

**APPENDIX E**

# **RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**ConnectSF**

MARCH 2018

The ConnectSF team made the draft vision document available to the public in February and March 2018. The following table documents how the project team addressed comments received during this time. The vision was collaboratively developed between the Futures Task Force, leadership from City agencies, and the general public. Staff made an effort to incorporate comments and suggested edits as long as they were consistent with the overall character of the vision.

No.	Comment	Response
1.	<p>Page 12: Note that outmigration is also related to people being pushed out. He recommended that we acknowledge our present-day condition and that we had to overcome that to get to the vision.</p>	<p>Language about protecting existing residents from displacement added earlier in this section.</p>
2.	<p>Page 8: "People are drawn to SF for its ability to retain and expand its diversity and inclusiveness." Similar to previous comment. Should acknowledge that there is the present-day condition of the city not being able to retail and expand diversity.</p>	<p>Rephrased to suggest more active maintenance of diversity.</p>
3.	<p>1) There needs to be a coherent vision for transportation in San Francisco. As a resident who cares about transportation and an advocate in this space, there are far too many discrete efforts for improving the transportation networks in SF. It is far too difficult for any individual to stay on top of these efforts, especially as an everyday San Francisco. During the last year that Connect SF has been in planning, there has been regular Vision Zero Task Force meetings, Transportation Task Force 2045, Muni Equity Strategy and more.</p>	<p>ConnectSF is unique in having a long-term focus. The intent is for the vision and goals of ConnectSF to steer the efforts of these shorter-term, more narrowly focused task forces. No change made.</p>
4.	<p>2) While the "Accountability and Engagement" goal is a good start, it doesn't go far enough. This additional goal is good in concept, but it reads mostly as an extension of things the City already does. I would encourage City planners to go a step further and think about what an ideal model of community engagement looks like so that we can both get feedback from local residents while also maintaining the urgency that transit and transportation projects require.</p> <p>In particular, I think that there needs to be a better model for community engagement that really considers the sustainability of this engagement. Too many times, City planners require on ad hoc outreach that favors certain perspectives and is generally unsustainable. Are there better models for engagement where City resources could be invested to ensure broader community participation and longevity in outreach efforts?</p>	<p>Added sentence to description of vision, emphasizing that engagement and accountability help us to move projects forward. The discussion of current practice favoring certain perspectives is addressed in other sections.</p>
5.	<p>3) "The Vision for San Francisco" does not feel relatable. I polled our SF Bicycle Coalition staff to get their feedback. Here are some of the things I heard back:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personally, the image above doesn't attract me. although I will probably read whatever they publish. Who is the intended audience? I especially don't like the autonomous vehicles tooling along in their own lane on a road without bike lanes where "Public right-of-way is dedicated to sustainable transportation modes"</li> </ul>	<p>Modified call-out to emphasize separated bicycling facilities and other active transportation modes.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where are the PBL's (protected bike lanes) on the main street?! They have a dedicated lane for autonomous/ TNCs (I'm guessing). Too many private vehicles imo, not enough active transportation, especially along the main street.</li> </ul>	<p>The graphic is trying to achieve a lot. To this comment, call-outs were modified to emphasize separated bicycling facilities and other active transportation modes. Showed integration with transit.</p>
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's cool. My initial reaction when I hear "Connect SF" isn't a chunk-snapshot of different transportation options packed on top of itself and looking chaotic though... I'd imagine a clear and concise aerial/planning map of the city with color-coordinated lines showing the location/route of each mode of transit and exactly where they are actually connecting to one another to emphasize network.</li> </ul>	<p>These types of schematics with project detail will be developed through the ConnectSF follow-in studies. No change made.</p>
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ohmyword, why is it so busy?!? There's a lot of visual clutter that makes it really hard to process what the heck is going on at all. Why do so many vehicles have weird wifi signal icons emitting from them?! I think it could be a lot clearer by simplifying it significantly. That said, the vision laid out in the fact sheet is strong, so long as it's not just a PR campaign but an actual vision guiding decision-making. I would call out a few other things: there are a LOT of taxi cabs in the image, which will very soon no longer exist. This makes the image seem already dated and out of touch with "emerging transportation technologies". Also: make those bike lanes protected, not just painted.</li> </ul>	<p>San Francisco will be a busy place with that level of sustained growth!</p>
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That looks like a Where's Waldo!!!!!! do all the cabs have wifi or something??? this is so hilariously bad!</li> </ul>	<p>San Francisco will be a busy place with that level of sustained growth! We agree the iconography is not necessarily intuitive. The call-outs on the following page explain them.</p>
10.	<p>FRAMING THE VISION REPORT: I don't think many readers will initially appreciate the difficulty of creating a 50 year vision statement. I think they are hoping to find specific recommendations and action items as opposed to the "framework" that is mentioned on page 14. Perhaps it would help if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>early in the report, or perhaps in a executive summary, you mention the challenge of creating a 50 year vision and the desired output being a framework for future planning in more detail.</li> </ul>	<p>Added sentence to "Why do we need to plan differently today?" section that describes the challenge.</p>
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>also, I think it might help to provide a summary of the drivers of change that were considered with a brief statement. This will perhaps give more substance to the effort of the study and complexity of the problem.</li> </ul>	<p>This text is at the top of page 17. No change made.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
12.	<p><b>EXPLORING THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF DIFFERENT LAND USE MODELS ON THE TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM:</b> It is hard to imagine that SF can develop a successful transportation system to handle 25-50% more population without rethinking where people need to commute daily within the city. On page 12 you discuss “new compact development placed along key transport corridors and hubs throughout the city”. But, I am wondering if we might envisage a city of the future where there are multiple business centers surrounded by residential and commercial areas that are related? Could we do some strategic what-if analyses where this concept is evaluated in terms of both population growth and transportation needs? Potentially, I think this could result in major \$ savings.</p>	<p>Modified text in Land Use implications to support more distributed centers.</p>
13.	<p>We talked briefly about Mission Bay, and it would be great to look at what the associated transportation needs were/are relative to perhaps creating a new community without all the related medical industry that has also been created nearby. I would love to read about any studies that have been done on this topic if you could point me to them.</p>	<p>Mission Bay is an example of the type of distributed activity center San Francisco will need to accommodate future growth but overly specific to include in this vision document. No change made.</p>
14.	<p>Similarly what studies have been done for the new development south of the ballpark, at Hunters Point, or perhaps near Stonestown? Again, I would be most appreciative if you could point me to such reports. And, I would be very interested in learning more about how you all model the impact of such development and whether this could lead to larger what-if analyses as part of the 2nd phase planning efforts.</p>	<p>Staff will provide information on these developments and modeling efforts. No change made.</p>
15.	<p><b>Page 7:</b> Call out the Accountability &amp; Engagement were a direct response from feedback. Shows we are actually listening and taking action to respond.</p>	<p>Added sentence to the paragraph following goals.</p>
16.	<p>Appendix A is mentioned in the index but nowhere else in the document.</p>	<p>Added reference to “Uniquely San Franciscan Vision” sidebar</p>
17.	<p>Index formatting doesn’t draw people’s eyes and is difficult to read. Needs higher contrast.</p>	<p>Index moved below image to make it easier to read.</p>
18.	<p><b>Page 21:</b> SFMTA has a board of Directors, not commissioners</p>	<p>“Commissioners” changed to “Directors.”</p>
19.	<p><b>Appendix B:</b> additional call-outs on co-learning events would be good to have. These are somewhat brushed under the rug. Additionally noting the futures primer is available to the general public and no small volume of work is a good idea.</p>	

No.	Comment	Response
20.	<p>Page 11: The vision is a statement of aspiration for San Francisco’s transportation system and rejects some of the potential future outcomes considered during the process, such as: <b>complete privatization of the transportation network unregulated innovation that creates a two-tiered transportation system</b>, prioritizing private automobile parking over road-user safety, and narrow interests halting progress for the entire City.</p> <p><b>#3:</b> Public right-of-way is dedicated to sustainable <b>and high-occupancy</b> transportation modes, improving operations and efficiency.</p>	<p>Modified language but kept focus on equity. Specifying “high-occupancy” under #3 would exclude walking and bicycling, so no change made.</p>
21.	<p>Page 12: The City still faces issues related to equity and income disparities, but policymakers and community members are diligent on finding ways to build consensus to address such challenges and developing effective ways to reduce inequities. This may mean increased taxes to provide high-quality services and to subsidize access to these services. It may also mean <b>potential</b> regulations and partnerships with businesses to ensure that transportation innovations further the public interest.</p> <p>Congestion and automobile travel times <b>may will</b> increase but are manageable due to <b>increased transportation choices</b>, robust investments in public transit and carpooling, which may include multiple new subway lines, a citywide network of bus-only lanes, and regional transit connections, like new transbay rail links and high-speed rail.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> When reviewing the scenarios, we saw that the Building Bridges scenario <b>creates more congestion</b>. We propose that this sentence is more honest about the reality of increased congestion, given the scenario’s assumed population growth and re-allocation of physical space (i.e. road diets and eliminating travel lanes for other uses such as transit-only lanes, bike lanes, greenspace, etc.)</p>	<p>“May also” implies “potential” so no change made.</p> <p>We agree with being more forthright about tradeoffs with congestion. Modified with “will likely” to account for uncertainty. Included language around transportation choices.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
22.	<p>Page 13: Micro-transit or other emerging mobility services such as bikesharing, car sharing, ridesharing, and autonomous vehicles fill in gaps or otherwise complement public transit, for example in overnight and early morning hours. More affordable transportation options exist for residents, workers, and visitors. Street space is repurposed from private auto use and storage to more space-efficient shared transportation options, as well as bicycling and walking.</p> <p><b>Feedback:</b> Overall for the vision, we love the focus on the various and new transportation options - but would like some vision around how they will be integrated from a trip planning, payment, and governance perspective. For example, a lot of SPUR's work has focused on how fractured regional Bay Area transportation is and the need for more integration to happen across the various providers. We'd like to see that better reflected, as the next 50 years will create not only growth in the City of SF but for the Bay Area as a whole. Having a distinct vision for a less fractured network needs to be explicit.</p> <p>In addition, much of the language in the vision about governance focuses on primarily on 1. regulation and 2. engagement/transparency with residents and transparency. We propose expanding this description of governance to also acknowledge the other ways in which governance in the city needs to modernize. For example, this could include internal changes such as procurement reform, as well as more emphasis on the city taking a user-centered approach to design. Finally, we would like to see a City/Agency commitment to embracing new digital technologies.</p>	Added examples per suggestion.
23.	Define "sustainable transportation" in call-out more concisely. For example, some people think that TNCs are sustainable.	Added "(i.e., transit, biking, walking)" after sustainable transportation" in call-out.
24.	Acknowledge PBA (Plan Bay Area) goals but go further, as they're pretty weak (e.g., 1% bike mode share) or are not necessarily good for SF.	Modified sentence to show that SF would go further where necessary.
25.	Housing should be its own issue, its own goal. Or should it an explicit part of one of the goals.	Housing is a critical part of every goal, especially equity. This is addressed in the language and the objectives in Appendix D. No change made.
26.	We should update or re-visit the vision and program every five years, as there will be regional issues that need to be addressed, e.g., sea-level rise, second BART tube, high-speed rail.	The vision will include a monitoring component, along objectives set forth in Appendix D. Suggestion to revisit the vision on a regular basis will be considered by partner agencies. No change made to the text.

No.	Comment	Response
27.	Congestion is so great, that essential services are negatively impacted and safety is compromised. Don't just talk about sustainable transportation. Private autos are the elephant in the room and should be explicitly restricted. You can use funding ideas, like congestion pricing. The days that people can get in their own car, go wherever they want, and whenever they want are over.	Modified text to reflect high likelihood of increased congestion. However, the relationship between congestion and safety is not straightforward. We believe the language throughout the vision document is fairly clear that moving current and future San Franciscans simply cannot be achieved with heavy reliance private autos.
28.	Regarding text of Accountability & Engagement goal statement, it lacks language about true accountability, how SF would be responsive and adjust. It needs language more specific to engagement, beyond simply working together.	More specificity regarding the goals is availability in the objectives included in Appendix D. No change made.
29.	New fifth goal is great, though we need to make sure we have engagement that is impactful. Transparency is very important, and this does not seem to be expressed in the goal statement. Is there some kind of tangible reporting system for the City?	Goal statement does not explicitly say "transparency" though it is mentioned in the vision description. The City has developed objectives around accountability and engagement and other goals, available in Appendix D. No change made to vision document.
30.	How will equity be integrated throughout the vision? Will there be equity in the employment sector, through hiring and job types?	The vision does call for a variety of job types. Added clause citing diverse and numerous opportunities for existing and new residents.
31.	Addition of fifth goal is an improvement, particularly the idea of holding government accountable. The vision language needs to reinforce the importance of transparency in public processes, where there is currently too much opacity	Goal statement does not explicitly say "transparency" though its importance is mentioned a few times in the document.
32.	Current graphic depiction of Vision looks like "Where's Waldo"	San Francisco will be a busy place with anticipated sustained growth. No change made.

No.	Comment	Response
34.	Increased density comes with trade-offs. How will this be balanced in neighborhoods that already have some density and narrow streets, like parts of SOMA, where taller buildings cast more shadows and create darker sidewalks that feel less safe?	Focus group participants, the Futures Task Force, and other community members were aware of the trade-offs around density (and others) when endorsing the vision, as described in “How the Vision Was Developed”. Added some text about how the vision facilitates inclusive discussion of trade-offs.
35.	Problem with affordable housing is that developers now can pay off City rather than include affordable units right there and then when they are constructing new housing	The vision recognizes that San Francisco has not been building enough affordable housing. Specific strategies to improve affordable housing outcomes will be considered
36.	What is the City doing to stem displacement of communities that have been in their location historically, like the Filipino residents of SOMA?	The vision does call for housing that’s affordable for all income levels and the protection of residents from displacement. Specific steps to achieve this will be an ongoing conversation in more detailed studies.
37.	I think the vision could use more emphasis on safe streets, not just safe neighborhoods. And also a focus on efficient transportation (maybe that’s what sustainable is getting at?). As written, the vision might still allow a lot of single-occupancy vehicles on our streets if they are not privately owned -- but that doesn’t make for a great city!	Strengthened language in “What does this mean for transportation and land use” about achieving Vision Zero, described importance of walking and bicycling networks.
38.	<p>Q: A fifth goal about accountability and engagement was added to ConnectSF’s goals (guiding principles), which had consisted of equity; safety and livability; environmental sustainability; and economic vitality. This was a result of comments we consistently heard during our outreach efforts as well as at the October workshop. Does this fifth goal support the overall vision?</p> <p>A: Yes – it’s a little confusing with the report broken into sections on the website, but once I found the content, it was good. Good to see accountability and engagement as the fifth goal. The vision is good but I didn’t see a lot of connection to families, kids, education, elderly. Perhaps that’s too in the weeds and not the right scale for this vision.</p>	Seniors and families are included under groups that the City has made room for and definitely an important part of the vision. No change made.