to the project's scope, schedule and budget.

A11.3.1 ADMINISTRATIVE-LEVEL CIP AMENDMENTS

Administrative-level amendments address minor changes that do not substantively change the nature of the original project and its impact on system performance, and do not increase the amount of funding allocated or programmed by the Transportation Authority to the project. Administrative amendments will only require notification to and approval by the Transportation Authority's Executive Director or her designee. The Executive Director may rule that a requested CIP amendment is administrative if the proposed changes, involving one or more projects and one or more funding sources, requires programming actions that can be authorized at the staff level at the Transportation Authority, at the MTC and/or the CTC, or at the regional office level for federal agencies, such as administrative TIP amendments.

A11.3.2 POLICY-LEVEL CIP AMENDMENTS

Policy-level amendments apply to changes that are deemed by the Transportation Authority to be significant enough that they have the potential to affect the performance of the multimodal transportation system and represent a significant departure from the scope, schedule, or budget approved by the Transportation Authority. This may include changes that will affect the year of delivery (completion), the amount or availability of operating funds, the year of programming, the fund source designation, or any other aspect of the project requiring action by the MTC and/or the CTC for funds initially prioritized or programmed by the Transportation Authority. Policy-level amendments require approval by the Transportation Authority Board prior to processing of the change by the project sponsor or other funding agency.

A11.3.3 APPLICABILITY OF CIP AMENDMENTS

Applicable funding sources include but are not limited to those programmed directly by the Transportation Authority, such as county share STP/CMAQ, SB 1 Local Partnership Program Formulaic Shares, RIP, LTP, TFCA, Prop L, Prop AA, and TNC Tax. Certain funding sources are programmed through state or regional processes and typically become available to project sponsors through a separate application procedure. Further, many sources have timely use of funds requirements where failure to meet deadlines can result in loss of funds to the project or to San Francisco or prohibition from applying for future cycles until deadlines are met. The MTC has requested that CMAs assist with oversight of certain funding sources (e.g. Highway Safety Improvement Program) even if not directly prioritized by CMAs. The intent is to improve project delivery and specifically to avoid loss of funds to the region. The Transportation Authority encourages sponsors to proactively notify the Transportation Authority of any project delivery issues or other issues that may threaten a project's ability to meet timely use of fund deadlines, whether sources covered by CIP amendments or not. The Transportation Authority can serve as a resource and facilitator to help resolve delivery issues and avoid loss of funds to San Francisco projects.