## Summary of Feedback - June 11, 2017 Sunday Streets in Golden Gate Park

- 41 total comments:
  - o 18 comment cards
  - o 22 post-it notes
  - o 1 letter
- The modes of transportation commenters said they use to get around Golden Gate Park (respondents selected all that apply):
  - Walking—12
  - Bicycling—12
  - Driving—6
  - Transit / park shuttle—1
  - Taxi / ride-hail app—2
- Mention of major topics/issues:
  - Car-free streets/park—10
  - Signage—6
    - Stop signs—1
    - Pedestrian advisory signs—2
    - Shuttle stop signs—1
    - General—2
  - Crosswalks—4
  - Entrances and exits—4
  - Traffic signals—4
  - Bicycle facilities—6
    - Protected bike lanes—3
  - o Parking—3
  - Flashing beacons—2
  - Speed limits—2
  - Bicycle boulevards—1
  - Bollards—1
  - Climate change—1
  - Free park/Muni shuttle—1
  - Greenery−1
  - Noise pollution−1
  - One-way streets—1
  - Paving—1
  - In-pavement reflectors—1
  - Restricted turns—1
  - Restrooms—1
  - Sidewalks—1
  - Speed humps—1
  - Visibility−1

## • The number of people residing in ZIP codes as specified on comment cards:

- 94121-7 → Richmond District / Outer Richmond / Sea Cliff
- 94117-3 → Haight-Ashbury / Cole Valley
- 94122-3 → Outer Sunset / Inner Sunset
- 94103-1 → South of Market
- 94110—1 → Mission District / Bernal Heights
- 94114-1 → The Castro / Dolores Heights / Noe Valley / Twin Peaks
- 94116—1 → Sunset District /West Portal / Forest Hill
- 94118—1 → Richmond / Laurel Heights / Presidio Heights

## • General reception of proposed 2017 spot improvements and traffic calming:

- 15 'supportive'
- 1 'somewhat supportive'
  - One commenter said: "The spot improvements are very minimal and not focused on cyclists."
- o 3 'somewhat negative'
  - Regarding 2017 spot improvements, one commenter said: "Mixed thoughts—I drive through park and value traffic but also value pedestrian safety"
  - Another stated: "As a biker, not a fan of speed bumps but I do understand the need"
  - One commenter believed the proposed traffic calming efforts do not go far enough: "It seems like a Band-Aid. I would prefer to wait for long-term improvements."
- None of these comments expressed pure opposition to the traffic calming proposals. The less than fully supportive comments could be divided into 2 different buckets of thought: (1) an initial discomfort, but acknowledgement of the need for traffic calming; and (2), seeing that there is a need for more sweeping changes and that the current plans are inadequate. Given that the audience targeted were attending Sunday Streets an active transportation and "open streets" event the commenters were largely supportive of traffic calming. The commenters from the 'somewhat negative' and 'somewhat supportive' commenters do appear to support SFMTA's efforts for Golden Gate Park, but they also highlight imperfections in the design proposals.

## • Specific feedback - below are some suggestions offered by commenters:

- For Golden Gate Park at-large:
  - "Bollards or other obstructions on east-west routes as on Middle Drive or Berkeley's Bike Boulevards"
  - "Enforcement of [the] current park speed limit"
- John F. Kennedy Drive:
  - "Increase signage / reflector lights [for] speed humps on JFK Drive by the bison"
- o 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue one-way pilot:
  - "How about a Class I or a Class IV bicycle facility?"
  - "No right turn on red at Fulton & 30<sup>th</sup> Ave"
  - "Yes, one-way 30<sup>th</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> avenues (and others)"
- Fulton Street:
  - "Use signal timing to regulate/slow traffic speeds. More speed limit signs on Fulton."
  - "More signage on Fulton  $\rightarrow$  yield here to peds"
  - "Give more time for pedestrians to cross the street"
  - "Access across Fulton to new dog park → need better crossing across Fulton near 39<sup>th</sup> Ave"
  - "SB Arguello → WB Fulton: Hard to see traffic on Fulton when making a right turn. Ideas: No right on red? Visibility daylighting?"
- Martin Luther King Jr Drive and Transverse Drive:
  - "Improve WB bike left turn onto path; turning right onto MLK"