File No. 170692 Committee Item No. 2
Board Item No. 26

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee **Date** July 17, 2017

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** JULY 25, 2017

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	**Motion**
☐	☐	**Resolution**
☒	☒	**Ordinance**
☒	☒	**Legislative Digest**
☐	☐	**Budget and Legislative Analyst Report**
☐	☐	**Youth Commission Report**
☐	☐	**Introduction Form**
☐	☐	**Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report**
☐	☐	**MOU**
☐	☐	**Grant Information Form**
☐	☐	**Grant Budget**
☐	☐	**Subcontract Budget**
☐	☐	**Contract/Agreement**
☐	☐	**Form 126 – Ethics Commission**
☐	☐	**Award Letter**
☐	☐	**Application**
☐	☐	**Public Correspondence**

OTHER **(Use back side if additional space is needed)**

☒	☒	PLN Proposed Reso No. 19921
☒	☒	PLN Ltr 051117
☒	☒	PLN Reso No. 19895 041317
☒	☒	Referral FYI 062117
☒	☒	Hearing Notice 070717
☒	☒	Committee Report Request 071417
☐	☒	Committee Report Memo 071817
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Erica Major **Date** July 14, 2017
Completed by: JM **Date** 7/18/17

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

TO: Supervisor Mark Farrell, Chair
Land Use and Transportation Committee

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: July 18, 2017

SUBJECT: **COMMITTEE REPORT, BOARD MEETING**
Tuesday, July 18, 2017

The following file should be presented as a **COMMITTEE REPORT** at the Board meeting, Tuesday, July 18, 2017. This item was acted upon at the Committee Meeting on Monday, July 17, 2017, at 1:30 p.m., by the votes indicated.

Item No. 39 **File No. 170692**

Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety; making findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

RECOMMENDED AS A COMMITTEE REPORT

Vote: Supervisor Mark Farrell - Aye
Supervisor Aaron Peskin - Aye
Supervisor Katy Tang - Aye

c: Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney

[General Plan Amendments - Implementing the City's Vision Zero Policy Regarding Pedestrian Safety]

Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety; making findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
Deletions to Codes are in ~~*strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*~~.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

(a) Charter Section 4.105 and Planning Code Section 340 provide that the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors, for approval or rejection, proposed amendments to the San Francisco General Plan.

(b) Planning Code Section 340 provides that an amendment to the General Plan may be initiated by a resolution of intention by the Planning Commission, which refers to, and incorporates by reference, the proposed General Plan amendment. Section 340 further provides that the Planning Commission shall adopt the proposed General Plan amendment after a public hearing if it finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendment or any part thereof. If adopted by the

Commission in whole or in part, the proposed amendment shall be presented to the Board of Supervisors, which may approve or reject the amendment by a majority vote.

(c) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, the Planning Commission initiated this amendment on April 13, 2017, in Resolution No. 19895. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 340 and Charter Section 4.105, the Planning Commission adopted this amendment to the various elements of the General Plan on May 18, 2017 in Resolution No. 19921, finding that this amendment serves the public necessity, convenience and general welfare, and is in conformity with the General Plan and the eight Priority Policies in Planning Code Section 101.1.

(d) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 170768 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

(e) The May 23, 2017 letter from the Planning Department transmitting the proposed amendments to the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan associated with the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety, and the resolutions adopted by the Planning Commission with respect to the approval of this amendment General Plan, are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 170692.

(f) The Board of Supervisors finds, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, that this General Plan amendment, set forth in the documents on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 170692, will serve the public necessity, convenience and general welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 19921 and incorporates those reasons herein by reference.

(g) The Board of Supervisors finds that this General Plan amendment, as set forth in the documents on file with the Clerk of the Board in Board File No. 170692, is in conformity with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 19921. The Board hereby adopts the findings set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 19921 and incorporates those findings herein by reference.

Section 2. The San Francisco General Plan is hereby amended by revising the objectives and policies of the Transportation and Urban Design Elements specified below, and by renumbering the remainder of the Objectives and Policies accordingly:

Transportation Element.

OBJECTIVE 18

ACHIEVE STREET SAFETY FOR ALL

Vision Zero is a strategy to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries, while increasing safe, healthy, equitable mobility for all. The City and County of San Francisco adopted the Vision Zero policy in 2014, prioritizing safety for all road users through good road design; providing meaningful education to the public and decision makers on traffic safety; equitable enforcement of traffic laws focused on dangerous behaviors and locations; and advancing policies that enhance safety.

POLICY 18.1:

Prioritize safety in decision making regarding transportation choices, and ensure safe mobility options for all in line with the City's commitment to eliminate traffic fatalities and severe injuries.

POLICY 18.2:

Advance policies at the local, state and federal level, as appropriate, to support safety in our transportation system, with a priority on those areas expected to have the greatest impact on improved safety, such as managing travel speeds; reducing reckless, distracted, and impaired driving; ensuring pedestrian right of way; and reducing barriers to building safe streets.

POLICY 18.3:

Focus the City's limited resources toward those areas most in need of safety improvements, based on appropriate data, recognizing that those most disproportionately impacted by traffic injuries and deaths are children, seniors, people of color and those in low-income communities.

TABLE 2: DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR STREETS

* * * *

Street width, traffic controls, destination and route information and illumination should be designed to maximize safety ~~*maximized at the intersection of two major arterials*~~.

* * * *

POLICY 18.2

Design streets for a level of traffic that serves, but will not cause a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses, nor eliminate the efficient and safe movement of transit vehicles and bicycles.

* * * *

The widening of streets at the expense of sidewalks or of setbacks should not occur where space is necessary for pedestrian movement, buffering from noise, useful open space and landscaping. This is especially true in densely populated neighborhoods with little public or private open space. No additional sidewalk narrowings, tow-away zones and one-way

streets should be instituted in a residential neighborhood if it would compromise the safety and comfort of the pedestrian resident. Existing towaway lanes should be phased out if they present a hazard to pedestrian safety. In addition, widening of streets should not occur at the expense of bicycle travel. The roadway space needed by bicyclists, whether between the line of traffic and the curb or the line of on-street parking varies ~~*between four and six feet*~~. The needs of bicyclists must be considered wherever the curb lane is proposed to be narrowed. Street restripings and widenings may be appropriate in industrial areas where access for oversize freight vehicles is important, but these projects should not reduce or eliminate the efficient movement of transit vehicles and bicycles.

~~*POLICY 19.1*~~

~~*Eliminate unnecessary cross traffic conflicts and improve traffic flow along major arterials.*~~

~~*Excessive numbers of intersections on major arterials reduce the average speed of traffic and encourage use of local streets for through movements. Cross traffic should be eliminated, where possible, if needed to speed the flow of traffic on the arterials intended to carry the bulk of inter-district travel and to reduce accidents. In some cases, where two major arterials meet, it may be necessary to create grade separations to avoid conflicts. However, measures to minimize this conflict that are less costly and disruptive should be used wherever possible.*~~

~~*Traffic signal synchronization and roadway vehicle detectors should be used to reduce traffic congestion on major arterials. At the same time, use of regulatory devices along local streets will discourage through traffic when a good signal system is in effect on the major arterials. Lane striping, curb cuts, parking configurations and service roads or lanes should provide for access in a manner that will not conflict with through traffic flows.*~~

OBJECTIVE 23

~~*IMPROVE THE CITY'S PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT, PLEASANT, AND SAFE MOVEMENT.*~~ *DESIGN EVERY STREET IN SAN FRANCISCO FOR SAFE AND CONVENIENT WALKING*

~~*POLICY 23.1*~~

~~*Provide sufficient pedestrian movement space with a minimum of pedestrian congestion in accordance with a pedestrian street classification system.*~~

POLICY 23.1

Every surface street in San Francisco should be designed consistent with the Better Streets Plan for safe and convenient walking, including sufficient and continuous sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings at reasonable distances to encourage access and mobility for seniors, people with disabilities and children.

Sidewalks should be sufficiently wide to comfortably carry existing and expected levels of pedestrians, and to provide for necessary pedestrian amenities and buffering from adjacent roadways. The need for these elements varies by the street context – sidewalk width should be based on the overall context and role of the street.

Where it is not feasible to provide a continuous pedestrian route due to topography, construction, preexisting barriers, or other factors, there should be a safe alternate route that minimizes the distance a pedestrian has to go out of their way.

POLICY 23.3

Maintain a strong presumption against reducing sidewalk widths, eliminating crosswalks and forcing indirect crossings to accommodate automobile traffic.

New crosswalk closures should not be implemented. Existing closed crosswalks should be evaluated and ~~removed~~ *opened* where feasible. *When appropriate, unmarked crosswalks should be evaluated and improved where feasible.*

Sidewalks should not be narrowed if doing so would result in the sidewalk becoming less than the minimum sidewalk width for the relevant street type.

POLICY 23.5

Establish and enforce a set of sidewalk zones that provides guidance for the location of all pedestrian and streetscape elements, maintains sufficient unobstructed width for passage of people, strollers and wheelchairs, consolidates raised elements in distinct areas to activate the pedestrian environment, and allows sufficient access to buildings, vehicles, and streetscape amenities.

Sidewalks should be viewed holistically and through the organizing logic of a set of zones. Sidewalk zones ensure that there is sufficient ~~clear~~ width for ~~pedestrians~~ *people walking as well as*~~, and that there are~~ appropriate areas for streetscape elements that will activate the sidewalk and provide amenities to pedestrians. New streetscape elements should be placed according to established guidelines for sidewalk zones, and existing elements should be re-located to meet these guidelines as opportunities arise to do so.

POLICY 23.10

Maintain a presumption against the use of actuated pedestrian signals.

Actuated pedestrian signals favor motor-vehicle traffic over pedestrians, and are relatively uncommon in San Francisco. Where they do occur, the signal must be triggered to secure enough time to cross. Otherwise, only a very short time is allocated -- for cross traffic, not pedestrians. As such,

demand-activated traffic signals present an inconvenience to pedestrians and should not be used on streets except where there is a need to prioritize transit or there is no significant pedestrian traffic.

OBJECTIVE 25

~~*DEVELOP A CITYWIDE PEDESTRIAN NETWORK.*~~ *DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN A MAP OF KEY WALKING STREETS*

~~*POLICY 25.1*~~

~~*Create a citywide pedestrian street classification system.*~~

~~*Similar in scope to the classification systems developed for pedestrians downtown and for automobiles citywide, the system permits directed planning for pedestrian improvements and the designation of pedestrian routes between significant destinations. Also similar to the other systems is the need to balance treatments and priority functions on streets that have an important function as defined by one or more street classification system, such as Van Ness Avenue, Geary Boulevard and The Embarcadero.*~~

~~*The classification system also addresses auto-oriented conditions that conflict with pedestrian travel on pedestrian-priority streets.*~~

~~*TABLE 5: PEDESTRIAN CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM*~~

~~*There are four types of pedestrian streets: Exclusive Pedestrian, Living Street, Pedestrian-oriented Vehicular, Vehicular Thoroughfare that are manifested in a variety of conditions as outlined below.*~~

~~*Exclusive Pedestrian Street:*~~

~~*Street on which vehicles are not permitted (except for transit vehicles and bicycles).*~~

~~*Living Street:*~~

~~*A street or alley designed to enhance its role in the City's open space network and to provide a visual focus for neighborhood activity and use.*~~

~~*Pedestrian-oriented Vehicular Street:*~~

~~*Street with vehicular traffic that has significant pedestrian importance. Design treatments and measures to ensure that pedestrians movement remains a primary function should be employed.*~~

~~*Vehicular Street:*~~

~~*A Major Arterial or freeway as identified in the Master Plan. While pedestrian traffic must be accommodated on every street except a freeway, a balance between vehicle and pedestrian movement must be maintained.*~~

~~*POLICY 25.2*~~

~~*Utilizing the pedestrian street classification system, develop a citywide pedestrian network that includes Design streets devoted to or primarily oriented to pedestrian use.*~~

~~*This network is composed of existing routes such as the Bay and Ridge trails, stairways, exclusive pedestrian streets, and pedestrian-oriented vehicular streets. The network links important destinations, neighborhood commercial districts, and open spaces.*~~

~~*POLICY 25.3*~~

~~*Develop design guidelines for pedestrian improvements in Neighborhood Commercial Districts, Residential Districts, Transit-Oriented Districts, and other pedestrian-oriented areas as indicated by the pedestrian street classification plan.*~~

~~*The design guidelines ensure identifiable, pedestrian-oriented treatments for important pedestrian streets and set minimum standards for the placement of pedestrian streetscape elements.*~~

~~***Pedestrian Enclaves***~~

~~*The City can also improve portions of public rights-of-way to improve neighborhood character and provide open space improvements on portions of streets by establishing "pedestrian enclaves." Pedestrian enclaves are defined by location rather than size; enclaves can utilize portions of the street*~~

~~and can establish broad corner bulb-outs. They should provide either restful space for pedestrians to enjoy a moment of reflection or active space such as open air weights or a dog obstacle course. In all cases, the design of the space should be mindful of adjacent activities and uses. In most cases enclaves should include benches, landscaping, and should improve the streetscape environment. A vista, garden, or streetscape view should be included to provide the user with a springboard for reflection. Examples of pedestrian enclaves include bulb-outs on Noe Street north of Market Street, Octavia Square at the base of Octavia and Market, and could include programming on some major transit plazas. Pedestrian enclaves serve a very localized population.~~

~~*POLICY 25.4*~~

~~*Maintain a presumption against the use of demand-activated traffic signals on any well-used pedestrian street, and particularly those streets in the Citywide Pedestrian and Neighborhood Networks.*~~

~~*Demand-activated traffic signals favor motor-vehicle traffic over pedestrians, and are relatively uncommon in San Francisco. Where they do occur, the signal must be triggered to secure enough time to cross. Otherwise, only a very short time is allocated -- for cross traffic, not pedestrians. As such, demand-activated traffic signals present an inconvenience to pedestrians and should not be used on streets except where there is no significant pedestrian traffic.*~~

~~*TABLE 6: PEDESTRIAN NETWORK STREETS AND DESIGN GUIDELINES*~~

~~*Citywide Pedestrian Network Street*~~

~~*Definition: An inter-neighborhood connection with citywide significance" includes both exclusive pedestrian and pedestrian- oriented vehicular streets, e.g. Market, California, Van Ness, 24th.*~~

- ~~*On a large scale, the Citywide Pedestrian Network connects much of the northern part of the city.*~~
- ~~*Includes the Bay, Ridge, and Coast trails (part of a regional system).*~~

~~• Includes stairways and other exclusive pedestrian walkways.~~

~~• Used by commuters, tourists, general public, and recreaters.~~

~~• Enhances walking as a primary means of commuting. Connects major institutions with transit facilities.~~

~~Design Goals.~~

~~• Visible marker/connection throughout to tie network together.~~

~~• Pedestrian movement is a priority and should not be compromised.~~

~~• Minimize conflicts with other modes.~~

~~• Priority street for pedestrian improvements (safety, access, aesthetics, and circulation)~~

~~• Pedestrian scale and orientation for street improvements and building frontages.~~

~~• Use non-obtrusive signage or markers along regional trails (Bay, Ridge and Coast) to alert pedestrians to changes in trail direction, and integrate and make consistent with symbols, markers and signage used throughout the regional system.~~

~~Neighborhood Network Street (intra-neighborhood connection)~~

~~Definition: A neighborhood commercial, residential, or transit street that serves pedestrians from the general vicinity. Some Neighborhood Network Streets may be part of the citywide network, but they are generally oriented towardsneighborhood serving uses. Types include exclusive pedestrian and pedestrian-oriented vehicular streets, and living streets.~~

~~Neighborhood Commercial Street~~

~~Definition: A street in a Neighborhood Commercial District as identified in the Master Plan. Predominately commercial use withparking and loading conflicts. e.g. Clement, Castro, West Portal.~~

~~Design Goals.~~

~~• Maintain at least 4 feet unobstructed width for pedestrian passage.~~

~~• Encourage pedestrian-oriented uses.~~

~~• Priority street for pedestrian improvements (safety, access, aesthetics, and circulation).~~

~~• Maintain a buffer (trees, parking, etc.) between pedestrian and vehicular circulation.~~

~~• Minimum crosswalk requirements.~~

~~• Turning movement restrictions in areas with high pedestrian volumes.~~

~~• Restrictions on curb cuts/auto entrances.~~

~~• Coordinated pedestrian improvements to reflect neighborhood character.~~

~~Transit Street~~

~~Definition: A Primary Transit Preferential Street as identified in the Master Plan. e.g. Divisadero, Masonic.~~

~~Design Goals.~~

~~• Enhanced pedestrian/transit connections including bus bulbs, better stop markings, and transit system/ neighborhood information.~~

~~• Maximum distance between crosswalks and transit stops.~~

~~• Minimum transit stop treatments including benches, shelters, and information.~~

~~Residential Street~~

~~Definition: A street within a R zoned district.~~

~~Design Goals.~~

~~• Every street has trees, where sidewalk widths allow.~~

~~• Maintain a buffer (trees, parking, etc.) between pedestrian and vehicular circulation. The extent of buffering is related to the magnitude of vehicular traffic.~~

~~• Capture the street for open space." On streets with sufficient width and without significant vehicular traffic. (i.e. Duboce Triangle style improvements)~~

~~Neighborhood Network Connection Street~~

~~Definition: An intra-neighborhood connection street that connects neighborhood destinations. e.g. 18th, Vulcan Steps.~~

~~Design Goals.~~

~~• Crosswalks and signals should enhance the pedestrian path of travel.~~

~~• Maintain an obstructed width of 4 feet for pedestrian passage.~~

~~• Pedestrian scale and orientation for street improvements and buildings.~~

~~• Maintain a buffer (trees, parking, etc.) between pedestrian and vehicular circulation.~~

~~• Minimize/discourage large volume vehicular traffic ingress and egress.~~

~~• Priority street for pedestrian improvements (safety, access, aesthetics, and circulation).~~

~~*POLICY 25.5*~~

~~*Where intersections are controlled with a left-turn only traffic signal phase for automobile traffic, encourage more efficient use of the phase for pedestrians where safety permits.*~~

~~*Left-turn only phases often occur where the streets from which the turn is made are wide and heavily-trafficked, and are usually followed by a red light that activates cross traffic. To help overcome the pedestrian challenges of street width and traffic volume, the left-turn phase time may enable pedestrians to begin their crossing earlier when safety allows. If the left turn is made onto a one-way street, the pedestrian traffic crossing against the one-way direction would have a relatively conflict-free opportunity to begin crossing early.*~~

~~*POLICY 25.6*~~

~~*Provide enforcement of traffic and parking regulations to ensure pedestrian safety, particularly on streets within the Citywide Pedestrian and Neighborhood Networks.*~~

~~*Cars that fail to stop at signs and lights, park across sidewalks and travel at excessive speeds pose serious threats to pedestrian safety.*~~

POLICY 25.1

Identify Key Walking Streets to be defined by the factors that contribute to high concentrations of people walking.

Key Walking Streets are defined by street segments in close proximity to significant pedestrian generators such as transit stops, schools, parks, tourist activities and shopping districts. Key Walking Streets are also defined by street segments in neighborhoods where there is more dependence on walking as a means of transportation, due to demographics, street slope, and/or limited access to transit or private automobiles.

POLICY 25.2

Prioritize safe and convenient walking as a mode of travel on Key Walking Streets. Ensure a high level of pedestrian quality and safety, and give sufficient right-of-way space to pedestrians.

POLICY 25.3

Prioritize funding for streetscape and pedestrian improvements on Key Walking Streets

POLICY 25.4

Design pedestrian improvements on Key Walking Streets consistent with the principles and guidelines for the appropriate street type in the Better Streets Plan and other adopted plans.

Pedestrian Enclaves

The City can also improve portions of public rights-of-way to improve neighborhood character and provide open space improvements on portions of streets by establishing "pedestrian enclaves." Pedestrian enclaves are defined by location rather than size; enclaves should utilize portions of the street and should establish broad corner bulb-outs. They should provide either restful space for pedestrians to enjoy a moment of reflection or active space such as open air weights or a dog obstacle course. In all cases, the design of the space should be mindful of adjacent activities and uses. In most

cases enclaves should include benches, landscaping, and should improve the streetscape environment. A vista, garden, or streetscape view should be included to provide the user with a springboard for reflection. Examples of pedestrian enclaves include bulb outs on Noe Street north of Market Street, Octavia Square at the base of Octavia and Market, and could include programming on some major transit plazas. Pedestrian enclaves serve a very localized population.

POLICY 25.5

Develop streetscape and public realm plans for areas with high pedestrian activity in collaboration with community members.

OBJECTIVE 26

EMPLOY A MULTI-DISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO IMPROVING PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

POLICY 26.1

Identify locations of high pedestrian injuries and fatalities based on available pedestrian safety data and established methodologies.

POLICY 26.2

Prioritize funding for pedestrian safety programs and improvements at high injury locations and programmatic initiatives that support Vision Zero citywide.

POLICY 26.3

Apply best practices in pedestrian safety education and enforcement to improve knowledge and awareness of pedestrian safety for the public and decision makers across the City.

POLICY 26.4

Apply best practices in street design and transportation engineering to improve pedestrian safety across the City.

POLICY 26.5

Focus enforcement on the top violations that most greatly affect pedestrian safety and at locations of high pedestrian injuries and fatalities.

POLICY 27.8

Encourage biking as a mode of travel through the design of safer streets, education programs and targeted enforcement. ~~*Prevent bicycle accidents though bicycle safety education and improved traffic law enforcement.*~~

Streets should be designed to incorporate effective safety measures to help people to bike safely and comfortably across the City.

Education of bicyclists and appropriate training should be made available at a wide variety of sources. These may include education of employees at work sites as part of alternative transportation education, to students at schools and colleges, and to new riders through bicycle shops and dealers.

Cars that fail to use turn signals, park in bike lanes, travel at excessive speeds and car passengers which open doors without looking pose serious threats to the safety of bicyclists. Education of motorists, bicyclists and the public should be actively and vigorously pursued. Such avenues may include billboards and public service messages, motor vehicle licensing procedures, traffic schools, and driver education and driver training courses. The cyclist's equal right to the road, as well as the responsibilities in using this access, should be emphasized.

Traffic enforcement should extend to protection of bicyclists' rights-of-way which are often violated by motorists. Special emphasis also needs to be placed upon theft prevention and investigation. Special training for police officers concerning bicycle-related laws and concerns should be included in their academy and in-service training.

Urban Design Element.

POLICY 1.10

Indicate the purposes of streets by adopting and implementing the Better Streets Plan, which identifies a hierarchy of street types and appropriate streetscape elements for each street type.

Orientation for travel is most effectively provided where there is a citywide system of streets with established purposes: major through streets that carry traffic for considerable distances between districts, local streets that serve only the adjacent properties, and other streets with other types of assigned functions. Once the purposes of streets have been established, the design of street features should help to express those purposes and make the whole system understandable to the traveler.

The appropriate purpose of and role for a street in the overall city street network depends on its specific context, including land use and transportation characteristics, and other special conditions. Streets in residential areas must be protected from the negative influence of traffic and provide opportunities for neighbors to gather and interact. Streets in commercial areas must have a high degree of pedestrian amenities, wide sidewalks, and seating areas to serve the multitude of visitors. Streets in industrial areas must serve the needs of adjacent businesses and workers; and so forth.

Similarly, some streets play a greater role in the movement of people and goods across the city and beyond, with higher volumes of pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and vehicles, while others serve

a more local context with less transportation activity. ~~*Similarly, busy transportation corridors by necessity carry high volumes and speeds of vehicle traffic, while neighborhood streets have lower speeds and volumes. Hence, t*~~The goal*s* for *throughways* ~~*busier corridors should focuses on creating*~~ *are to enhance pedestrian safety, buffer pedestrians from negative effects of vehicular traffic, and create* a strong image appropriate to the street's importance to the city pattern*.*~~*, buffering pedestrians from vehicular traffic, and improving conditions for pedestrians at crossings.*~~ The goal*s* for neighborhood streets ~~*should be*~~ *are* to ~~*protect neighborhoods by*~~ calm~~*ing*~~ traffic and provid*e*~~*ing*~~ neighborhood-serving amenities.

The Better Streets Plan identifies and defines a system of street types and describes the appropriate design treatments and streetscape elements for each street type. Future decisions about the design of pedestrian and streetscape elements should follow the policies and guidelines of the Better Streets Plan, as adopted by the Board of Supervisors on December 7, 2010 and amended from time to time. The Better Streets Plan, is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the City Attorney's Office to work with Planning Department staff to carry out the provisions of this Ordinance, particularly to ensure that all the different objectives and policies that follow the objectives and policies added, deleted or amended herein are numbered appropriately.

Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

Section 5. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the General Plan that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: _____
ANDREA RUIZ-ESQUIDE
Deputy City Attorney

n:\land\as2017\9690391\01183254.docx

FILE NO. 170692

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[General Plan Amendments - Implementing the City's Vision Zero Policy Regarding Pedestrian Safety]

Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety; making findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Existing Law

General plans are broad policy documents to guide development. State law requires that general plans include discussion of seven issues: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise and safety. These issues are often included in different chapters, or elements, of a general plan. In addition, local jurisdictions have discretion to include other issues in their general plans. The San Francisco General Plan includes ten elements: the Housing Element, the Commerce and Industry Element, the Recreation and Open Space Element, the Transportation Element, the Urban Design Element, the Environmental Protection Element, the Community Facilities Element, the Community Safety Element, the Arts Element, and the Air Quality Element, and a Land Use Index. In addition, the San Francisco General Plan contains a series of Area Plans, such as Downtown, East and West Soma, Glen Park, Market and Octavia, and Mission, adopted to tailor the General Plan policies to the specific realities of the City's diverse neighborhoods.

The Transportation Element of the General Plan contains several sections, each of which dealing with an important component of the local and regional transportation system. These sections are (1) General, (2) Regional Transportation, (3) Congestion Management, (4) Vehicle Circulation, (5) Transit (6) Pedestrians, (7) Bicycles, (8) Citywide Parking and (9) Goods Movement. Each section consists of objectives and policies regarding a particular segment of the master transportation system and related maps which describe key physical aspects.

Amendments to Current Law

This Ordinance would amend the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the Vision Zero Policy, which was adopted by the City in 2014. This policy commits the City to build better and safer streets, educate the public on traffic safety, enforce traffic laws, and adopt changes to city policies, with the overall objective to eliminate all traffic deaths by 2024. As currently written, the Transportation and Urban Design Elements do not directly reference the City's Vision Zero Policy. Moreover, several policies and objectives are

inconsistent with this policy. The Ordinance would add several policies and objectives to the Transportation and Urban Design Elements to reflect the City's Vision Zero policy. It would also amend several existing policies and objectives, to make them consistent with such policy.

Background Information

In 2014, the City adopted a Vision Zero Policy to eliminate all traffic fatalities by 2024 and called on City departments to identify specific actions which could help the City to achieve Vision Zero. In response, the Planning Commission passed Resolution 19174, which outlined specific actions the Department could take to achieve Vision Zero, including updating the policies and objectives of the General Plan. This Ordinance includes changes to the Transportation Element and the Urban Design Element to reflect the City's Vision Zero Policy.

n:\land\as2016\9690391\01141755.docx

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary
General Plan Text Amendment
HEARING DATE: MAY 18, 2017

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date:	May 11, 2017
Case No.:	**2014.0556GPA**
Project Name:	Vision Zero: Proposed General Plan Amendments
Staff Contact:	Lily Langlois – (415) 575-9083 *lily.langlois@sfgov.org*
Reviewed By:	Adam Varat– (415) 558-6405 *adam.varat@sfgov.org*
Recommendation:	Recommend Approval

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

The proposed Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the San Francisco General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety.

The Way It Is Now:

1. The Transportation Element of the General Plan does not directly reference the City's Vision Zero Policy.
2. Policies 19.1, 23.1, 23.8, 25.1, 25.2, 25.3, 25.4, 25.5, 25.6, and 27.8, and Objectives 23 and 25 are inconsistent with the City's Vision Zero policy.

The Way It Would Be:

1. Policies 18.1, 18.2, 18.3, 26.1, 26.2, 26.3, 26.4, 26.5, and Objectives 18 and 26 would be added to the Transportation Element and of the General Plan to reflect the City's Vision Zero policy.
2. Policies 23.1, 23.8, 23.10, 25.1, 25.2, 25.3, 25.4, 25.5, 25.6, and 27.8, and Objectives 23 and 25 would be amended to be consistent with the City's Vision Zero policy.

BACKGROUND

In 2014, the City adopted a Vision Zero Policy to eliminate all traffic fatalities by 2024 and called on City departments to identify specific actions which could help the City to achieve Vision Zero. In response, the Planning Commission passed Resolution 19174, which outlined specific actions the Department could take to achieve Vision Zero, including updating the policies and objectives of the General Plan. The

proposed Ordinance includes changes to the Transportation Element and the Urban Design Element to reflect the City's Vision Zero Policy.

The proposed amendments also support numerous projects and programs that were led or supported by the Planning Department to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety including the Better Streets Plan, WalkFirst, the Pedestrian Strategy, the Bicycle Strategy, Green Connections, the Vision Zero Two Year Action Strategy, and specific streetscape and public realm plans.

ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Vision Zero

Vision Zero is a commitment to eliminating traffic fatalities and creating a culture that prioritizes traffic safety. What began as an initiative in Sweden in 1997, cities across the world are working to achieve Vision Zero through the design of streets, education and outreach campaigns, enforcement programs, and policy changes.

San Francisco is consistently voted one of the best cities for walking in the country. However, San Francisco continues to experience a high loss of life each year. There are significant inequities and costs associated with injuries. More than 70% of severe and fatal injuries occur on just 12% of City streets, and these injuries are concentrated in communities with higher percentages of residents that are low-income, seniors, disabled, non- English speaking, and immigrants.

In 2014, the City adopted a Vision Zero policy to eliminate all traffic deaths by 2024. Through the coordinated effort of the Vision Zero Task Force, the City is working to achieve Vision Zero through a combination of engineering measures, education campaigns, targeted enforcement efforts, and policy changes.

Planning Department's Role in Vision Zero

The Planning Department plays a key role in developing plans, policies and designs which can improve pedestrian and bicycle safety and can help the City to achieve Vision Zero. In June 2014, the Planning Commission passed a resolution in support of Vision Zero. The resolution outlined specific actions the Department could take to achieve Vision Zero, including updating the policies and objectives of the General Plan.

Currently the General Plan does not reference Vision Zero nor does it reflect recent citywide efforts to improve safety for people walking and riding bikes. The proposed amendments are significant because the Planning Department through our review of development applications and capital improvements makes consistentcy findings with the General Plan, and other City agencies reference the General Plan when proposing street changes.

Interagency Collaboration

The General Plan amendments proposed for adoption (see Exhibit B) represents a close collaboration between numerous city agencies including the Municipal Transportation Agency and Department of Public Health, and incorporates feedback received from members of the Board of Supervisors, City

agencies, community members, the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, the Pedestrian Safety Task Force, the Vision Zero Task Force, and the Vision Zero Coalition.

On October 20, 2016, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of an ordinance to amend the General Plan. However, on January 10, 2017, the Board of Supervisors rejected the legislation. Since that time, Planning Department staff has conducted briefings with all interested members of the Board of Supervisors and has conducted additional outreach through the Vision Zero Task Force, the Vision Zero Coalition and the Vision Zero Committee. Based on the feedback received, the following changes have been incorporated into the Ordinance (see Exhibit B).

- Add language under Policy 23.10 to state that demand-activated traffic signals should not be used on streets except where there is a need to prioritize transit or there is no significant pedestrian traffic.
- Add language to Policy 25.5 to emphasize that streetscape and public realm plans will be developed in collaboration with community members.
- Add language to Policy 26.2 to emphasize that Vision Zero improvements will be implemented citywide.
- Incorporate the map of Key Waking Streets by reference so that it can more easily be modified as new data becomes available.

RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the Commission recommend *approval* of the proposed Ordinance and adopt the attached Draft Resolution to that effect.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Department supports the proposed amendments because they will ensure that the General Plan appropriately reflects the City's Vision Zero policy. Vision Zero is a commitment to create a culture that prioritizes traffic safety and to ensure that mistakes on the roadway don't result in serious injuries or death. The City and County of San Francisco adopted Vision Zero as a policy in 2014. Numerous city agencies and departments have adopted a resolution in support of Vision Zero and identified near and long term actions that could help the city achieve this goal. Further, the proposed amendments will fulfill the direction outlined in the Planning Commission 2014 resolution to update the policies and objectives in the general plan to help achieve Vision Zero.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

The proposed Ordinance is before the Commission so that it may recommend adoption, rejection, or adoption with modifications to the Board of Supervisors

IMPLEMENTATION

The Department determined that this ordinance will not impact our current implementation procedures.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

An initiation hearing was held on April 13, 2017 and there was no public comment. Additional public comment will be taken at the Planning Commission hearing on May 18, 2017 and any subsequent adoption hearings that will be held relating to this amendment.

RECOMMENDATION:	**Recommend Approval**

Attachments:

1. Exhibit A: Draft Planning Commission Resolution
2. Exhibit B: Ordinance Adopting General Plan Amendments
3. Exhibit C: Planning Commission Resolution 19895 Initiating General Plan Amendments

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Planning Commission Resolution No. 19921

General Plan Text Amendment

HEARING DATE MAY 18, 2017

Case No.:	2014.0556GPA
Project Name:	Vision Zero: Proposed General Plan Amendments
Staff Contact:	Lily Langlois – (415) 575-9083 *lily.langlois@sfgov.org*
Reviewed By:	Adam Varat– (415) 558-6405 *adam.varat@sfgov.org*

RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN TO UPDATE THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN TO REFLECT THE CITY'S VISION ZERO POLICY; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Department shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco adopted Vision Zero as a policy in 2014, committing to build better and safer streets, educate the public on traffic safety, enforce traffic laws, and adopt changes to city policies to save lives; and

WHEREAS, The mission of the Planning Department, under the direction of the Planning Commission, is to shape the future of San Francisco and the region by: generating an extraordinary vision for the General Plan and in neighborhood plans; fostering exemplary design through planning controls; improving our surroundings through environmental analysis; preserving our unique heritage; encouraging a broad range of housing and a diverse job base; and enforcing the Planning Code; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Department works with other city agencies including the SFMTA, SFDPW, SFCTA, SFDPH on initiatives such as the Better Streets Plan, WalkFirst, the Pedestrian Strategy, the

Bicycle Strategy, the Vision Zero Two Year Action Strategy and various streetscape and public realm projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 19174 in June 2014, to include Vision Zero in near term and long term planning documents, including the San Francisco General Plan, as appropriate;

WHEREAS, Because the General Plan does not currently reference Vision Zero, the proposed amendment would update the General Plan to reflect the City's Vision Zero policy; and

WHEREAS, per Planning Code Section 340, on April 13, 2017, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 19895, initiating amendments to the Transportation Element and Urban Design Element, and;

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on May 18, 2017; and,

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(2) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors **approve** the proposed ordinance.

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The City and County of San Francisco adopted Vision Zero as a policy in 2014.

2. City departments, including the Planning Department, have adopted resolutions in support of Vision Zero and identified near and long term actions that could help the city achieve this goal.

3. The proposed amendments will fulfill the direction outlined in the Planning Commission 2014 resolution to update the policies and objectives in the general plan to help achieve Vision Zero.

4. The Commission supports the proposed amendments because they will ensure that the General Plan appropriately reflects the City's Vision Zero policy.

5. **General Plan Compliance.** The Commission finds that the proposed Ordinance is consistent with the General Plan.

6. **Planning Code Section 101 Findings.** The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

   1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

      The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on neighborhood serving retail uses or opportunities for employment in or ownership of such businesses.

   2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

      The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on the City's housing stock or on neighborhood character.

   3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

      The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

   4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

      While the proposed amendment would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI's transit service, overburdening the streets or altering current neighborhood parking.

   5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

      The proposed amendment would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors or future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors.

   6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

      While the proposed amendment would not adversely affect achieving the greatest possible preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

   7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed amendment would have no effect on preservation of landmarks or historic buildings.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on parks and open space or their access to sunlight and vista.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission hereby recommends that the Board ADOPT the proposed Ordinance to amend the Urban Design Element and the Transportation Element of the General Plan.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission on May 18, 2017

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Hillis, Johnson, Fong, Koppel, Melgar, Richards,

NOES: None

ABSENT: Moore

ADOPTED: May 18, 2017

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Planning Commission Resolution No. 19895

General Plan Text Amendment

HEARING DATE APRIL 13, 2017

Case No.:	**2014.0556GPA**
Project Name:	**Vision Zero: Proposed General Plan Amendments**
Staff Contact:	Lily Langlois – (415) 575-9083 *lily.langlois@sfgov.org*
Reviewed By:	Adam Varat– (415) 558-6405 *adam.varat@sfgov.org*

INITIATING AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN TO UPDATE THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN TO REFLECT THE CITY'S VISION ZERO POLICY; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco mandates that the Planning Department shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan.

WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco adopted Vision Zero as a policy in 2014, committing to build better and safer streets, educate the public on traffic safety, enforce traffic laws, and adopt changes to city policies to save lives;.

WHEREAS, The mission of the Planning Department, under the direction of the Planning Commission, is to shape the future of San Francisco and the region by: generating an extraordinary vision for the General Plan and in neighborhood plans; fostering exemplary design through planning controls; improving our surroundings through environmental analysis; preserving our unique heritage; encouraging a broad range of housing and a diverse job base; and enforcing the Planning Code,

WHEREAS, The Planning Department works with other city agencies including the SFMTA, SFDPW, SFCTA, SFDPH on initiatives such as the Better Streets Plan, WalkFirst, the Pedestrian Strategy, the Bicycle Strategy, the Vision Zero Two Year Action Strategy and various streetscape and public realm projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in San Francisco;

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission adopted resolution 19174 in June 2014, to include Vision Zero in near term and long term planning documents, including the San Francisco General Plan, as appropriate;

WHEREAS, Because the General Plan does not currently reference Vision Zero, the proposed amendment would update the General Plan to reflect the City's Vision Zero policy;

WHEREAS, per Planning Code Section 340, the Planning Commission adopts a Resolution of Intention to initiate amendments to the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to update the Transportation Element and Urban Design Element.

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on April 13, 2017; and,

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(2) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The City and County of San Francisco adopted Vision Zero as a policy in 2014.

2. City departments, including the Planning Department, have adopted resolutions in support of Vision Zero and identified near and long term actions that could help the city achieve this goal.

3. The proposed amendments will fulfill the direction outlined in the Planning Commission 2014 resolution to update the policies and objectives in the general plan to help achieve Vision Zero.

4. The Commission supports the proposed amendments because they will ensure that the General Plan appropriately reflects the City's Vision Zero policy.

5. **General Plan Compliance.** The Commission finds that the proposed Ordinance is consistent with the General Plan.

6. **Planning Code Section 101 Findings.** The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

    i. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on neighborhood serving retail uses or opportunities for employment in or ownership of such businesses.

ii. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on the City's housing stock or on neighborhood character.

iii. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

iv. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

While the proposed amendment would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI's transit service, overburdening the streets or altering current neighborhood parking.

v. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The proposed amendment would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors or future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors.

vi. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

While the proposed amendment would not adversely affect achieving the greatest possible preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

vii. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed amendment would have no effect on preservation of landmarks or historic buildings.

viii. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed amendment would have no adverse effect on parks and open space or their access to sunlight and vista.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, the Planning Commission adopts a Resolution of Intention to initiate amendments to the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to update the Transportation Element and Urban Design Element.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.3, the Planning Commission authorizes the Department to provide appropriate notice for a public hearing to consider the above referenced General Plan amendment in a draft ordinance approved as to form by the City Attorney contained in Attachment B, as though fully set forth herein, to be considered at a publicly noticed hearing on or after May 18, 2017.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission on April 13, 2017.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Hillis, Johnson, Fong, Koppel, Melgar, Moore, Richards

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: April 13, 2017

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

May 23, 2017

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2014.0556GPA to the Board of Supervisors: Updating the Transportation Element and the Urban Design Element of the General Plan to reflect the City's Vision Zero Policy.**
Planning Commission Recommendation: *Approval*

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On May 18, 2017, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance which the Commission initiated on April 13, 2017. The proposed Ordinance would amend the Transportation Element and the Urban Design Element of the General Plan.

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment.

At the May 18th hearing, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed Resolution.

Please find attached documents relating to the Commission's action. If you have any questions or require further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

John Rahaim
Director of Planning

Attachments (one copy of the following):
Planning Commission Resolution No. 19921
Draft Ordinance (signed to form)
Planning Commission Executive Summary for Case No. 2014.0556GPA

170692

From: Ivar Satero (AIR)
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2017 3:13 PM
To: Major, Erica (BOS)
Cc: Cathy Widener (AIR)
Subject: Airport's Response re: REFERRAL FYI (170692) General Plan Amendments - Implementing the City's Vision Zero Policy Regarding Pedestrian Safety

Good afternoon, Erica:

Airport staff has reviewed the Vision Zero Policy Regarding Pedestrian Safety and do not see any impact beyond safety measures already implemented at landside/curbside of the Airport.

Ivar C. Satero
Airport Director

From: "Major, Erica (BOS)" <erica.major@sfgov.org>
To: "Rahaim, John (CPC)" <john.rahaim@sfgov.org>, "Reiskin, Ed (MTA)" <ed.reiskin@sfmta.com>, "Garcia, Barbara (DPH)" <barbara.garcia@sfdph.org>, "Scott, William (POL)" <william.scott@sfgov.org>, "Nuru, Mohammed (DPW)" <Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>, "Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (MYR)" <mawuli.tugbenyoh@sfgov.org>, "Khambatta, Arfaraz (ADM)" <arfaraz.khambatta@sfgov.org>, "Ivar Satero (AIR)" <Ivar.Satero@flysfo.com>, "Gascon, George (DAT)" <george.gascon@sfgov.org>, "Rosenfield, Ben (CON)" <ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org>, "tilly.chang@sfcta.org" <tilly.chang@sfcta.org>, "'Kelly, Jr, Harlan (PUC)'" [EX:/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b81c2eee6ae24025bd90bd3b0a1a9163-Harlan Kelly Jr], "Hayes-White, Joanne (FIR)" <joanne.hayes-white@sfgov.org>, "Raphael, Deborah (ENV)" <deborah.raphael@sfgov.org>, "Forbes, Elaine (PRT)" <elaine.forbes@sfport.com>, "leighm@sfusd.edu" <leighm@sfusd.edu>
Cc: "Sanchez, Scott (CPC)" <scott.sanchez@sfgov.org>, "Gibson, Lisa (CPC)" <lisa.gibson@sfgov.org>, "Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC)" <anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org>, "Starr, Aaron (CPC)" <aaron.starr@sfgov.org>, "Navarrete, Joy (CPC)" <joy.navarrete@sfgov.org>, "Lynch, Laura (CPC)" <laura.lynch@sfgov.org>, "Martinsen, Janet (MTA)" <janet.martinsen@sfmta.com>, "Breen, Kate (MTA)" <kate.breen@sfmta.com>, "Auyoung, Dillon (MTA)" <dillon.auyoung@sfmta.com>, "Wagner, Greg (DPH)" <greg.wagner@sfdph.org>, "Chawla, Colleen (DPH)" <colleen.chawla@sfdph.org>, "Carr, Rowena (POL)" <Rowena.Carr@sfgov.org>, "Demafeliz, Kristine (POL)" <kristine.demafeliz@sfgov.org>, "Blot, Jennifer (DPW)" <jennifer.blot@sfdpw.org>, "Thomas, John (DPW)" <John.Thomas@sfdpw.org>, "Liu, Lena (DPW)" <lena.liu@sfdpw.org>, "Cathy Widener (AIR)" <Cathy.Widener@flysfo.com>, "DeBerry, Cristine (DAT)" <cristine.deberry@sfgov.org>, "Szabo, Max (DAT)" <max.szabo@sfgov.org>, "Rydstrom, Todd (CON)" <Todd.Rydstrom@sfgov.org>, "steve.stamos@sfcta.org" <steve.stamos@sfcta.org>, "Cynthia Fong (CTA)" <cynthia.fong@sfcta.org>, "'Ellis, Juliet (PUC)'" [EX:/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=449d49a134b54740a9ca39124154d5b2-Juliet Ellis], "'Hood, Donna (PUC)'" [EX:/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=8d041eb3a12c4ec883a31be928fff967-Donna

Hood], "Scarpulla, John (PUC)" <jscarpulla@sfwater.org>, "Alves, Kelly (FIR)" <kelly.alves@sfgov.org>, "Rodriguez, Guillermo (ENV)" <guillermo.rodriguez@sfgov.org>, "Dunham, Daley (PRT)" <daley.dunham@sfport.com>, "Casco, Esther" <CascoE@sfusd.edu>, "Mogi, Viva" <mogiv@sfusd.edu>, "houckd@sfusd.edu" <houckd@sfusd.edu>
Subject: REFERRAL FYI (170692) General Plan Amendments - Implementing the City's Vision Zero Policy Regarding Pedestrian Safety

Greetings:

This matter is being forwarded to your department for informational purposes. If you have any comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

ERICA MAJOR
Assistant Clerk
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4441 | Fax: (415) 554-5163
Erica.Major@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Click here to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: **Monday, July 17, 2017**

Time: **1:30 p.m.**

Location: **Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall**
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

Subject: **File No. 170692.** Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety; making findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 14, 2017.

Alisa Somera
for Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

DATED/PUBLISHED/POSTED: June 7, 2017

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

ERICA MAJOR
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

EXM# 3028823

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description EDM 07.17.2017 Land Use and Transportation - 170692 - General Plan Amendments - City's Vision Zero

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

07/07/2017

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY, JULY 17, 2017 - 1:30 PM CITY HALL, LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, ROOM 250 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Land Use and Transportation Committee will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard: File No. 170692. Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety; making findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act. In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments to the City prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made part of the official public record in this matter, and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the Committee. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board. Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 14, 2017. - Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board.

A00000449279 4

BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Rahaim, Director, Planning Department
Ed Reiskin, Executive Director, Municipal Transportation Agency
Barbara A. Garcia, Director, Department of Public Health
William Scott, Police Chief, Police Department
Mohammed Nuru, Director, Public Works
Mawuli Tugbenyoh, Liaison to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office
Arfaraz Khambatta, Interim Director, Mayor's Office on Disability
Ivar C. Satero, Airport Department
George Gascon, District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney
Ben Rosenfiled, Controller, Office of the Controller
Tilly Chang, Executive Director, County Transportation Authority
Harlan Kelly, Jr., General Manager, Public Utilities Commission
Joanne Hayes-White, Chief, Fire Department
Deborah Raphael, Director, Department of the Environment
Elaine Forbes, Executive Director, Port Department
Myong Leigh, Interim Superintendent, San Francisco Unified School District

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: June 21, 2017

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Planning Commission on June 13, 2017:

File No. 170692

Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety; making findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: erica.major@sfgov.org.

c: Scott Sanchez, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Planning Department
Joy Navarrete, Planning Department
Laura Lynch, Planning Department
Janet Martinsen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Kate Breen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Dillon Auyong, Municipal Transportation Agency
Greg Wagner, Department of Public Health
Collen Chawla, Department of Public Health
Rowena Carr, Police Department
Kristine Demafeliz, Police Department
Jennifer Blot, Public Works
John Thomas, Public Works
Lena Liu, Public Works
Cathy Widener, Airport Department
Cristine Soto DeBerry, Office of the District Attorney
Maxwell Szabo, Office of the District Attorney
Todd Rydstrom, Office of the Controller
Steve Stamos, County Transportation Authority
Cynthia Fong, County Transportation Authority
Juliet Ellis, Public Utilities Commission
Donna Hood, Public Utilities Commission
John Scarpulla, Public Utilities Commission
Kelly Alves, Fire Department
Guillermo Rodriguez, Department of the Environment
Daley Dunham, Port Department
Viva Mogi, San Francisco Unified School District
Esther Casco, San Francisco Unified School District
Danielle Houck, San Francisco Unified School District

COB Leg Dep, LV Clk

Member, Board of Supervisor
District 2

City and County of San Francisco

MARK FARRELL

BOS SAN FRANCISCO 2017 JUL 13 AM 9:34

DATE: July 13, 2017

TO: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Supervisor Mark Farrell

Mark S. Farrell

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee
COMMITTEE REPORTS

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of the Land Use and Transportation Committee, I have deemed the following matters are of an urgent nature and request they be considered by the full Board on Tuesday, July 18, 2017, as Committee Reports:

170761 **Public Works, Administrative Codes - Street Encroachment Permits and Maintenance Fund for Certain Permits**

Ordinance amending the Public Works Code to update provisions on street encroachment permits, establish appeals procedures and fees for such appeals, waive the annual public right-of-way occupancy assessment fee in lieu of the waiver for permit fee payment for certain permits, modify the street encroachment permit process for governmental entities, and create a temporary street encroachment permit for a maximum period of 30 months; amending the Administrative Code to establish an encroachment maintenance fund for permits where the permittee is not an adjacent property owner; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

170692 **General Plan Amendments - Implementing the City's Vision Zero Policy Regarding Pedestrian Safety**

Ordinance amending the Transportation and Urban Design Elements of the General Plan to implement the City's Vision Zero policy regarding pedestrian safety; making findings, including findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

170820 **Planning Code - Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District Zoning Control Table**

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to adopt the zoning control table for the Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit District, which was deleted inadvertently from Ordinance No. 129-17, the Article 7 Reorganization Ordinance; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies

City Hall • 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place • Room 244 • San Francisco, California 94102-4689 • (415) 554-7752
Fax (415) 554 - 7843 • TDD/TTY (415) 554-5227 • E-mail: mark.farrell@sfgov.org • www.sfbos.org/farrell

of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and adopting findings of public convenience, necessity, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

170783 Extending Interim Zoning Controls - Indoor Agriculture

Resolution extending interim zoning controls to require conditional use authorization for indoor agriculture uses, as defined in Planning Code, Section 102, and other indoor agriculture uses in Production, Distribution and Repair zoning districts; making findings of consistency with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

These matters will be heard in the Land Use and Transportation Committee at a Regular Meeting on Monday, July 17, 2017, at 1:30 p.m.