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Executive Summary

ConnectSF is a multi-agency collaborative process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system for San Francisco’s future.

Phase 1 of the process produced a 50-year vision for what people wanted to see San Francisco look and feel like, generated by discussions with the public and ConnectSF Futures Task Force.

Phase 2 began in 2018 and seeks to answer the focal question: “What do we need to get to our vision for the future?” To answer this question, Phase 2 of ConnectSF will identify policies and major transportation investments that will help us reach our priorities, goals, and aspirations as a city.

ConnectSF combines both technical work and community outreach, with each informing and building upon the other. This report outlines the second round of community outreach which took place between fall 2019 and winter 2020 for Phase 2.
**WHAT WAS THE GOAL OF THIS ROUND OF OUTREACH?**

The goal was to gather robust and diverse feedback on how, where, and why people travel in San Francisco and the region today and in the future, and use that information to inform the project concepts that are being developed in the modal studies.

More specifically, the three key questions asked in this round of outreach were:

» What local and citywide travel options work well and what do not?
» What would it take for participants to travel using non-automobile modes?
» What project and policy concepts would help us reach the vision?

**HOW DID WE ENGAGE WITH THE PUBLIC?**

The graphics below illustrate both in-person and digital opportunities to provide feedback during this round of outreach.

---

**PHASE 2 OUTREACH TIMELINE**

- **November 2019**
  - Mission High School Targeted Workshop for Youth
    - Targeted Audience
  - Southeast Community Facility Targeted Workshop (Bayview)
    - Targeted Audience
  - Presentation to SPUR
    - General Public

- **December 2019**
  - Online Survey (English, Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog)
    - General Public
  - Mission Cultural Center Public Workshop
    - General Public

- **January 2020**
  - Park Branch Library Public Workshop
    - General Public

- **February 2020**
  - Presentation to BMAGIC
    - General Public

- **March 2020**
  - General Public Targeted Audience

**PARTICIPATION IN PHASE 2 OUTREACH COMPONENTS**

- **235** Event Attendees (Approximate)
- **158** Completed Worksheets
- **6** Events
- **58** Nextdoor Comment Threads
- **221** Responses Within Those Threads
- **2,328** Online Survey Respondents
  - **4** Languages Offered: English, Spanish, Chinese, and Tagalog
Along with two workshops aimed at the general public, two workshops were held specifically for youth and southeast neighborhood residents. The youth workshop was conducted because the projects and policies coming out of ConnectSF have long-range implications; the southeast neighborhoods workshop sought to increase participation by communities often excluded from past long-range planning efforts.

The digital engagement consisted of a survey that sought to replicate much of the workshop experience. Both in-person and digital opportunities were offered in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Tagalog. The project team also offered briefings about the study to community-based organizations.

**WHAT DID WE HEAR?**

The project team heard a range of ideas for project and policy concepts that can help us reach our community-generated vision for the future. Highlights from each of the outreach goals include:

**What works well and what doesn’t for both local and citywide travel?**

- Downtown was by far the most common area of the city that respondents noted was easy to travel to by transit, biking, and/or walking, according to survey respondents and workshop participants.
- Survey and workshop participants generally indicated that it was easy to walk, bike, or take transit to get to other parts of their neighborhood and adjacent areas.
- Thirty-nine percent of survey respondents said it was easy to get to the East Bay and Peninsula via transit.
- Survey respondents and workshop participants said transit was often slow, unreliable, and infrequent with poor connections or too many transfers when traveling outside their neighborhoods.
- Workshop participants indicated that it was difficult to get to the Marina/North Heights, North Beach and Chinatown, the Hills Districts, Noe Valley, Glen Park and Bernal, the Outer Mission, and Bayshore.

**What will encourage travel using more sustainable modes?**

- About 68% of survey respondents said convenience (proximity, frequency) was most important in deciding how they travel (see Figure 1).
- Other factors commonly cited included safety, reliability, accessibility, and affordability.
What project and policy concepts were identified to help us reach our vision?

Project and policy proposals from workshop and survey participants mentioned most often related to transit: increasing service, expanding transit infrastructure, improving operations, and changes to fares.

Another popular category was improvements for active transportation. Some participants also identified using congestion pricing to help manage vehicles. A full list of ideas are provided on page 15.

COVID-19’S IMPACT ON OUTREACH

While general public outreach had concluded prior to the beginning of the pandemic, four targeted focus groups in Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, and Russian had to be canceled due to shelter-in-place requirements.

HOW WILL WE USE WHAT WE HEARD?

The project team will use feedback from this round to better refine the projects and policies that are being studied in the Streets and Freeways Study and Transit Corridors Study.
Findings from Outreach in Winter 2020

ConnectSF staff from the San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Transportation Authority), and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) gathered community input as part of a second round of outreach for Phase 2. The information would be used to help inform the modal studies that are being developed as part of Phase 2. The three guiding questions of this round of outreach were:

» What local and citywide travel options work well and what do not?
» What would it take for participants to travel using non-automobile modes?
» What project and policy concepts do participants want us to explore to help us reach the vision?

Figure 10 provides a detailed summary of activities conducted from fall 2019 to winter 2020.
Monolingual workshops in Russian, Chinese, Spanish, and Tagalog were canceled due to the local and regional shelter-in-place order imposed because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Civic Edge made additional efforts to meet these language groups online.

The remainder of this report presents key findings from the workshops and online surveys.
WHO DID WE HEAR FROM?

Four workshops and an online survey ensured that diverse opinions were gathered from across the city. Figures 3 and 4 show where survey respondents live and work in the city.

**Survey Respondent Demographics**
The online survey included a number of optional demographic questions. Because they were optional, about 40% of survey respondents skipped these questions or stated that they preferred not to answer. The bulleted findings below exclude those respondents. Full charts for those that responded to the demographic questions can be found in Appendix H.

- More respondents identified as female (55%) than male (43%).
- By race/ethnicity, the largest groups represented were white (22%), Asian and/or Pacific Islander (19%), Lantinx and/or Hispanic (16.5%), and Black or African American (2.8%).
- The approximate household income for survey respondents was largely lower than the general income statistics for the city, with over 58% of participants earning less than $74,999 annually.
- About two-thirds of survey takers were under 44 years old.

We are often asked if our work reflects the entire city, including low income residents and people of color.

In this round of outreach, the answer is mixed. For example, many respondents earn less than the typical San Franciscan resident or household.

However, only 2.8% of respondents identified as Black or African American, compared to 5.6% citywide. Staff acknowledges that future outreach efforts should target Black and African American populations to ensure results are closer to the citywide proportion.
## WHAT DID WE HEAR?

### What San Franciscans like about their neighborhoods – today and in the future
What workshop participants like the most about their neighborhoods is their community and their local business, followed by transit and housing. Within the broader categories of community and business, participants commonly mentioned diversity and small or local businesses as the things they liked the best about their neighborhoods.

In 50 years, the workshop participants want to ensure that their communities persist, and remain diverse and family oriented. Others noted retaining businesses, specifically small and local businesses, and having strong transit. Additionally, we heard that people would like their neighborhoods to be walkable and have plenty of amenities and services, like churches, child serving amenities, community gardens, and libraries.

### Trips San Franciscans make – where is it easy and difficult to go now?
We asked both workshop and survey participants where they currently travel and by what mode. In the workshops, we asked people to draw their trip making patterns on a map. In the survey, we asked people to select the neighborhoods they travel to most often and their home and work zip codes. This information will help to inform what corridors are important travel corridors.

This set of questions was designed to help the ConnectSF team better understand where future transportation system improvements are needed. Staff will use this information to help focus the development of project concepts on important connections that are challenging to make today.

### How do Participants typically get around?
Both workshop attendees and survey participants were most likely to take transit or walk. Workshop participants were much more likely to bike for their day-to-day purposes than those responding to the survey, while survey participants were slightly more likely to drive. This reflects the current city mode share — 22% walking, 22% transit, 2% bicycling, 5% TNC, 1% other, 31% drove alone, and 17% carpool (SFMTA FY 2019 Non-Private Auto Mode Share).

![Figure 5. How do you typically get around?](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why do they use the modes that they do?
About 68% of survey respondents stated that convenience was the most important in deciding how they travel. Other factors commonly cited were safety, reliability, accessibility, and affordability. Participants had the option to rank up to 3 responses.

Figure 6. What's most important to you when deciding how to travel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where is it easy to go now by transit, biking, and walking?
In order to better understand where strong infrastructure currently exists, we asked where it is easy to go now by transit, biking, and walking. For workshop attendees and survey respondents alike, Downtown was by far the most common area of the city cited as easy to get to. Fewer respondents stated that it was easy to get to other parts of the city. Participants could select multiple areas of the city for this question.

Figure 7. Worksheets: Where is it easy to get to now?

Figure 8. Map shown to survey respondents

To be successful, future projects and policies developed in the modal studies should develop convenient, reliable, and safe options to travel around the city.

Downtown is currently easy to get to while other parts of the city are more difficult for most people. To be successful, the modal studies should improve all connections, with a focus on connecting places to each other outside of Downtown.
Staff conducted cross-tabulation analysis on this data by the home district of respondents who are San Francisco residents.

Downtown was the easiest location to reach using transit, biking, or walking across the board for residents in different parts of the city. Beyond that, respondents generally stated that it is easy to use those modes to get to areas near where they live and to adjacent neighborhoods.
Where is it easy to go to in the region?

About 39% of survey respondents found that it was easy to get to either the East Bay or the Peninsula via transit, biking, or walking. Participants could select multiple options. Answers to this question varied by where people indicated they lived.

**Figure 11. Survey: From your home, where is it easy to get to regionally (outside of San Francisco) by transit, biking, or walking?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent do not equal 100.*

Few Southwest residents stated that it was easy to get around nearby areas like the South and East. This may be a challenge to address through the Active Transportation Study.

What existing connections could work better?

At the workshops, participants were asked which existing connections (trips and transfers) could be improved. Participants typically identified transit lines near to the workshop locations. For example, several people at the West Side workshop stated that they would like to have better connections to BART.

Workshop participants and survey respondents provided comments to describe why some transportation connections are challenging. The most frequent comments were that transit is often slow (25%), unreliable (18%), infrequent or that the wait times were too long (16%), and/or with poor connections or too many transfers (15%).

For transit projects to be successful, they must be faster, more reliable, frequent, and reduce waiting times. Improving transit speed was cited as a top priority from workshop participants. More specifically, addressing slow speeds and bad connections are a top priority for those living on the West Side of the city, and the youth group cited crowding as a top issue.
**Figure 12. Why are existing transit connections not working?**

*This question was on the workshop worksheet and not everyone who attended the workshops answered the question.

**What trips would San Franciscans like to make by transit, biking, or walking?**

The answer to this question varied between workshop attendees and survey respondents. Workshop attendees were most interested in making transit, walk, and bike trips to the Sunset district the most followed by Bayshore, Mission/Potrero, South Bay, Richmond, and Marina / Pacific Heights districts. Across survey respondents, the Downtown area of San Francisco was the most common answer.
Staff analyzed these data by the home district of respondents who live in San Francisco. For these respondents, the North area of the city was by far the most common area that they would like to see easier access by transit, walking, or biking. North, Downtown, and Southeast residents were interested in better connections for their own districts. Southwest residents were interested in better connections to the North and Northwest.

The Transit Corridors Study and Active Transportation Study can help identify projects and networks that support better access to the North area of the city.

In addition, residents of North, Downtown, and Southeast areas were especially interested in making transit, walking, or biking better in their own areas.
Survey respondents were also asked specifically about what regional trips they would like to make. More than half were interested in better transit, walking, or biking connections to the North Bay.

*Percents do not equal 100.

The Transit Corridors Study and Active Transportation Study could ensure ideas support regional connections especially to North Bay.
**Big Ideas**

Below is a list of policy and project proposals. These ideas were generated by survey respondents and workshop participants. The list contains the ideas most often mentioned when asked for large-scale transformative transportation projects and ideas for San Francisco. This list includes big ideas from the surveys, workshop groups, and presentations at SPUR and BMAGIC.

Many of the project and policy ideas fell into the categories related to transit: increasing service, expanding transit infrastructure, improving operations, and changes to fares. This should be kept in mind for future transit improvements.

**Figure 16. Survey & workshop: policy and project proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase service/More frequent service/longer vehicles</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend service hours</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More rapid service</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More express service</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Subways (general)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-only lanes, BRT</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More BART (e.g., to Marin or San Jose)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary Subway</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/light rail route extension/expansion</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/reduced fares</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated transit system/fare payments</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transit payment options</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transit reliability</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronized transfers/connections</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Metro operational improvements</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Bike Infrastructure</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car free streets</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit/charge vehicles/keep parking outside of city center (beyond Congestion Pricing)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) like Uber and Lyft</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations for cars/more parking</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled/elderly/accessibility improvements</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION**

**TRANSIT OPERATIONS**

**TRANSIT FARES**

**TRANSIT SERVICE**

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION**

**CONGESTION PRICING**

**REGULATION / ENFORCEMENT**

**IMPROVEMENTS FOR PRIVATE VEHICLES**
**PHASE 2 NEXT STEPS / PART 3 OUTREACH**

This stage of the outreach generated important information for the ConnectSF program. The information on common travel patterns and modes will help to inform our technical analysis, and help us understand who we are hearing from. Where people would like to go and cannot easily go today will help inform where future improvements would be most beneficial. The information on which corridors do not work well today is being used to support the analysis of the potential for new transit, active transportation, street, and freeway improvements in the modal studies that are currently happening. Additionally, specific “Big Ideas” will be compared to ideas generated through technical analysis and will be used to help refine or advance new concepts.

The next round of outreach will present potential project and policy concepts to the public, including concepts that were suggested during the current round of outreach. Outreach will ask participants about public priorities for new transportation investments. This information will help inform the how potential future transportation investments are prioritized.
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APPENDIX A  WHAT WE HEARD

HOW DID WE HEAR FROM THE PUBLIC?

Staff completed Part 2 Outreach on March 23, engaging about 2,500 individuals through four public workshops, two presentations to organizations, and an online survey. The public workshops had two targeted (Southeast and Youth) and two general (West Side and Central) workshops that were each 90 minutes in length with small group discussions where attendees completed worksheets. The survey was released online from January 17 to March 23, and contained 19 total questions — 12 topic related and 7 demographic. Staff used targeted social media ads to increase responses by certain groups after the survey was open for about one week.

Table: A1: Workshops and participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Worksheets Completed</th>
<th>Approximate Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Workshops</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>11/13/2019</td>
<td>Southeast Community Facility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>11/21/2019</td>
<td>Mission High School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public Workshops</td>
<td>West Side</td>
<td>2/8/2020</td>
<td>Park Branch Library</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>2/13/2020</td>
<td>Mission Cultural Center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A2: Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2328</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT SAN FRANCISCANS LIKE ABOUT THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS – TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE

In general, workshop participants like their community (43%) and the businesses within those communities (39%). Often, within those categories, participants mentioned diversity (14%) and Small or Local businesses (22%) as the things they liked the best about their neighborhoods. These were followed by major categories of transit (25%) and housing (9%).
On the worksheets, participants identified the following places, people, and features that make their neighborhood unique.

**Community (44)**
- Community – Diversity (14)
- General (9)
- Families (5)
- Artists (3)
- CBOs (3)
- Neighborhood (2)
- Small Town Feel (2)
- Demographics (1)
- Native Residents (1)
- Community Center (1)
- Community Events (1)

**Businesses (40)**
- Small or Local (22)
- Restaurants/Bars/Shops (13)
- General (3)
- Neighborhood Commercial Corridor (1)
- PDR (1)

**Transit (29)**
- Transit Access (16)
- Connectivity (4)
- Transit Hub (1)
- General (1)
- BART (1)
- BART Station Area (1)
- Direct to downtown & Chinatown (1)
- Transit Routes (1)

**Housing (9)**
- Density (2)
- Density – low (1)
- Large yards (1)
- Mixed (1)
- Mixed Incomes (1)
- Mixed zoning (1)
- Residential (1)
- Single Family (1)

*106 total worksheets completed; Approximately 160 participants*
In 50 years, the workshop participants want to see their communities (17%), and more specifically the diversity (4%), and families oriented (4%) components of those communities persist. This is followed by strong businesses (15%), specifically small and local businesses (9%), and strong transit (11%). Additionally, people would like their neighborhoods to be walkable (6%) and with plenty of amenities (5%), like churches (1%), child serving amenities (0.5%), community gardens (0.5%), and libraries (1%).

Participants stated on worksheets that they want to make sure the following features and assets are still around in 50 years.

**Community (33)**
- Diversity (7)
- Families (7)
- General (6)
- Artists (1)
- Community Gardens (1)
- Creativity (1)
- Demographics (1)
- Entrepreneur spirit (1)
- Neighborhood (1)
- Neighborhood Connection (1)
- Safety (1)
- Sharing (1)
- Small Town Feel (1)

**Businesses (28)**
- Small or Local (17)
- Neighborhood Commercial Corridor (2)
- 3rd St Corridor (1)
- Commercial Corridors (1)
- Grocery Stores (1)
- Ground Floor Retail (1)
- Jobs (1)
- More entry level jobs (1)
- Restaurants (affordable) (1)
- Restaurants/Bars/Shops (1)
- Sam Jordanis (1)

**Transit (21)**
- Transit Access (4)
- General (2)
- Buses (2)
- Free (2)
- Free shuttle for seniors in Hunters Point (1)
- Caltrain Extension to Downtown (1)
- BART 24 hrs (1)
- Enjoyable (1)
- Faster (1)
- Frequent LRT (1)
- N Judah (1)
- Reliable and more frequent connections (1)
- Sustainable (1)
- T Third (1)
- Transit Connections (1)

**Housing (17)**
- Density (2)
- Density – low (1)
- Density (same) (1)
- Enough (1)
- Families (1)
- House boats by Mission Bay Library (1)
- Mixed Incomes (1)
- Moderate Density (1)
- No Single Family Residential to Condos (1)

**Walkability (12)**
- General (7)
- Safety (2)
- Lower Haight (1)
- Noe Valley (1)
- Sidewalks (1)

**Amenities (10)**
- Churches (2)
- Child serving (1)
- Community Gardens (1)
- Connectivity
- Ferry Building
- Landmarks
- Mission Bay Library
- Recreation Centers
- San Francisco Public Library

**Biking (7)**
- General (2)
- Bike Lanes (2)
- Page Street (1)
- Protected Bike Lanes (1)
- Safety (1)

---

**Figure A2. Worksheets: What about the neighborhood do you like that you want to make sure is around in 50 years?**

*106 total worksheets completed. Approximately 160 participants*
THE TRIPS SAN FRANCISCANS MAKE

During the workshops and the survey, we asked participants where they currently travel and by what mode. In the workshops we asked people to draw their trip making patterns on a map, and in the survey, we asked people to select the neighborhoods they most often travel to and their home and work zip codes. This information will help to inform what corridors are important.

In the survey, participants had the option to select multiple neighborhoods. Many respondents stated that they travel most often to the Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, Financial District, and South of Market neighborhoods. It should be noted that options were slightly different in in-language surveys.

Figure A3. Survey: What neighborhood(s) best represent where you travel to most often (for work, school, appointments, etc.)?
The “Trips You Make Activity” Workshop Activity was a warmup activity at each workshop to help participants see where and by what mode each other were using to make trips.

**Figure A4. Youth Workshop responses**

![Youth Workshop Responses](image)

**Figure A5. Southeast Workshop responses**

![Southeast Workshop Responses](image)
HOW DO SAN FRANCISCANS TYPICALLY GET AROUND?

For each transportation mode, survey respondents selected how often they used the mode. Many stated that they often use the following modes either daily or several times a week:

» take public transit,
» walk and/or use a wheelchair, or
» drive.

Respondents also had the option to select that they never use the transportation mode. A majority stated that they never use the following modes:

» ride a scooter,
» use an accessible transit service such as paratransit,
» rent a bike or electric scooter, or
» ride a bicycle.

We saw a diversity of responses to this question at the various workshops. At the Mission workshop, a majority of participants stated that they walk or take transit with a smaller group biking or driving.

Findings from the Southeast workshop demonstrate diverse responses in mode including driving, walking, transit, and some biking. A majority who do drive state they do so because of unreliable and slow transit, they must take many trips throughout the day, and because their destination is not accessible by transit.

Those at the youth workshop said transit, walking, and ride-hailing are their top modes. Some comments reflect that owning a bike is expensive, biking is dangerous, and shared ride-hailing rides can sometimes cost the same as transit making it a more attractive option.

On the worksheets, most participants said that they typically get around by transit and walking. The highest number is highlighted for each workshop group.

Table A3. Worksheets: Respondents who never use each transportation mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Drive</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

106 total worksheets completed; Approximately 160 participants
Figure A8. Worksheets: How do you typically get around?

- **DRIVE**: Southeast Workshop 10%, Youth Workshop 20%, Mission Workshop 30%, West Side Workshop 40%
- **TRANSIT**: Southeast Workshop 40%, Youth Workshop 50%, Mission Workshop 60%, West Side Workshop 70%
- **BIKE**: Southeast Workshop 5%, Youth Workshop 10%, Mission Workshop 15%, West Side Workshop 20%
- **WALK**: Southeast Workshop 20%, Youth Workshop 30%, Mission Workshop 40%, West Side Workshop 50%
- **OTHER**: Southeast Workshop 10%, Youth Workshop 20%, Mission Workshop 30%, West Side Workshop 40%

106 total worksheets completed; Approximately 160 participants

**WHY DO THEY USE THE MODES THAT THEY DO?**

About 68% of survey respondents stated that convenience was the most important in deciding how they travel. Other factors commonly cited were safety, reliability, accessibility, and affordability. Participants had the option to select up to 3 options.

Figure A9. Survey: What’s most important to you when deciding how to travel?

- **CONVENIENCE**: 68%
- **SAFETY**: 55%
- **RELIABILITY**: 46%
- **ACCESSIBILITY**: 39%
- **AFFORDABILITY**: 38%
- **SUSTAINABILITY**: 13%
- **OTHER**: 6%
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WHERE IS IT EASY TO GO NOW BY TRANSIT, BIKING, AND WALKING?

This set of questions was designed to help the ConnectSF Staff team better understand where future improvements do and don’t need to be made for our transportation system. Staff will use this information in combination with other data to focus project concept recommendations to where it is difficult to go to now, or, where people would have gone and currently cannot. Lesser emphasis will be placed on project concepts that focus on places where it is currently easy for people to make trips.

Mission workshop participants cited trips that work on Muni to be on the routes of: 5, 38R, 1, 2, 33, 44, 22, 43, 12, 55, 49, and 24. Those who bike cited the wiggle path and Market Street in Downtown as safe places for cycling.

Southeast workshop participants mentioned Caltrain access as a connection that worked in their neighborhood. They also mentioned BART as efficient for those who live near it, and that the 24, 29, 54, and 44 Muni bus lines work well.

Youth workshop participants mentioned the 5, 6, 38R, 1, 43, and 29 as Muni lines that work well. BART to the East Bay was also mentioned as working well. Additionally, they mentioned it is easy to get around the following neighborhoods: the Outer Mission/ Visitacion Valley to Downtown, Stonestown Galleria, Western Addition and the Haight to Downtown, Western Addition to Pacific Heights, and the Mission.

About 26% of participants indicated on worksheets that it was easy to get to Downtown. This zone was followed by Mission/Potrero (13%), SoMa (13%), Western Market (12%), and the Sunset (10%).

Table A4. Worksheets: Where is it easy to get to now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southeast Workshop</th>
<th>Youth Workshop</th>
<th>Mission Workshop</th>
<th>West Side Workshop</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina / Pacific Heights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Beach / Chinatown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/ Potrero</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noe/ Glen/ Bernal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Districts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*106 total worksheets completed: Approximately 160 participants
Most participants (61%) indicated on the worksheets that they took transit to the places it was easy for them to get to. This may suggest that when transit is easy to use, people will choose to take it more.

Table A5. Workshops: How do you typically get around?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Drive</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

106 total worksheets completed; Approximately 160 participants
Survey participants where is it easy to get to in San Francisco now by transit, biking, or walking. They could select multiple areas of the city for this question. Downtown was by far the most common area of the city cited as easy to get to by transit, biking, or walking, with about 64% of respondents selecting it as one of their responses. Many fewer respondents stated that it was easy to get to other parts of the city.

When looking at survey findings by home location, Downtown was the easiest to get to using transit, biking, and walking across the board. Beyond that, respondents generally stated that it is easy to use those modes to get to other parts of their home area and areas that were adjacent. Highlighted in the table below is where it is easy to go for San Francisco residents from their home area. Other than Downtown and their own district, many noted nearby districts as also easy to get to.
Table A6. Survey: From your home, where is it easy to get to in San Francisco now by transit, biking, or walking?

WHERE IS IT EASY TO GO TO IN THE REGION?

Considering regional travel, about 39% of respondents found that it was easy to get to the East Bay and the Peninsula via transit, biking, and walking.

Figure A13. Survey Response: From your home, where is it easy to get to regionally (outside of San Francisco) by transit, biking, or walking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME LOCATION</th>
<th>Northwest</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>None of the above</th>
<th>Other specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For respondents who are San Francisco residents, the East Bay and Peninsula were also popular answers to this question across different home locations in the city.

**Table A7. Survey: From your home, where is it easy to get to regionally (outside of San Francisco) by transit, biking, or walking?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home location (in San Francisco)</th>
<th>North Bay</th>
<th>East Bay</th>
<th>Peninsula</th>
<th>South Bay</th>
<th>Other specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey respondents were able to select more than one location outside of San Francisco, so responses do not add to 100%*

**WHAT EXISTING CONNECTIONS COULD WORK BETTER?**

Participants were asked about which existing connections (trips and transfers) could work better.

**The Mission workshop participants focused on the following connections that could work better:**

- N line to the beach
- Faster transit options (e.g., 29 bus takes too long)
- Improving ferry service (including faster trip time)
- Seamless transit transfers
- Expanding the bike network
- Mobility hubs within Golden Gate Park
- Bike valets
- Cargo e-bikes for bikeshare
- Connection to Amtrak towards Sacramento / regional connections
- Coordinate construction activities
- Display of next bus stops on buses

**Below are those cited at the Southeast workshop:**

- Better incentives for carpooling and vanpooling
- More direct, elevated, and safe bike routes (including bike-only streets)
- Circulator shuttles or on-demand shuttles
- Policies where only certain license plates can drive on certain days
- Encouraging and/or requiring electric vehicles
- Increasing Muni speed and reliability
- Increasing pedestrian crossing times
- Effective paratransit and transit for seniors
- Multi-language communications regarding transportation options
The Youth workshop focused on the following connections:

» Better transfers
» Better bus stop signage especially along Market (middle of the street/side street stops are confusing)
» Better late-night trips
» Specific transit service could be improved on: Richmond to Downtown routes, 29, 5, 48, 54, 22, 10, 8, 23, 43, 48, 44, 7, 21, 5R, Balboa Park BART, Persian Triangle, Sloat and Junipero Sierra, Twin Peaks and Glen Park service, and Potrero Hill bike access.
» Larger buses for the 14R route to fit more people
» Having school specific buses for students
» Sunset bus routes are difficult to get to

The West Side / Park workshop focused on the following connections:

» Better regional/local transfers (e.g., BART to Muni, Muni to Muni, BART to Caltrain) including lower fare costs
» Better access to BART and Caltrain stations within San Francisco (via transit or biking/walking)
» Better Muni reliability across all routes
» Additional 43 bus service in the PM peak period due to crowding/long waits
» Additional N Judah service providing more frequency
» Additional 38 bus frequency after 7pm
» The 22, 38, 43, and 29 bus services don’t work
» Improvements on the T-Third line past Chase Center
» Biking and transit options on 19th Avenue
» Improved travel options for: Inner to Outer Sunset, Inner Richmond to Presidio, Alemany and Civic Center Farmer’s Market, Ocean Beach to Excelsior, Office Depot / Rainbow Grocery, Mission Bay, SOMA to South of SOMA, Portola to Golden Gate Park, and Bayview to Downtown
» Additional frequency of bus service on weekends

On the worksheets, participants mentioned the T the most (13%) in response to a question asking about the existing transit connections that could work better. Caltrain (8%), BART (7%), Muni Metro (7%), the N (7%), the 8 (7%), and the 29 (7%) were also cited as needing improvements.
## Table A8. Worksheets: What existing connections (trips and transfers) could work better?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>West Side</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Metro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants stated on worksheets that the reasons connections were not working was primarily that they were slow (25%), unreliable (18%), infrequent or that the wait times were too long (16%), or that the service had bad connections (15%).

**Table A9. Worksheets: Reasons connections are not working.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Southeast Workshop</th>
<th>Youth Workshop</th>
<th>Mission Workshop</th>
<th>West Side Workshop</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent/ wait times too long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure A15. Worksheets: Why are they not working?**

**WHAT TRIPS WOULD THEY LIKE TO MAKE BY TRANSIT, BIKING, OR WALKING?**

During the workshops, the participants were asked what kinds of trips that they would like to take by non-auto modes that they currently do not do today.

Most participants said on worksheets that they would like to visit family and friends (29%) by walking, biking, or taking transit. This was closely followed by shopping and errands (25%), and then work or school (19%), and the doctor’s office (14%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Purpose</th>
<th>Southeast Workshop</th>
<th>Youth Workshop</th>
<th>Mission Workshop</th>
<th>West Side Workshop</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work/School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping/errands</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors Office</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit family/friends</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A10. Worksheets: Trip purpose that could be completed by transit, biking, or walking.**
Other trips you would like to take by transit, biking, or walking.

» Recreation Locations (gyms, waterfront, parks, museums, nightlife) (12)
» Regional Connections (6)
» Neighborhood Connections (E-W, N-S) (3)
» Work Meetings (1)

Figure A16. Worksheets: What kinds of trips would you like to take via transit, biking, or walking that you don’t today?

![Bar chart showing responses]

Specifically, at the Mission workshop participants mentioned the following connections they would like to make:

» Baker Beach to Bayview
» Ocean Beach to Marina
» Chinatown to Ocean Avenue CCSF
» Regional transit trips
» Amtrak gap corridor
» Millbrae Connection
» Twin peaks
» Church and Castro
» High speed rail to Tahoe
» West Span Bike Path
» Balboa Park to Sunnydale Caltrain
» Mission Bay

» Noe Valley to North of Market
» Ingleside to Downtown if better biking infrastructure
» Excelsior to Inner Sunset transit
» East – West protected bike routes
» Hard to get to Caltrain from West side
» South Bay transit access/speed
The South East workshop focused on the following connections:

» East – West transit connectivity
» Ferry to Marin and Foster City
» Ferry on the Eastern shore of SF
» Transit connection from South East to South West
» Muni run ferry service
» Hunters Point Shipyard shuttle service
» SF State transit connections
» Beach connections
» Connections to schools, healthcare, UCSF, grocery stores, etc.
» Bayview to Castro
» 24-hour 16th/Potrero Safeway
» Central and Eastern parts of the City
» Connections between Yosemite and Bayview

Youth workshop participants stated the following connections:

» Twin Peaks/ Glen Park bus service
» Sunset bus service
» Excelsior to Bayview to Pacific Heights
» Richmond to the East side
» Excelsior to Presidio
» BART to West Side
» Sunset to Bayview
» BART to East Bay (more frequency)
» Treasure Island
» San Jose
» Marin

West Side / Park workshop participants stated the following connections:

» Ferry to Treasure Island
» Transit to North Bay/Marin
» Bayview
» BART looping the Bay Area
» San Jose
» Sacramento
» Rainbow Grocery
» North West transit connections
» North South transit connections
» Less transfers to reach the airport
» Better access to 22nd Street Caltrain
» West side connection to Daly City
» Transit service for recreation (e.g., Golden Gate Park, Presidio, and McLaren Park bus route)
» 28R on weekends
» Any location that is currently inaccessible by BART (e.g., Emeryville, Coast, Half Moon Bay)

Among survey respondents, the Downtown area of San Francisco was the most common answer across all respondents. Note that participants could select multiple options.
Figure A17. Survey: From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking, or biking in San Francisco if there were better connections and an easier way to get there?

For respondents who are San Francisco residents, the North area of the city was by far the most common area that they would like to access by transit, walking, or biking easier. North, Downtown, and Southeast residents were interested in better connections for their own districts.

Table A11. Survey: From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking, or biking in San Francisco if there were better connections and an easier way to get there?

Participants responded on worksheets that they would take more trips to the Sunset (15%), the Bayshore (12%), the South Bay (11%), and Mission/Potrero (11%) if there were better connections to these places. These areas were closely followed by the Richmond (9%) and the Marina and Pacific Heights (9%).
Table A12. Worksheets: From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking, or biking in San Francisco if there were better connections and an easier way to get there?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southeast Workshop</th>
<th>Youth Workshop</th>
<th>Mission Workshop</th>
<th>West Side Workshop</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina / Pacific Heights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Beach / Chinatown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Market</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoMa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/Potrero</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noe/Glen/ Bernal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Districts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A18. Worksheets: Are there trips you would like to make if there were better connections?
On the worksheets, participants were asked why we need these connections, and many of their reasons fell into the economic vitality category (28%). These were followed by livability (24%) and recreation (18%) reasons.

**Table A13. Worksheets: What would this connection help us fix? (Major Categories)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southeast Workshop</th>
<th>Youth Workshop</th>
<th>Mission Workshop</th>
<th>West Side Workshop</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease Auto reliance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A19. Worksheets: Why do we need these connections?**

RESPONSES
Survey respondents were asked “From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking, or biking around the region if there were better connections and an easier way to get there?” Participants could select multiple options. More than half of respondents were interested in better transit, walking, or biking connections to the North Bay.

**Other Thoughts**
Survey respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional thoughts or comments to their responses to survey questions 5 and 8. Many identified the issue of too many transfers and few fast, direct routes as a barrier for them to use transit, walking, and biking for local San Francisco as well as regional trips. Poor connections between transit lines was another commonly mentioned issue.

**Figure A20. Survey: From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking, or biking around the region if there were better connections and an easier way to get there?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH BAY</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENINSULA</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST BAY</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH BAY</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO / CENTRAL VALLEY</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure A21. Survey: Why people are not taking trips by transit.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOO MANY TRANSFERS / FEW FAST DIRECT ROUTES</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR CONNECTIONS</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOW TRANSIT</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRELIABLE TRANSIT</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFREQUENT TRANSIT / WAIT TIMES TOO LONG</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT SYSTEMS ARE TOO COMPLEX</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWDED TRANSIT</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXTDOOR THEMES

Staff summarized comments received on NextDoor in response to an announcement of the workshop and survey promotion. These comments were regarded as additional feedback.

There were 58 unique comments, and 221 responses within those threads. Those comments were coded by theme and summarized. Additionally, “Big Ideas” were also captured.

Generally, comments fell into five categories:

» Accountability & Engagement (9)
» All modes, cars too (18)
» Congestion (5)
» Safety & Livability (39)
» Transit (41)

Other categories that could not be grouped into larger categories were:

» Data collection: bike usage (1)
» Funding (1)
» Policy/Analysis: bike lane/transit impacts to vehicles (1)
» Project Process (7)
» Survey Issues (1)

Additionally, there were 159 responses between respondents – disagreeing or clarifying previous statements in the comment thread. There were two major theme groups that are useful to break down into their sub themes. These are Safety & Livability (39) and Transit (41).

Safety & Livability

Within Safety & Livability comments generally fell into the topics of schools, security, street design, and user behavior. Of these, 23 people commented on street design topics – 16 of those were issues with current design and street usage. 14 people commented on user behavior elements, mainly with making sure bike, scooters, and TNC vehicles behave in a safe way.

Transit

For Transit topics, access (13) and affordability (13) were commented on the most, followed by new routes ideas (5), new types of transit (4) not in San Francisco, and reliability (4).
**BIG IDEAS**

Below is a list of policy and project proposals mentioned most often throughout the outreach — the surveys, workshop groups, worksheets, and other sources (including SPUR, BMAGIC and Nextdoor Comments).

*Table A14. Big Ideas Summarized by Category and Type.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Proposals</th>
<th>Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service</td>
<td>Increase service/More frequent service/longer vehicles</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend service hours</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More rapid service</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More express service</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Infrastructure Expansion</td>
<td>More Subways (general)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More BART (e.g. to Marin or SJ)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geary Subway</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit-only lanes, BRT</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus/light rail route extension/expansion</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Fares</td>
<td>Free/reduced fares</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other transit payment options</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated transit system/fare payments</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operations</td>
<td>Improve transit reliability</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synchronized transfers/connections</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muni Metro operational improvements</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>More Bike Infrastructure</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car free streets</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Pricing</td>
<td>Limit/charge vehicles/Keep parking outside of city center (beyond Congestion Pricing)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation/Enforcement</td>
<td>Regulate Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) like Uber and Lyft</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements for Private Vehicles</td>
<td>Considerations for cars/more parking</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled/elderly/accessibility improvements</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A22. Big ideas

- Survey
- Workshop Worksheets
- Workshop Groups
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1. Increase service/more frequent service/longer vehicles
2. Free/reduced fares
3. More bike infrastructure
4. More subways (general)
5. Transit-only lanes, BRT
6. Improve transit reliability
7. More BART routes (e.g., to Marin or SJ)
8. Geary subway
9. Synchronized transfers/connections
10. Bus/light rail route extension/expansion
11. Extend service hours
12. Regulate TNCS
13. Integrated transit system/fare payments
14. Limit/charge vehicles/keep parking outside of city center
15. More rapid service
16. Considerations for cars/more parking
17. Congestion pricing
18. Disabled/elderly/accessibility improvements
19. Muni Metro operational improvements
20. More express service
21. Other transit payment options
22. Car free streets

Workshop Groups
Survey
Workshop Worksheets
Other
Survey respondents were also given the opportunity to state which goal area the ideas they provided help solve. Safety and Livability was the most cited goal area.

**Figure A23. Survey: What do these ideas help us solve?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability &amp; Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Livability</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Comments**
Survey respondents had one final opportunity to provide additional thoughts in an open-ended form. Here are some themes that emerged:

- **Cleanliness on both BART and Muni should be improved or is a major reason people choose not to ride**
  - 10

- **City transportation policy is very challenging for the elderly and people with disabilities**
  - 9

- **City transportation policy is very challenging for families with children**
  - 7

- **There are too many transit operators/fare structures/schedules and these things should be better standardized/consolidated/integrated**
  - 7

Respondents also spoke to other cities in the world that may be good examples of transportation:

- Europe (General): 8
- New York City: 6
- German Cities: 2
- Hong Kong: 2
- Washington DC: 2
At the workshops, participants were also asked about the idea of mobility hubs. Mobility hubs could be staffed and sheltered areas for parking & charging e-bikes, bikes, and scooters; built at major transit stops and other key destinations. The questions asked were, “What would a mobility hub need to do to make it useful for you? When thinking about a trip where you would want to take a bike or walk, what does that route look like?”

**Mission Workshop participants focused on the following in regard to mobility hub:**

- More regional transit hubs
- Implementing hubs equitably
- Hubs near Golden Gate Park to cut the walking gap
- Tricycles at hubs
- Hubs in outer neighborhoods
- Hubs at libraries and parks
- Provide charging for e-bikes at hubs
- Make Glen Park a hub
- SF State hub
- Hub between Civic Center and Castro
- Include bike service/repair stations and public restrooms at hubs

**Southeast Workshop participants provided the following feedback:**

- Undergrounding transit
- Seamless transfers at the hubs
- Shuttle services
- Different types of “bikes” including cycles with 3-4 wheels for accessibility
- Intermodal hub at Balboa Park BART

**Youth Workshop participants** were most interested in mobility hubs with bike/scooter parking spread to every neighborhood of the city.

**West Side / Park Workshop participants** were interested in multimodal mobility hubs throughout the city. They cited wanting to see mobility hubs near stores, restaurants, libraries, transit stations, and package delivery/pick up service stations. They would like the mobility hubs to also provide vending machines, e-charging options for electric vehicles, expanding e-bike availability at all stations, and coordinating curb management for pick-up/drop-off of delivery/people.
Finally, staff categorized issues and ideas mentioned in the workshops into the five different ConnectSF Goal Areas.

**Figure A24. Worksheets: ConnectSF Goal Area Mentions**

EQUITY

- Southeast Workshop
- Youth Workshop
- Mission Workshop
- West Side Workshop

ECONOMIC VITALITY

- Southeast Workshop
- Youth Workshop
- Mission Workshop
- West Side Workshop

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

- Southeast Workshop
- Youth Workshop
- Mission Workshop
- West Side Workshop

SAFETY & LIVABILITY

- Southeast Workshop
- Youth Workshop
- Mission Workshop
- West Side Workshop

ACCOUNTABILITY & ENGAGEMENT

- Southeast Workshop
- Youth Workshop
- Mission Workshop
- West Side Workshop
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APPENDIX B  WORKSHOP WORKSHEET QUESTIONS

WORKSHEET TYPE A

ConnectSF  Southeast Workshop

This worksheet follows along with the workshop discussion. Please fill in your answers as you move through the discussion sections, indicating your feedback. Thank you for your participation.

Name: 
Affiliation: Resident of Bayview
Email: 

LOCAL PRIORITIES

Tell us how you usually get around your neighborhood and the city.

1. What are a few things—places, people, and features—that makes your neighborhood unique?
   - Combination of flat lands & hills
   - Largest district in the city
   - More African American
   - Other district
   - Large PDR parcels

2. What about the neighborhood do you like that you want to make sure is around in 50 years?
   - Affordable housing
   - PDR jobs
   - Thriving 3rd St corridor
   - Open space

3. How do you typically get around? What is the purpose of those trips?
   - Drive to work, Apple, meetings
   - Take transit to seldom - always late
   - Bike to
   - Walk to
   - Others: Uber

4. What kinds of trips would you like to take via transit, bike, or walking that you don’t today?
   - Work / school
   - Shopping / errands
   - Doctor’s office
   - Visit family / friends
   - Others:

continued on other side...
TRANSPORTATION NETWORK DISCUSSION

As you answer the following questions, consider: With the goal of creating safer, more livable, and accessible neighborhoods, what would encourage you or others to take more trips by transit, bike, or walking?

5a. Where is it easy to get to now?
   It’s not easy to get anywhere in Bayview

5b. How do you get there?
   Drive or Uber

6a. What existing connections (trips and transfers) could work better?
   Time to 34
   Getting to San Bruno Ave T line

6b. Why are they not working?
   Always late
   Late, crowded busses
   Late, slow

7a. Are there trips you would like to make if there were better connections?
   Meetings Downtown
   Small shopping trips

7b. Why do we need them?

8. What ideas for projects or policies do you have that can improve our transit system?
   Shuttle bus for Seniors
   Transit oriented development
   Consider in a more effective way as to service all residents not just those close to transit hubs

9. What projects or policies would encourage people to bike or walk more regularly?
   Faster trains and busses
   Better connections
   SAFETY
   More comfortable transit
   Affordability
This worksheet follows along with the workshop discussion. Please fill in your answers as you move through the discussion sections, indicating your feedback. Thank you for your participation.

Name: 
Affiliation: 
Email: 

LOCAL PRIORITIES

Tell us how you usually get around your neighborhood and the city.

1. What are a few things—places, people, and features—that makes your neighborhood unique?
   - Sunset District
   - Community
   - Families
   - Slowed Down
   - Quiet

2. What about the neighborhood do you like that you want to make sure is around in 50 years?
   - All of those same unique attributes!

3. How do you typically get around?
   On the lines provided, please indicate the purpose of those trips.
   - [ ] I drive to areas outside of SF for neighborhoods
   - [ ] I take transit to work downtown/ various trips
   - [ ] I bike to
   - [x] I walk to grocery stores in the neighborhood
   - [ ] Others:

4. What kinds of trips would you like to take via transit, bike, or walking that you don’t today?
   - [ ] Work/school
   - [ ] Shopping/errands
   - [ ] Doctor’s office
   - [ ] Visit family/friends
   - [ ] Others:

continued on other side...
TRANS榔ATION NETWORK DISCUSSION

As you answer the following questions, consider: With the goal of creating safer, more livable, and accessible neighborhoods, what would encourage you or others to take more trips by transit, bike, or walking?

5a. What neighborhoods are easy to get to now?
Anything downtown & around Market, Richmond Dist., Haight-Ashbury

5b. How do you get there?
Muni Buses & N streetcar

6a. What existing connections (trips and transfers) could work better?
Trips across the city, like Sunset to North Beach/Marina, and to church area

6b. Why are they not working?
Not the lack of room, but too many stops (more than 30+ stops in some cases)

7a. Are there trips you would like to make if there were better connections? Please specify neighborhoods or regions.

7b. Why do we need them?
Lower environmental impact because right now I'd choose to drive over taking public transit to these neighborhoods.

IDEA-STORM

With an understanding of some of today's challenges, we can think about the strategies that might help solve them.

8. What ideas for projects or policies do you have that can improve our transit system?
Bike boulevards & protected lanes, slowed down streets in particular to make biking safer (current lanes), street closures to cars (like Market closure, maybe Valencia & Mission)

9. Mobility hubs are staffed and sheltered areas for parking & charging e-bikes, bikes and scooters; built at major transit stops and other key destinations. What would a mobility hub need to do to make it useful for you?

Larger number of hubs
**Worksheet Type C**

**Transportation Network Discussion**

What trips do you make — or would like to make — around the city. We want to think of the network as a whole.

As you answer the following questions, consider: **With the goal of creating safer, more livable, and accessible neighborhoods, what would encourage you or others to make more of your daily trips by transit, bike, or walking?**

1. What connections (trips and transfers) are working now? Why are they working?

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

2. What connections (trips and transfers) are missing?

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

3. Why do we need them?

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

**Summary of San Francisco’s Needs for 2050**

- **Mode Share** — we want to get 60% sustainable trips, right now we will see 30% sustainable in 2050
- Decrease **GHG emissions** from the transportation sector
- Increase **equitable outcomes** for low-income and communities of color residents, specifically, increase access to jobs, and decrease commute times.

**Idea Storm**

Based on the challenges listed above, what project concepts and policies strategies might help solve them?

1. What ideas do you have for projects or policies that can improve our transportation system?

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

2. What does this help solve? Circle any that apply

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]

   - [ ]
WORKSHEET TYPE C (CONTINUED)
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APPENDIX C  WORKSHOP WORKSHEET CODING

PURPOSE:
This appendix gives an overview of the coding protocol for data collected during phase 2 of ConnectSF outreach:

> 11/07/19 SPUR Workshop
> 11/21/19 Youth Workshop
> 11/13/19 Southeast Workshop
> 02/08/20 West Side Workshop
> 02/13/20 Mission Workshop
> 02/18/20 BMAGIC Workshop

WHAT DATA HAS BEEN COLLECTED?
Three different sets of outreach materials have been used for Phase 2 outreach. Examples of each are included in the appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet Type A</th>
<th>Worksheet Type B</th>
<th>Worksheet Type C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>SPUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>West Side</td>
<td>BMAGIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type A and type B worksheets were very similar. Several questions were worded slightly differently (3, 5a). Question 9 was changed completely between A and B (from walk/bike focused → mobility hubs).

Type C worksheets were significantly different and were coded with a different protocol, outlined below.

CODING PROTOCOL: TYPE A/B WORKSHEETS (YOUTH, SOUTHEAST, MISSION, WEST SIDE)

> Questions #2, 7b 8 are coded by ConnectSF Goal Area.
> #3 is coded by mode (drive, transit, bike, walk, other)
> #4a is coded by trip purpose (work/school, shopping/errands, doctor, family/friends, other)
> #5a is coded by neighborhood. Neighborhood boundaries were sourced from ConnectSF trip patterns maps: [https://connectsf-trippatterns.sfcta.org/](https://connectsf-trippatterns.sfcta.org/)
> #5b is coded by mode (drive, transit, bike, walk, other)
> #6a is coded by MUNI line or transit operator (eg., Muni J, Muni L, Muni #14, BART, Caltrain)
> #6b is coded by complaint category (unreliable, slow, cost, inefficient, infrequent/long wait times, crowded, bad connections, too complex, unsafe). These categories were determined after examining common worksheet responses.
» #7a is coded by neighborhood (same as #5a)
» #8 was read for large project ideas. Any ideas articulated for this question were recorded and added to totals from group discussion notes.

Responses were coded per-workshop, so that responses for each workshop can be summed separately. See appendix D for an example coded response.

CODING PROTOCOL: TYPE C WORKSHEETS (SPUR, BMAGIC)

The Type C worksheets used for SPUR and BMAGIC workshops were significantly shorter and different than materials used elsewhere. These Type C worksheets were coded only for major project ideas. Project ideas were pulled from text responses as well as drawings (a map was provided with each worksheet over which participants could draw their project ideas).

CODING GROUP DISCUSSION NOTES AND LARGE MAPS

Group discussion notes and table maps were coded mostly for large project ideas. These ideas were collected and tallied by the number of groups which suggested the idea. For instance, “car-free streets” was a common idea among many groups. Maps used for the “trips you take” warmup exercise were overlaid to show common trips and were not coded.
ConnectSF - San Francisco's Transportation Future

Tome esta encuesta en Español | 以中文参加调查 | Sagutan ang sarbey na ito sa Filipino

Whether you walk, bike, drive, carpool, or take public transit, the decisions we make today about how we invest and plan for our transportation future will have lasting effects for generations to come.

We are seeking your feedback to help us better understand what does and doesn’t work well when it comes to local and citywide travel so we can better plan for future challenges. Help us understand your transportation needs and share your ideas to make transportation better in the future.

This survey should take about 5 to 10 minutes. If you have questions about the survey, please contact us at connectsf@sfgov.org.

Thank you for sharing your feedback with the ConnectSF team.
**Local Priorities**

As the population continues to grow in San Francisco, the city will not be able to sustain the current number of daily vehicle trips. We must develop a transit system and streets that encourage and support other modes of transportation.

---

**San Francisco Neighborhood Map**

![San Francisco Neighborhood Map](image)
1. What neighborhood(s) best represent where you travel to most often (for work, school, appointments, etc.)? Select all that apply.

- Bayview
- Beaus Heights
- Castro / Upper Market
- Chinatown
- Crocker Amazon
- Diamond Heights
- Downtown / Civic Center
- Excelsior
- Financial District
- Glen Park
- Golden Gate Park
- Haight Ashbury
- Hunters Point
- Inner Richmond
- Inner Sunset
- Lakeshore
- Marina
- Mission
- Nob Hill
- Noe Valley
- North Beach
- Ocean View
- Outer Mission
- Outer Richmond
- Outer Sunset
- Pacific Heights
- Parkside
- Potrero Hill
- Presidio
- Presidio Heights
- Russian Hill
- Searcy
- South of Market
- Tenderloin
- Treasure Island
- Twin Peaks
- Yerba Buena Island
- Visitacion Valley
- West of Twin Peaks
- Western Addition

2. How do you typically get around?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Less than once a week</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take public transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride a bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk and/or use wheelchair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a taxi or company like Uber and Lyft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride a scooter or skateboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an accessible transit service such as paratransit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent a bike or electric scooter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What’s most important to you when deciding how to travel? Select up to 3 responses.

- Accessibility
- Affordability
- Convenience
- Reliability
- Safety
- Sustainability
- Other
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Citywide Transportation Network

The city’s transportation network should connect all San Franciscans with the rest of the city as well as regional destinations.

***

Connections that are working

As we work to encourage more trips by walking, biking, and transit, help us identify the trips that are working well.
4. Please use the map above as a guide.

From your home, where is it easy to get to in San Francisco now by transit, biking, or walking? Select all that apply.

☐ Center
☐ Downtown
☐ East
☐ North
☐ Northeast
☐ South
☐ Other (please specify)

5. Please use the map above as a guide.

From your home, where is it easy to get to regionally (outside of San Francisco) by transit, biking, or walking? Select all that apply.

☐ North Bay
☐ East Bay
☐ Peninsula
☐ San Jose
☐ Sacramento / Central Valley
☐ Other (please specify)
6. Additional thoughts or comments:


Connections that are missing
As we work to encourage more trips by walking, biking, and transit, help us identify the trips that could work better.

7. Please use the map above as a guide.
From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking or biking in San Francisco if there were better connections and an easier way to get there? Select all that apply.

- Center
- Downtown
- East
- North
- Northwest
- South
- Other (please specify)

- Southeast
- Southwest
- Treasure Island
- West
- None of the above
8. Please use the regional map above as a guide.

From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking or biking around the region if there were better connections and an easier way to get there? Select all that apply.

- North Bay
- East Bay
- Peninsula
- San Jose
- Sacramento / Central Valley
- Other (please specify)

9. Additional thoughts or comments:


Project and Policy Ideastorm

We want to explore ideas for citywide transportation projects or policies that might solve today’s transportation challenges. We need your ideas to help us create a better transportation system.

10. What ideas for projects or policies do you have that can improve our transportation system?

Your Idea #1:

Your Idea #2:

Your Idea #3:

11. What do these ideas help us solve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Environmental Sustainability</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Safety and Livability</th>
<th>Accountability &amp; Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Additional thoughts or comments:
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13. Home Zip Code:


14. Work or School Zip Code:


15. How do you describe your gender identity? Select all that apply.

- Female
- Male
- Gender Non-binary
- Transgender
- Prefer not to answer
- Another gender (please specify):

16. What race and/or ethnicity do you identify with? Select all that apply.

- Asian and/or Pacific Islander
- Black and/or African American
- Latinx and/or Hispanic
- Middle Eastern and/or North African
- Native American
- White
- Prefer not to answer
- Another race or ethnicity (specify):

17. What is your approximate household income?

- Less than $10,000
- $10,000 to $24,999
- $25,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $74,999
- $75,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $124,999
- $125,000 to $149,999
- $150,000 to $174,999
- $175,000 to $199,999
- $200,000 or more
- Prefer not to answer
16. What race and/or ethnicity do you identify with? Select all that apply.

☐ Asian and/or Pacific Islander
☐ Black and/or African American
☐ Latinx and/or Hispanic
☐ Middle Eastern and/or North African
☐ Native American
☐ White

☐ Prefer not to answer
☐ Another race or ethnicity (specify):

17. What is your approximate household income?

☐ Less than $10,000
☐ $10,000 to $24,999
☐ $25,000 to $49,999
☐ $50,000 to $74,999
☐ $75,000 to $99,999
☐ $100,000 to $124,999

☐ $125,000 to $149,999
☐ $150,000 to $174,999
☐ $175,000 to $199,999
☐ $200,000 or more
☐ Prefer not to answer

18. What is your age?

☐ 18 or under
☐ 19 – 24
☐ 25 – 34
☐ 35 – 44

☐ 45 – 54
☐ 55 – 64
☐ 65 or over
☐ Prefer not to answer

19. Please provide your contact information to learn more about ConnectSF.

Email address:

Phone number:

Thank you for sharing your time and insight with us today. We hope you’ll continue to follow the project at ConnectSF.org.

We want to hear from your friends, family, and colleagues. Please share this survey on social media.

8/12 100%

Prev Done
SURVEY RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

About 40% of respondents skipped the following demographics questions or stated that they preferred not to answer. The demographics charts show the responses based on those who answered the questions.

**Q15: How do you describe your gender identity?**
Of those who provided their gender, survey respondents were more female than male. Participants could select multiple options.

**Figure E1. How do you describe your gender identity?**

- **Female**: 54.80%
- **Male**: 43.20%
- **Gender Non-Binary**: 1.10%
- **Transgender**: 0.50%
- **Another Gender Specified**: 0.40%

**Q16: What race and/or ethnicity do you identify with?**
Participants could select multiple options.

Of those who provided race and/or ethnicity, a large proportion of participants identified as white, Asian, and/or Latinx or Hispanic. Additionally, participants could select multiple options.

**Figure E2. What race and/or ethnicity do you identify with?**

- **White**: 34.60%
- **Asian and/or Pacific Islander**: 29.50%
- **Latinx and/or Hispanic**: 25.60%
- **Another race or ethnicity (specify)**: 5.60%
- **Black and/or African American**: 2.80%
- **Native American**: 1.10%
- **Middle Eastern and/or North African**: 0.80%
Q17: What is your approximate household income?
The approximate household income for survey respondents was largely lower than the general income statistics for the city, with over 58.5% of participants earning less than $74,999 annually.

![Figure E3. What is your approximate household income?](chart)

Q18: What is your age?
Of those who provided their age, about two-thirds of survey takers were under 44 years old.

![Figure E4. What is your age?](chart)
APPENDIX F

CONNECTSF ONLINE SURVEY CODING

PURPOSE:
This memorandum gives an overview of the coding protocol for data collected as part of the online survey distributed in Phase 2 of ConnectSF outreach.

WHAT DATA HAS BEEN COLLECTED ONLINE?
The ConnectSF Team administered an online survey which was available in English, Spanish, Tagalog, and Chinese.

CODING PROTOCOL: SURVEY
Questions 6 and 9 were free response questions which asked for “Additional thoughts or comments.” Q6 followed a series of questions which asked where it is easy to get by transit, walking, and biking. Q9 followed a series of questions about where it is hard to get to by transit, walking, and biking. Responses to both questions focused on barriers to travel. For that reason, Q6 and Q9 were coded together by barrier mentioned.

Question 10 asked for three project ideas. These project ideas were summarized and recorded. Common project ideas were noted.

Question 12 asks for “Additional thoughts or comments.” Each response was summarized, then key themes were extracted. Many respondents also mentioned comparison geographies which have transportation systems that San Francisco could emulate. This information was also recorded.

CODING PROTOCOL: NEXTDOOR
The process for coding NextDoor comments involved the following steps:

1. Determine if the comment is a direct response to ConnectSF material, or a response to another NextDoor post
2. Extract major themes from comments to ConnectSF material
3. Note any major project ideas in any comments
4. From extracted themes, determine if many responses say the same thing
5. Determine what goal area major themes fall into
SURVEY GEOGRAPHIES DIFFER ACROSS LANGUAGES

Question 1: “What neighborhood(s) best represent where you travel most often (for work, school, appointments, etc.)? Select all that apply.”

» The following were available answers on the English survey, but did not appear in Spanish, Chinese, or Tagalog: Chinatown, Hunters Point, Tenderloin, Twin Peaks, Yerba Buena Island.

Question 4: “Please use the map above as a guide. From your home, where is it easy to get to in San Francisco now by transit, biking, or walking? Select all that apply.”

» In Spanish only, there is a “Noreste” option, which translates to “Northeast”.
» In English only, there is a “Northwest” option.
» In Spanish, Chinese, and Tagalog the following are options: Bayview, North Beach, South of Market, Western Addition. However these do not appear as options in the English survey.

Question 5: “Please use the map above as a guide. From your home, where is it easy to get to regionally (outside of San Francisco) by transit, biking, or walking? Select all that apply.”

» In English, options were presented as large regions: North Bay, East Bay, etc. In Spanish, Chinese, and Tagalog, options were presented as counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Napa, etc. The table below was used to map county geographies onto regions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>Marin, Sonoma, Napa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Alameda, Contra Costa, Solano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento / Central Valley</td>
<td>Sacramento, Stockton/Central Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Discretionary Categorization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7: Please use the map above as a guide. From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking, or biking in San Francisco if there were better connections and an easier way to get there? Select all that apply.

» In English, an option was presented for “Southwest”. This was not an option in the Spanish, Chinese, or Tagalog surveys.
» In Spanish, Chinese, and Tagalog, Bayview, North Beach, Northeast, and Western Addition were presented as options. These options did not appear on the English survey.

Question 8: “Please use the regional map above as a guide. From your home, what trips would you like to make by transit, walking, or biking around the region if there were better connections and an easier way to get there? Select all that apply.”

» Identical Problem and geography-matching as in Question 5
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Director of Communications  Eric Young  1 Feb

Public Workshop

Share your ideas about SF’s transportation future. Join us at a ConnectSF workshop. Your input will be critical in helping us identify project and policy concepts as we look to build a transportation system that will best serve us in the future.

We will be hosting two public workshops:

Saturday, February 8 from 2-4PM | Park Branch Library Community Room, 1833 Page Street, San Francisco
Thursday, February 13 from 6-8PM | Mission Cultural Center, 2868 Mission Street, San Francisco
Learn more and RSVP: https://connectsf.org/events/

The workshop will run the full two hours. Please be sure to arrive on time.

Both workshops will cover the same topics.

Food will be provided.

Interpretation will be provided in Spanish, Chinese, and Filipino.

Not able to join us at one of our workshops? Participate in our survey at https://connectsf.org/survey/

Learn more about ConnectSF at: https://connectsf.org/
Posted to Subscribers of San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Staff summarized comments received on NextDoor in response to an announcement of the workshop and survey promotion. These comments were regarded as additional feedback.

There were 58 unique comments, and 221 responses within those threads. Those comments were coded by theme and summarized. “Big Ideas” were also captured.

**Generally, comments fell into five categories:**

- Accountability & Engagement (9)
- All modes are important, emphasis on cars being included too (18)
- Congestion (5)
- Safety & Livability (39)
- Transit (41)

**Other categories that could not be grouped into larger categories were:**

- Data collection: bike usage (1)
- Funding (1)
- Policy/Analysis: bike lane/transit impacts to vehicles (1)
- Project Process (Goal Area: Accountability & Engagement) (7)
- Survey Issues (1)

Additionally, there were 159 responses between respondents — disagreeing or clarifying previous statements in the comment thread. There were two broad themes raised in these comments — Safety & Livability (39) and Transit (41) — and a number of ideas within each theme.

**Safety & Livability**

Within Safety & Livability comments generally fell into the topics of schools, security, street design, and user behavior. Of these, 23 people commented on street design topics — 16 of those were issues with current design and street usage. 14 people commented on user behavior elements, mainly with making sure bike, scooters, and TNC vehicles behave in a safe way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design - bike friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design - protected bike lanes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design - protected bike lanes, car free streets, BRT lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design - safer streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design - signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: bike lane near school)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: bike lanes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: bulbouts and bike lanes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: car free street)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: car free streets, Better Market)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: double parking)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: e-bikes, e-scooters, cars)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: parking, double parking)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: red carpet lanes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: shared mobility, parking removed, parklets, red lanes)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: Street Design (issue: traffic calming)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: User Behavior (cleanliness)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: User behavior (enforcement)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: User behavior (enforcement: bikes)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: User behavior (enforcement: bikes, scooters)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: User behavior (enforcement: scooters)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Livability: User behavior (enforcement: TNCs)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit**

For Transit topics, access (13) and affordability (13) were commented on the most, followed by new routes ideas (5), new types of transit (4) not in San Francisco, and reliability (4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit: access</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: affordability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: affordability - free transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: affordability; peak hour congestion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: issue - exclusive lanes (Taraval specific)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: new routes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: new type</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: reliability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: speed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Big Ideas

The Big Ideas were coded similarly to the surveys for consistency. The top categories are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase service/more frequent service/longer vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/reduced fares</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More bike Infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More subways (general)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-only lanes, bus rapid transit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve reliability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More BART (e.g. to Marin or San Jose)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary Subway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronized transfers/connections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/light rail route extension/expansion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend service hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate TNCs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated transit system/fare payments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit/charge vehicles/keep parking outside of city center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More rapid service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations for cars/more parking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Pricing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabled/elderly/accessibility improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Metro operational improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More express service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transit payment options</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car free streets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete list of Big Ideas from NextDoor are:

- Build multi story garages near transit hubs
- Install “crossing gates” on the side of buses to stop cars while people are alighting instead of removing parking
- Improve traffic corridors: Upper Market, 19th Avenue, Folsom, Bush/Howard, Franklin/Gough
- Better timing of lights on Mission and Folsom plus left turn lanes to allow cars to cross Market
- Free mass transit
- More rapid transit
- More grade-separated rapid transit
- Make Franklin and Gough bike/scooter free to safely move traffic
- More protected bike lanes
» Scooter companies put out docking/pay stations, so the scooters aren’t all over the sidewalks.
» Transit signal priority
» New rail line from Powell up Geary to 48th Avenue
» 24/7 transit
» Better transit and protected bike lanes
» Free mass transit by 10% more taxpayer funding
» Free mass transit for over 65-ers
» No construction during rush hour or other high traffic times
» Large commercial vehicles/trucks should be restricted from driving in SF during peak hours unless they pay high fee
» Connect new stadium to BART down 16th Street
» Light-Rail Transit from the Marina down Van Ness to BART
» Bus Only lane on Columbus Street
» Bus Only lane on Bay Bridge
» Extend Central Subway to Fisherman’s Wharf and the Presidio
» Link Sloat L Taraval back up to West Portal and drop it south to Daly City on westside of Stonestown SFSU and Parkmerced to John Daly Loop or brotherhood way (no county investment and link it back to Daly City revitalized Bart platform with transfers between BART and MUNI directly on the west side than link T line up Geneva Harney and loop the F-line and Van Ness BRT at Caesar Chavez and out to Chrissy field Connect the dots.
» Reinstate old streetcar routes
» Gondolas/overhead transit
» Gondolas/overhead transit: specifically, from YBI to SF
» People movers up the hills
» Ski lifts and slides
» More subways