

## APPENDIX C. MARKET AND OCTAVIA COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS, DETAILED PROJECT SCOPE AND COSTS

This appendix corresponds to Table 6. For each line item in Table 6 we provide:

1. The **Project Scope**, usually referring to the Neighborhood Plan policies, as they are provide descriptive information about the plan’s vision for specific projects;
2. A **Cost Projection**, describing how cost estimates were made; and
3. A list of **Relevant Agencies**, the lead agency is listed first.

A1.	“LIVING STREET” IMPROVEMENTS FOR SELECT ALLEYS .....	41
A2.	STREET TREE PLANTINGS .....	45
A3.	MCCOPPIN STREET GREENING .....	48
A4.	BRADY PARK .....	51
A5.	MCCOPPIN PLAZA – PHASE I.....	53
A6.	MCCOPPIN PLAZA EXTENSION – PHASE II.....	55
A7.	PATRICIA’S GREEN HAYES IN HAYES VALLEY .....	56
A8.	UNDER FREEWAY PARK .....	57
A9.	HAYES GREEN ROTATING ART PROJECT .....	58
A10.	IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING PARKS .....	59
A11.	OCTAVIA BOULEVARD .....	60
A12.	IMMEDIATE FREEWAY MITIGATION .....	62
A13.	STUDY CENTRAL FREEWAY .....	63
A14.	HAYES STREET TWO WAY PROJECT.....	64
A15.	IMPROVE SAFETY OF CITY PARKING GARAGES.....	65
A16.	PARKING SUPPLY SURVEY AND ANALYSIS.....	66
A17.	PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS FOR PRIORITY INTERSECTIONS.....	67
A18.	EXTEND OCTAVIA ROW TO GOLDEN GATE .....	71
A19.	MARKET STREET & CHURCH OR VAN NESS MUNI ENTRANCES .....	72
A20.	WIDEN HAYES STREET SIDEWALK .....	73
A21.	DOLORES STREET MEDIAN EXTENSION .....	75
A22.	RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT ALLEYWAYS .....	76
A23.	VAN NESS BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT .....	80
A24.	TRANSIT PREFERENTIAL STREETS .....	81
A25.	DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES .....	84
A26.	CHURCH STREET IMPROVEMENTS .....	85
A27.	NEIGHBORHOOD FAST PASS .....	87
A28.	TRANSIT USER INFRASTRUCTURE .....	88
A29.	TRANSIT SERVICES .....	89
A30.	BICYCLE NETWORK IMPROVEMENTS .....	90
A31.	MUNI BIKE RACKS .....	93
A32.	ON-STREET BIKE RACKS .....	94
A33.	PAGE ST BICYCLE BOULEVARD .....	95
A34.	CHILDCARE FACILITIES.....	96
A35.	LIBRARY MATERIALS .....	97
A36.	RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.....	98
A37.	DUBOCE STREET MUSEUM.....	99
A38.	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN .....	100
A39.	HISTORIC SURVEY .....	102
A40.	PLAN AREA MONITORING .....	103
A41.	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION .....	104
A42.	OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, EXISTING AND NEW FACILITIES.....	105

A43. IMPROVEMENTS TO TRANSIT SERVICE AND CAPACITY IN THE HUB ..... 106

A44. 11<sup>TH</sup> STREET (MARKET STREET TO BRYANT STREET) ..... 107

A45. 12<sup>TH</sup> STREET (MARKET STREET TO OTIS STREET) ..... 108

A46. 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET (VALENCIA STREET TO FOLSOM STREET)..... 109

A47. MARKET STREET (11<sup>TH</sup> STREET TO 12<sup>TH</sup> STREET) ..... 110

A48. OAK STREET (FRANKLIN STREET TO VAN NESS AVENUE) ..... 111

A49. OTIS STREET (DUBOCE AVENUE TO SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE) ..... 112

A50. SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE (MISSION STREET TO 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET)..... 113

A51. VALENCIA STREET (MARKET STREET TO 15<sup>TH</sup> STREET)..... 114

A52. 11TH AND NATOMA PARK ..... 115

A53. IMPROVEMENTS TO BUCHANAN MALL ..... 116

A54. IMPROVEMENTS TO KOSHLAND PARK..... 117

A55. NEW/IMPROVED CIVIC CENTER PUBLIC SPACES..... 118

A56. NEW PARKS AND OPEN SPACES IN THE HUB AREA (TBD) ..... 119

A57. COMMUNITY FACILITIES ..... 120

## A1. “Living Street” Improvements for Select Alleys

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 4.1.6**

***Introduce traffic-calming measures for residential alleys. Consider improvements to alleys with a residential character to create shared, multipurpose public space for the use of residents.***

Traffic calming can improve residential streets and alleys in a number of ways. Parking can be concentrated along the curbside with the fewest driveway breaks; new pedestrian-scaled lighting can be added; trees can be planted (if residents desire trees), with agreement on a single tree species and a unified planting pattern. Narrow traffic lanes are more conducive to slow vehicular movement than are wide lanes. Because these alleys carry relatively little traffic, they can be designed to provide more public space for local residents—as a living street with corner plazas to calm traffic, seating and play areas for children, with space for community gardens and the like—where people and cars share space. By calming traffic and creating more space for public use, the street can become a common front yard for public use and enjoyment.

Working closely with DPT’s “Livable Streets” traffic-calming program, prototypes should be developed for more extensive improvements to residential alleys. And a process should be developed whereby local residents can propose living-street improvements and participate actively in the design for their alley.

- Develop prototypes for residential alley improvements, to be used as part of the “Livable Streets” traffic-calming initiative.
- Develop a process whereby local residents can propose living street improvements and participate in the design and implementation of improvements to their alley.




Figure 1. Schematic of Living Street Alleyway Concept

---

The following policy from the Market and Octavia Area Plan provides guidelines for Non-residential alley improvements.

**POLICY 4.1.8*****Consider making improvements to non-residential alleys that foster the creation of a dynamic, mixed-use place.***

Certain alleys support non-residential uses. Coordinated approaches to the design of these alleys should protect the intimate scale of these alleys and yet create public space that contributes to and supports the varied uses along them.

Enliven the ground floor space with active uses where possible. Loading spaces can be accommodated in ways that add to the character of the alley.

Non-residential alleys can benefit from “living street” improvements that provide public open spaces that enhance the commercial uses.



Encourage coordinate on throughout the alley by using similar or complementary details throughout.

Create spaces that allow for the growth and evolution of uses.

Non-residential alleys may provide for a number of different and often conflicting uses. Reduce the conflict of uses by providing an uncluttered environment. Consider placing furnishings such as trash cans in a recessed area.



Map 7 Alleys for "Living Street" Improvements



Map 1 Alleys for "Living Street" Improvements

## Cost Projection

### "LIVING STREETS IMPROVEMENTS" WOONERF STREETSCAPE

	SPACING (UNIT: LINEAR FEET PER ITEM)	COST PER UNIT	TOTAL
Curb	1	\$25	\$30
Demo curb	1	\$5	\$5
Concrete curb ramp with truncated domes @ bulb outs	103	\$3,000	\$29
Benches	100	\$1,500	\$15
Tables	100	\$1,500	\$15
Shrubs (med)	5	\$35	\$7
Special trees	20	\$2,000	\$100
Tree grates	20	\$850	\$43
Trash bins	100	\$600	\$6
Drainage	410	\$35,000	\$85
Bollards	51	\$1,800	\$35
Signage	68	\$100	\$1
Ped lighting	40	\$10,000	\$250
<b>cost/lf</b>			<b>\$622</b>

	TOTAL LINEAR FT	AVERAGE COST PER LINEAR FOOT	TOTAL COSTS
Living Alleyways	31,867	\$621.72	\$19,812,336
Soft Costs			
Subtotal			\$19,812,336
Soft Costs			\$13,208,224
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$33,020,559</b>

## Relevant Agencies

Department of Public Works  
Municipal Transportation Agency  
Mayor's Office of City Greening

## A2. Street Tree Plantings

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 4.1.2**




***Enhance the pedestrian environment by planting trees along sidewalks, closely planted between pedestrians and vehicles.***

Closely spaced and sizeable trees parallel and close to curbs, progressing along the streets to intersections, create a visual and psychological barrier between sidewalks and vehicular traffic, like a tall but transparent picket fence. More than any other single element, healthy street trees can do more to humanize a street, even a major traffic street. On many streets within the Market and Octavia neighborhood, successful environments can be created through aggressive tree infill, for example on Otis, Mission, Franklin, and Gough Streets north of Market Street. On other streets, such as Gough Street south of Market, Fell, and Oak Streets, and Duboce Avenue, it will mean major new tree planting.

Consistent tree plantings make an important contribution to neighborhood identity. Different tree species can be used on different streets, or even different blocks of the same street, thereby achieving diversity on a broader basis. Rather than removing existing trees from any given street, the dominant tree species—or preferred tree species—on each block should be identified and future tree planting should be of that tree type.



**Tree Type**

-  Special Trees
-  Special Trees (Long Term)
-  Trees



**Map 2 Streets scheduled for intensive street tree plantings**



## Cost Projection

### TYPICAL STREETScape (EXCL. PAVING)

	SPACING (UNIT: LINEAR FEET PER ITEM)	COST PER UNIT	TOTAL
Trees	20	850	\$43
Curb	1	30	\$30
Demo curb	1	5	\$5
Tree grates	20	850	\$43
Trash bins	100	600	\$6
Ped lighting	40	10,000	\$250
Bench	200	1500	\$8
<b>cost/lf</b>			<b>\$384</b>

### SPECIAL STREETS (EXCL. PAVING)

	SPACING (UNIT: LINEAR FEET PER ITEM)	COST PER UNIT	TOTAL
Trees special	20	2,000	\$100
Curb	1	30	\$30
Demo curb	1	5	\$5
Tree grates	20	850	\$43
Trash bins	100	600	\$6
Ped lighting	40	10,000	\$250
Bench	200	1500	\$8
<b>cost/lf</b>			<b>\$441</b>

	TOTAL LINEAR FEET	AVERAGE COST PER LINEAR FOOT	TOTAL COSTS
typical tree scape improvements	11,444	\$384	\$4,388,774
special tree scape improvements	19,035	\$441	\$8,394,435
Subtotal			\$12,783,209
Soft Costs			\$8,522,139
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$21,305,348</b>

## Relevant Agencies

Department of Public Works  
Municipal Transportation Agency  
Mayor's Office of City Greening

## A3. McCoppin Street Greening

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 7.2.4**

#### ***Redesign McCoppin Street as a linear green street with a new open space west of Valencia Street.***

With the new freeway touchdown, traffic accessing the freeway will no longer have the option of using McCoppin Street as a cut-through. As a result, the street will carry only a fraction of the traffic that it does today. Anticipating this change, there is the opportunity to reconfigure McCoppin Street from Otis to Valencia Streets as a linear green street, with a substantial portion of the vehicular right-of-way reclaimed as open space on the north side (the sunny side) of the street, and a calmed right-of-way for local traffic. The portion of McCoppin Street west of Valencia Street will no longer be needed for vehicular traffic, providing the opportunity for a small open space. The space, approximately 80 feet by 100 feet, would provide an excellent location for a small plaza or other form of community space for the use of local residents.



**Cost Projection****(B1) MCCOPPIN STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS- CONCEPTUAL COST ESTIMATE, 2/15/2005**

PROJECT COSTS						
NO.	ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EXTENSION	SUBTOTAL
<b>PLANNING</b>						<b>\$94,718</b>
1	Planning Community Outreach (10% of total construction costs)	1	LS	\$85,402	\$85,402	
<b>DESIGN</b>						<b>\$94,718</b>
3	Design (10% of total construction costs)	1	LS	\$85,402	\$85,402	
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>						<b>\$947,182</b>
<b>S&amp;H</b>						
4	Demolition	1	LS	\$50,000	\$50,000	
5	Asphalt Concrete Wearing Surface	275	TON	\$150	\$41,250	
6	8-Inch Thick Concrete Base	6,500	SF	\$10	\$65,000	
7	6-Inch Wide Combined Concrete Curb and 2-Foot Concrete Gutter	1,300	LF	\$40	\$52,000	
8	3 1/2-Inch Thick Concrete Sidewalk	26,000	SF	\$8	\$208,000	
9	12-Inch Diameter VCP Sewer, Culverts, Sewer Vents, and Base Over Sewer	600	LS	--	\$150,000	
10	Concrete Catch basin with New Frame and Grating	2	EA	\$10,000	\$20,000	
11	Relocate Catch basin	3	EA	\$10,000	\$30,000	
12	Relocate Low-Pressure Fire Hydrant	2	EA	\$15,000	\$30,000	
13	Relocate Utilities for Sidewalk Widening	37	EA	\$2,000	\$74,000	
14	Typical Concrete Curb Ramp	17	EA	\$2,500	\$42,500	
15	Detectable Warning Surface	160	SF	\$60	\$9,600	
16	6-Inch Wide Concrete Curb at Curb Return	170	LF	\$30	\$5,100	
17	3 1/2-Inch Thick Concrete Sidewalk at Curb Return	400	SF	\$8	\$3,200	
18	Relocate Utilities for Sidewalk Widening	37	EA	\$2,000	\$74,000	
<b>DPT</b>						
19	Double Yellow Line	500	LF	\$4	\$1,750	
20	Raised Pavement Markers (white or Yellow)	22	EA	\$8	\$182	
21	Parking Stalls	100	EA	\$20	\$2,000	
<b>LA</b>						
22	36" Box Trees	50	EA	\$800	\$40,000	
23	36" Root Barrier	1,200	LF	\$10	\$12,000	
24	Mulch	20	CY	\$50	\$1,000	
25	Irrigation System	8,900	SF	\$4	\$35,600	
<b>CONTINGENCY 15%</b>						<b>\$142,077</b>
<b>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST AND CONTINGENCY</b>						<b>\$1,089,259</b>

				<b>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT</b>		<b>\$217,852</b>
26	Inspection (15% const. total & contingency cost)	1	LS	\$163,389	\$163,389	
27	Construction Support (5% const. total & contingency cost)	1	LS	\$54,463	\$54,463	
				<b>ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST</b>		<b>\$1,496,547</b>

**Project Scope:** The closure of McCoppin Street west of Valencia Street is expected to reduce the amount of vehicular traffic on McCoppin Street between Valencia and Otis Street. This proposal, also part of DPT's Livable Streets Program, would reduce the n...

### Relevant Agencies

Department of Public Works  
 Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Mayor's Office of City Greening

## A4. Brady Park

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 7.2.5**

***Make pedestrian improvements within the block bounded by Market, Twelfth, Otis, and Gough Streets and redesign Twelfth Street between Market and Mission Streets, creating a new park and street spaces for public use, and new housing opportunities.***

The block bounded by Market, Gough, Otis and 12th Streets, known as the "Brady Block" is a unique place, in that its interior is divided and made publicly-accessible by four different alleys bisecting it in different directions. At its core, the block shows the signs of many years of neglect; surface parking lots and a large ventilation shaft for the BART system create a large swath of undefensible space.

The block has tremendous potential despite its present conditions. It is an intimate space of small buildings facing on narrow alleys. It isn't hard to envision a small neighborhood here-on the scale of Southpark: small residential infill and existing buildings framing a new public park at the core of the block's network of alleys. The addition of new housing and the development of a small-scaled living area with a narrow but connected street pattern can make this an enviable mini-neighborhood. Existing uses can stay, but new uses can, by public and private cooperation, create a residential mixed-use enclave.

A small new open space can be developed in the center of the Brady Block, taking advantage of a small, approximately 80-foot-square BART-owned parcel that provides access to its tunnel below, and through purchase, an additional 100 foot by 80 foot parcel, currently surface parking. By creating a small open space here and connecting the existing alley network, the city would have created a magnificent centerpiece for this intimate mini-neighborhood. The park will be surrounded by several housing opportunity sites and would be accessed via a network of mid-block alleys designed as "living street" spaces, in accordance with policies for residential alleys outlined in Element 3 of the Neighborhood Plan. The BART vent shaft rather than a hindrance, could be the site of a central wind driven, kinetic sculpture.



## Cost Projection

BRADY PARK	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
land cost	11,800	sf	\$80	\$944,000
open space (soft)	13,000	sf	\$20	\$263,250
Lawn	7,500	sf	\$3	22500
Irrigation	10,000	sf	\$6	\$60,000
benches	6	each	\$1,500	\$9,000
tables	2	each	\$1,500	\$3,000
shrubs (large)	30	each	\$150	\$4,500
trees	15	each	\$850	\$12,750
brick paving	1,500	sf	\$40	\$60,000
soil	333	cubic yard	\$40	\$13,320
drinking fountain	1	each	\$4,500	\$4,500
pedestrian lighting	8	each	\$10,000	\$80,000
Subtotal				\$1,476,820
Soft Costs				\$984,546.67
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$2,461,367</b>

## Relevant Agencies

Recreation and Parks Department  
 Department of Public Works  
 Mayor's Office of City Greening  
 Department of Real Estate  
 Planning Department

## A5. McCoppin Plaza – Phase I

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 4.2.4**

***Create new public open spaces around the freeway touchdown, including a plaza on Market Street and a plaza in the McCoppin Street right-of-way, west of Valencia Street.***

Bringing the freeway down to ground south of Market Street offers the opportunity to create two new small public open spaces: a plaza along Market Street west of the freeway touchdown, and a plaza or other form of small open space within the closed last block of McCoppin Street, west of Valencia Street. The plaza on Market Street will enhance the pedestrian experience of the street, and facilitate safer pedestrian crossings. Because of its prominent location at the end of the freeway and beginning of Octavia Boulevard, it should be designed with elements that signal an entry to the city, including seating, trees and other pedestrian amenities. The leftover space on McCoppin Street is an appropriate place for a community-serving open space, integrated into the overall “green street” treatments proposed for McCoppin Street east of Valencia Street, as well as the proposed bikepath on the east side of the touchdown. The triangular parcel immediately south of the McCoppin Street right-of-way, currently serving as a truck-rental office, could be part of a larger open space at this location.



## Cost Projection

(D1) MCCOPPIN COMMUNITY PARK -CONCEPTUAL COST ESTIMATE, 2/15/2005

PROJECT COSTS						
NO.	ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EXTENSION	SUBTOTAL
<b>PLANNING</b>						<b>\$55,368</b>
1	Community Outreach (7% of Const. Cost)	1	LS	\$38,758	\$38,758	
2	Project Development (3% of Const. Cost)	1	LS	\$16,610	\$16,610	
<b>DESIGN</b>						<b>\$55,368</b>
3	A&E services (10% Total Construction Cost)	1	LS	\$55,368	\$55,368	
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>						<b>\$553,680</b>
4	Demolition	1	LS	\$20,000	\$20,000	
5	Hazardous Material Assessment & Abatement	900	Tons	\$50	\$45,000	
6	Import Fill	671	CY	\$80	\$53,680	
7	Grading and Drainage	1	LS	\$35,000	\$35,000	
8	Landscape Construction	1	LS	\$300,000	\$300,000	
9	Planting and Irrigation	1	LS	\$100,000	\$100,000	
<b>CONTINGENCY 15%</b>						<b>\$83,052</b>
<b>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST AND CONTINGENCY</b>						<b>\$636,732</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT</b>						<b>\$127,346</b>
10	Inspection (15% total const. & contingency cost)	1	LS	\$95,510	\$95,510	
11	Construction Support (5% total const. & contingency cost)	1	LS	\$31,837	\$31,837	
<b>ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST</b>						<b>\$874,814</b>

**Project Scope:** When the new Central Freeway touches down at Market Street, McCoppin Street west of Valencia Street will no longer connect with Market Street. The proposal for the resulting right-of-way cul-de-sac is to convert the roadway into a secured community park, approximately 7,210 square feet. This particular estimate includes a community garden including low terraces conforming to the existing slope. The design of the community park will be coordinated with the proposed bike lane connecting Valencia Street with Market Street and Octavia Boulevard.

## Relevant Agencies

Recreation and Parks Department  
 Department of Public Works  
 Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Mayor's Office of City Greening



## A6. McCoppin Plaza Extension – Phase II

### Project Scope

Following Policy 4.2.4 reprinted on page 53, this project explores as a long term strategy the possibility of acquiring lot 3502113 west of Valencia Street, currently owned by U-haul, with the purpose of using the site as an addition to the McCoppin Community Park.

### Cost Projection

#### MCCOPPIN STUB EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENTS

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
acquisition of lot 3502113	4,929	sf	\$120.00	\$591,432
greening of lot	4,929	sf	\$80.00	\$626,001
Subtotal				\$1,217,433
Soft Costs				811622
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$2,029,055</b>


### Relevant Agencies

Recreation and Parks Department  
 Department of Public Works  
 Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Mayor's Office of City Greening

## A7. Patricia's Green Hayes in Hayes Valley

### Project Scope

Completed 2005.



### Project Costs

\$1,500,000

*Source: Ramon Kong, DPW*

### Relevant Agencies

Park and Recreation Department  
Caltrans  
Department of Public Works  
Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency

## A8. Under Freeway Park

### Project Scope

Use the Caltrans parcels beneath the new Central Freeway structure for uses other than parking (unless parking revenue could fund additional maintenance of ancillary projects), such as recreational open space (for example, a dog run) and/or temporary structures housing cultural arts programs.

### Cost Projection

#### CENTRAL FREEWAY - SITE WORK CONCEPTUAL COST ESTIMATE (12/15/05)

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	COST	SUBTOTAL
Parcel A					\$740,200
Skatepark Equipment (Area:15,750 SF)	1	LS	500,000	\$500,000	
Fencing	970	LF	150	\$145,500	
Pathway Colorcoat	2,950	SF	2	\$5,900	
Double Gates	6	EA	1,800	\$10,800	
Lighting	13	EA	6,000	\$78,000	
Parcel B					\$444,650
Basketball Court/Play Area Colorcoat	15,000	SF	2	\$30,000	
Pathway Colorcoat	3,200	SF	2	\$6,400	
Dog Park Surfacing	8,500	SF	2	\$17,000	
Fencing	1,055	LF	150	\$158,250	
Single Gates	8	EA	2,000	\$16,000	
Double Gates	2	EA	3,000	\$6,000	
Sliding Gates	2	LS	8,000	\$16,000	
Basketball Backboards	3	EA	5,000	\$15,000	
Lighting	18	EA	6,000	\$108,000	
Seat Wall	480	LF	150	\$72,000	
MISC					\$10,000
ADA Improvements (curb ramps at Stevenson)	1	LS	10,000	\$10,000	
Subtotal					\$1,200,000
20%Contingency					\$240,000
Construction Cost					\$1,440,000
A/E & Construction Management Services (35% Construction)					\$504,000
Maintenance Cost	3	Year	\$80,000	\$240,000	\$240,000
<b>Total Project Cost</b>					<b>\$2,184,000</b>

### Relevant Agencies

Department of Public Works  
 Caltrans  
 Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Recreation and Parks Department  
 San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
 Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development

## A9. Hayes Green Rotating Art Project

### Project Scope

The community and the San Francisco Arts Commission has identified Hayes Green as a wonderful opportunity to feature a variety of temporary public art pieces. David Best's temple, which was temporary by design, certainly influenced the community's dedication to this very progressive method of selecting art for public spaces.

### Cost Projection Strategy

#### HAYES GREEN ROTATING ART PROJECT - PER YEAR

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
Acquisition	2	piece	\$50,000	\$100,000
Insurance	2	piece	\$15,000	\$30,000
Re-habilitation	2	piece	\$10,000	\$20,000
Subtotal				\$150,000
Soft Costs				\$100,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$250,000</b>

### Relevant Agencies

San Francisco Arts Council  
 Department of Public Works  
 Recreation and Parks Department

## A10. Improvements to Existing Parks

### **Project Scope**

Make necessary improvements to existing parks, such as the addition of recreational facilities or other amenities, additional landscaping programs, and activation of the space.

### **Cost Projection Strategy**

TBD


### **Relevant Agencies**

Planning Department  
Recreation and Parks Department

## A11. Octavia Boulevard

### Project Scope

Completed 2005.



## Project Cost

### CENTRAL FREEWAY - OCTAVIA BOULEVARD PROJECT

PROJECT ELEMENTS:	COST
Preliminary engineering	\$300,000
Project Management	\$3,200,000
Land Management	\$2,600,000
Traffic Management Plan	\$6,900,000
Traffic System Management	\$6,000,000
Octavia Blvd Design	\$1,300,000
Public Art	\$250,000
Octavia Blvd Construction	\$13,000,000
Oak Street Resurfacing	\$450,000
Octavia Blvd Construction Mngt.	\$1,600,000
Octavia Blvd Design Support	\$424,000
Archeology	\$1,200,000
VanNess Ave. Resurfacing	\$5,850,000
Ancillary Projects	\$5,500,000
Octavia Blvd Maintenance	\$750,000
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COST</b>	<b>\$49,324,000</b>
Hayes Green	\$(1,500,000)
<b>Octavia Boulevard - Recently Built</b>	<b>\$47,824,000</b>

Source: Ramon Kong, DPW

## Relevant Agencies

Caltrans  
 Department of Public Works  
 Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Recreation and Parks Department  
 San Francisco County Transportation Agency

## A12. Immediate Freeway Mitigation

### Project Scope

Install 6 trees at Freeway touchdown.

Install Sculpture at Market Street

Install lighting below freeway at Valencia and other key pedestrian areas.

### Cost Projection

FREEWAY MITIGATION	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
Trees for Highway touchdown	6	ea	\$2,000.00	\$12,000.00
slender sculpture or column for market and highway	1	ea	\$223,000	\$223,000
lighting for below the freeway	16	ea	\$10,000.00	\$160,000
other				
Subtotal				\$395,000
Soft Costs				\$263,333
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$658,333</b>

### Relevant Agencies

San Francisco County Transportation Agency

Department of Public Works

Municipal Transportation Agency

Recreation and Parks Department

Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Caltrans



## A13. Study Central Freeway

### Project Scope

1. Evaluate the impacts of traffic flow from new Central Freeway.
2. Consider the further dismantling of the Central Freeway.

### Cost Projection

\$200,000

### Relevant Agencies

San Francisco County Transportation Agency

Planning Department

Caltrans

Municipal Transportation Agency

Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development

## A14. Hayes Street Two Way Project

### Project Scope

**Reorganize east-west traffic in Hayes Valley to reduce pedestrian conflicts and eliminate confusing Z-shaped jogs of one way traffic.**

One-way streets encourage fast-moving traffic, disrupt neighborhood commercial activities, and negatively affect the livability of adjacent uses and the neighborhood as a whole. Construction of Octavia Boulevard makes it unnecessary for one-way Oak Street traffic to be routed east of Van Ness Avenue via Franklin Street, or westbound Fell Street traffic to come from the east via Hayes Street and Gough Street. This reorganization will greatly simplify traffic patterns, make street crossings for pedestrians safer, and return Hayes Street to a two-way local street, which is best suited to its commercial nature and role as the heart of Hayes Valley.

### Cost Projection

TBD

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
Planning Department

## A15. Improve Safety of City Parking Garages

### Project Scope

“Access and personal safety improvements should be made to the Civic Center Garage to serve patrons of area cultural institutions.” (*Draft Plan, p. 120*)

### Cost Projection

#### IMPROVE SAFETY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF CITY PARKING

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
lights	4		\$10,000.00	\$40,000
cameras/staff				
Subtotal				\$40,000
Soft Costs				\$26,667
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$66,667</b>

### Relevant Agencies

Parking Authority  
 Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development

## A16. Parking Supply Survey and Analysis

### Project Scope

Parking Inventory Survey

#### Objectives:

1. Take inventory of on and off street parking stock in the plan area, this data should serve as a base for the plan monitoring effort as well as informing further analysis of parking management strategies.
2. Research the implementation of on street parking management strategies, especially parking benefits districts, and residential parking permit reform. Make specific policy recommendations that consider administration of the program, social justice issues, economic impacts of programming on individuals and the neighborhood, and impacts on the transportation networks. Develop executable implementation strategies which identify agency, procedures, and an approval strategy.
3. Study mechanisms to re-capture the impacts of off street parking in the neighborhood and curb cuts, especially associating additional parking with housing unit based transit passes. Survey like programs, suggest an implementation strategy and agency.

### Cost Projection

Estimated Cost: \$300,000

Cost estimate is 4 times the budget allocated for the Transit Authorities Parking Benefits District Survey. This Study should first survey the existing parking supply, second pursue the development of three programs: Residential Parking Permit Reform, Parking Benefits Districts, Parking Transit Impact Program, and Curb Cut Impact Fee Program.

### Relevant Agencies

Planning Department  
Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency

## A17. Pedestrian Improvements for Priority Intersections

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 4.1.1**


***Widen sidewalks and shorten pedestrian crossings with corner plazas and boldly marked crosswalks.***

On streets throughout the plan area, there is a limited amount of space on the street to serve a variety of competing users. Many streets have more vehicular capacity than is needed to carry peak vehicle loads. In accordance with the city's Transit-First Policy\*, street right-of-way should be allocated to make safe and attractive places for people and to prioritize reliable and effective transit service—even if it means reducing the street's car-carrying capacity. Where there is excessive vehicular capacity, traffic lanes should be reclaimed as civic space for widened sidewalks, plazas, and the like.

The plan calls for full bulbouts on every corner at identified intersections.

Bulbouts are planned at 42 intersections for 179 corners.

Map below identifies specific corners.



Map 6 Priority Intersections for Pedestrian Improvements



## Cost Projection

The Market and Octavia Plan calls for pedestrian improvements at 42 intersections. The Department of Public Works generated site specific cost estimates [ see Site Specific Cost Estimates column in table on next page] for nearly half of these intersections as part of the Central Freeway Ancillary Project effort. From these site specific cost estimates, the Planning Department estimated the average cost of bulbouts for one corner to be just over \$48,000. Project cost estimates for the remaining identified intersections was estimated based on this cost [Average Cost Estimates column].

	STREET1	STREET2	STREET3	NUMBER OF CORNERS AT THE INTERSECTION	COST ESTIMATE FROM SITE SPECIFIC COST ESTIMATE	COST ESTIMATE FROM AVERAGE COST PER CORNER	ESTIMATED COST
A17.1	Otis	Gough	McCoppin	4	\$213,271		\$213,271
A17.2	Mission	S Van Ness	12th Street	6	\$654,400		\$654,400
A17.3	Van Ness	Market	S Van Ness	5	\$199,088		\$199,088
A17.4	Van Ness	Fell		4	\$43,136		\$43,136
A17.5	Market	Sanchez	15th Street	4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.6	Market	Church	14th Street	6		\$292,220	\$292,220
A17.7	Buchanan	Fell		4	\$232,760		\$232,760
A17.8	Buchanan	Oak		4	\$165,560		\$165,560
A17.9	Buchanan	Market	Duboce	5	\$118,576		\$118,576
A17.10	Laguna	Fell		4	\$83,870		\$83,870
A17.11	Laguna	Oak		4	\$172,185		\$172,185
A17.12	Laguna	Market		5	\$184,797		\$184,797
A17.13	Octavia	Fell		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.14	Octavia	Oak		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.15	Octavia	Market		5		\$243,517	\$243,517
A17.16	Gough	Turk		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.17	Gough	Golden Gate		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.18	Gough	McAllister		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.19	Gough	Fulton		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.20	Gough	Grove		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.21	Gough	Hayes		4	\$344,846		\$344,846
A17.22	Gough	Fell		4	\$194,035		\$194,035
A17.23	Gough	Oak		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.24	Gough	Page		4	\$211,296		\$211,296
A17.25	Gough	Market		4	\$299,897		\$299,897
A17.26	Franklin	Turk		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.27	Franklin	Golden Gate		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.28	Franklin	McAllister		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.29	Franklin	Fulton		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.30	Franklin	Grove		4		\$194,814	\$194,814
A17.31	Franklin	Hayes		4	\$276,846		\$276,846
A17.32	Franklin	Fell		4	\$215,910		\$215,910
A17.33	Franklin	Oak		4	\$169,537		\$169,537
A17.34	Franklin	Page	Market	5	\$297,747		\$297,747
A17.35	Mission	Duboce	13th Street	5	\$117,616		\$117,616
A17.36	Mission	10th Street		4	\$196,687		\$196,687
A17.37	Mission	11th Street		4	\$330,171		\$330,171
A17.38	South Van Ness	Howard	Division	4		\$194,814	\$194,814

APPENDIX C. Market and Octavia Community Improvements, Detailed Project Scope and Costs

February 2008

A17.39	Polk	Market		5	\$117,786		\$117,786	
A17.40	Noe	Market	16th	4		\$194,814	\$194,814	
A17.41	Larkin	Market	9th	4		\$194,814	\$194,814	
A17.42	Herman	Steiner		4		\$194,814	\$194,814	
			Subtotal	179	\$4,840,017	\$4,042,380	\$8,882,397	
			Soft Costs				\$5,921,598	
<b>Total</b>								<b>\$14,803,995</b>

Table uses estimated costs per corner based on costs in ancillary projects. The estimation error means that there are "observed" estimates in the ancillary projects which we allow to override the "average" cost per corner. Therefore, there is an error term.

## Relevant Agencies

Department of Public Works  
 Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Planning Department  
 Mayor's Office of Greening



## A18. Extend Octavia ROW to Golden Gate

### Project Scope

**POLICY 4.2.7**

***Re-introduce a public street along the former line of Octavia Street, between Fulton Street and Golden Gate Avenue.***

Damage done to the San Francisco grid by land-assembly projects of the 1960’s and 1970’s can be partially repaired through the reestablishment of Octavia Street as a public right-of-way from Fulton Street to Golden Gate Avenue, providing improved access to existing housing developments, helping to knit them back into the areas south of Fulton Street, and providing a “green connection” between the new Octavia Boulevard and Jefferson Park and Hayward Playground. Bicycle movement in a north-south direction would also be improved by this policy.



### Cost Projection

**REINTRODUCE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY ON OCTAVIA BETWEEN FULTON AND GOLDEN GATE**

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
land acquisition	11,485	sf	\$60.00	\$689,105
site prep	11,485	sf	\$2.00	\$22,970
signage	2	blocks	\$1,600.00	\$3,200
create sidewalks/streetscape	275	lf	\$383.50	\$105,463
paving	7,700	sf	\$20.00	\$154,000
Subtotal				\$974,737
Soft Costs				\$649,825
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$1,624,562</b>

Land cost is assumed comparatively low relative to price/square foot otherwise found in plan area because of the vacant and for the time being non-buildable nature of the site.

### Relevant Agencies


Department of Public Works  
 San Francisco Redevelopment Agency  
 Planning Department

## A19. Market Street & Church or Van Ness Muni Entrances

### POLICY 4.3.6

**Improve BART and Muni entrances and exits to give them a sense of identity and make them less intrusive on sidewalk space.**

The very wide BART and Muni entrances and the sidewalks behind them, presently somewhat moribund and hard to recognize, offer opportunities for Market Street: to create more visible entranceways with modest vertical elements and to create small open spaces with sitting areas, integrated news-vending boxes, pedestrian lighting, and information and sales kiosks.



### Cost Projection

#### MARKET AND VAN NESS & CHURCH: BART AND MUNI ENTRANCES

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
identity markers	6	piece	\$200,000	\$1,200,000
lighting	8	light	\$10,000	\$80,000
Subtotal				\$1,280,000
Soft Costs				\$853,333
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$2,133,333</b>

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Department of Public Works  
 San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
 Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
 Planning Department

## A20. Widen Hayes Street Sidewalk


### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 4.2.6**

***Widen the sidewalk on the northern side of Hayes Street, between Franklin and Laguna Streets, to create a linear pedestrian thoroughfare linking commercial activities along Hayes Street to the new Octavia Boulevard.***

Hayes Street is a special commercial street within the neighborhood. It is at once locally-focused, with small cafes and restaurants, and citywide focused, with its numerous galleries and proximity to cultural institutions in the Civic Center. It is often alive with pedestrian activity.

Between Franklin and Laguna Streets, where traffic rerouting policies suggested in Element 5 allow a return to two-way traffic, the roadway is wider than it needs to be. Widening the sidewalk on the north side of the street, planting new trees, and installing new pedestrian-scaled light fixtures and benches will create a much needed public open space and lend additional grace to the street. Café seating should be allowed to spill out onto the widened sidewalk. The sidewalk widening should not adversely affect turning movements for Muni buses.



## Cost Projection

### WIDEN HAYES STREET SIDEWALK

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
Demo	43,802.25	SF	\$2	\$87,605
3-1/2-Inch Thick Concrete Sidewalk	27,703.5	SF	\$10	\$277,035
6-Inch Wide Concrete Curb	1,788.75	LF	\$45	\$80,494
8-Inch Thick Concrete Parking Strip and Gutter	16,098.75	SF	\$11	\$177,086
Concrete Curb Ramp with Truncated Domes @ Bulb Outs	3	EA	\$2,000	\$6,000
Concrete Curb Ramp with Truncated Domes @ Other Corners	10.5	EA	\$4,000	\$42,000
Install Tree and Tree Grate	41.25	EA	\$2,000	\$82,500
Relocate Catch basin	6	EA	\$9,000	\$54,000
Relocate High Pressure Fire Hydrant	1.5	EA	\$50,000	\$75,000
Relocate Low Pressure Fire Hydrant	2.25	EA	\$10,000	\$22,500
New Light Pole/Strain Pole	3	EA	\$10,000	\$30,000
New Light Pole, Mast Arm, or Traffic Signal	7.5	EA	\$20,000	\$150,000
New Light Pole	16.5	EA	\$8,000	\$132,000
New Trash Receptacles	6	EA	\$2,000	\$12,000
New Bike Rack/Art Enrichment	18	EA	\$2,000	\$36,000
Relocate Utility Boxes, Traffic Signs, Parking Meters	ALLOW			\$105,000
Traffic Control	0.5		\$136,922	\$68,461
Subtotal				\$1,437,680
Soft Costs				\$958,454
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$2,396,134</b>


## Relevant Agencies

Department of Public Works  
Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
Planning Department

## A21. Dolores Street Median Extension

### Project Scope

Dolores Street has special historic significance to the people of San Francisco and is one of the most visually memorable streets in the city, because of its palm-tree-lined central median. The intersection of Dolores Street and Market Street should be celebrated by extending the median to Market Street and creating a small paved plaza in front of the statue for people to meet, talk, and sit, and by announcing this significant city street, the location of Mission Dolores. Over the years, it may be expected that the large property bordering the west side of this block of Dolores Street will be redeveloped, privately, with housing and commercial uses that will be made all the more attractive by this improvement.



### Cost Projection

#### DOLORES STREET MEDIAN EXTENSION

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
Median extension	4	bulbouts	\$48,703	\$194,812
Bollards	17	bollards	\$800	\$13,600
Subtotal				\$208,412
Soft Costs				\$138,941
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$347,353</b>

The cost to extend the median is estimated from the cost of a bulbout construction.

### Relevant Agencies

Department of PublicWorks  
 Planning Department



## A22. Re-establishment of Select Alleyways

### Project Scope

#### POLICY 4.1.5

***Do not allow the vacation of public rights-of-way, especially alleys. Where new development creates the opportunity, extend the area's alley network.***


Pursue the extension of alleys where it would enhance the existing network:

- Purchase the easternmost portion of Plum Alley that is in private ownership.
- Pursue the extension of Stevenson Alley from Gough Street to McCoppin Street as part of any proposal for demolition and new construction on parcel 3504030.



Further, as a part of this effort:

- Parcel 3505029, which is currently vacant, will have to be purchased and dedicated to Department of Public Works as a public right-of-way connecting Stevenson Alley with Colton and Colusa Alleys.
- Approximately 4,000 sf. of parcel 3505035, which is currently a surface parking lot, will have to be purchased and dedicated to Department of Public Works as a public right-of-way connecting the two disconnected halves of Stevenson Alley.



The alleys differ with respect to how ready they are for right-of-way reconnection. Some are vacant, whereas some still have structures. It should be stressed that in those cases, the reconnection is a long-range policy to be triggered whenever there is a proposed change to the building on the site.







Map 1 Alley ROWs Programmed for Re-Establishment

## Cost Projection

### ALLEYWAY RECONNECTIONS

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
<b>Brady Block Connect Stevenson with Colton and Colusa</b>				
Purchase vacant parcel 3505029**	2,787	sf	\$80	\$0
Development of streetscape	100	lf	\$379	\$37,850
Concrete paving	2,787	sf	\$20	\$55,740
Catch Basins	2	each	\$6,000	\$12,000
Sewer Manhole	1	manhole	\$6,000	\$6,000
Culvert (Pipe)	100	lf	\$150	\$15,000
Capital Costs				\$126,590
Soft Costs				\$84,393
Project Total				\$210,983
<b>Brady Block Stevenson Alley Re-connection</b>				
Purchase 4000sf of parcel 3505035 to connect Stevenson alley	4,000	sf	\$80	\$0
Development of streetscape	180	lf	\$379	68130
Concrete paving	4,000	sf	\$20	\$80,000
Catch Basins	4	each	\$6,000	\$24,000
Sewer Manhole	2	manhole	\$6,000	\$12,000
Culvert (Pipe)	200	lf	\$150	\$30,000
Capital Costs				\$214,130
Soft Costs				\$142,753
Project Total				\$356,883
<b>Stevenson to Mccoppin Alley Re-connection</b>				
Purchase portion of parcel 3504030**	9725			\$0
Development of streetscape	460	lf	\$379	\$174,110
Concrete paving	9725	sf	\$20	\$194,500
Purchase of right of way	3225	sf	\$50	\$161,250
Development of streetscape	0	lf	\$379	\$0
Concrete paving	0	sf	\$20	\$0
Catch Basins	4	each	\$6,000	\$24,000
Sewer Manhole	2	manhole	\$6,000	\$12,000
Culvert (Pipe)	200	lf	\$150	\$30,000
Capital Costs				\$595,860
Soft Costs				\$397,240
Project Total				\$993,100



<b>Plum Alley Completion</b>					
Purchase of Right of Way	3225	sf	\$50		\$161,250
Development of streetscape	0	lf	\$379		\$0
Concrete paving	9725	sf	\$20		\$194,503
Purchase of right of way	3225	sf	\$50		\$161,250
Development of streetscape	0	lf	\$379		\$0
Capital Costs					\$517,003
Soft Costs					\$344,669
Project Total					\$861,672
<b>Total</b>					<b>\$2,422,638</b>

\*\* Included as costs in the Brady Block Community Park Estimate.

### **Relevant Agencies**

Department of Public Works  
 Planning Department  
 Municipal Transportation Agency

## A23. Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project

### **Project Scope**

Implement Bus Rapid Transit program for Van Ness Avenue from Mission Street to Hayes Street.

### **Cost Projection**

### **Relevant Agencies**

San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
Municipal Transportation Agency

## A24. Transit Preferential Streets

### Project Scope

Time the lights from Duboce Avenue to The Embarcadero precisely according to the length of time it takes for Muni to board passengers then travel to the next intersection. Consider reverting to the signal timing prior to the Loma Prieta earthquake.

Use a colored asphalt overlay, typically red, and signage to make transit lanes clearly identifiable.


Implement transit preferential treatments, such as stop sign removal and signal preemption/prioritization, on bus route streets such as Haight/Page, Hayes, Fillmore/Church and Mission Streets. (DPT, Muni)

Implement transit preferential treatments outside the neighborhood along the J, K, L, M and N lines, 22 line, and entire Haight Street and Mission Street corridors to improve frequency and capacity within it. (DPT, Muni).


### Cost Projection

#### TRANSIT PREFERENTIAL STREETS

	NUMBER OF INTERSECTIONS	COST PER FIXTURE	TOTAL
Install Transit preferential signals	33	\$150,000	\$4,950,000
Install signs	132	150	\$19,800
Subtotal			<b>\$4,969,800</b>
Soft Costs			\$3,313,200
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$8,283,000</b>



Map 9 Important High Capacity Transit Corridors



### **Relevant Agencies**

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
Department of Public Works  
Planning Department

## A25. Dedicated Transit Lanes

### Project Scope

Transit-only lanes should be created on Duboce Avenue just west of Church Street to speed passenger boarding at the stops there.

Transit-only lanes should be created along the four-lane segment of Church Street between Duboce Avenue and 16<sup>th</sup> Street, ensuring that the J and 22 lines will not have to wait more than a single traffic-light cycle.

Implement enforceable transit-only lanes on Market Street east of Octavia Boulevard and Mission Street north of 16th Street. (DPT, Muni) Seek legislation for video enforcement of transit only lanes. (State legislative delegation)

Implement dedicated bus lanes on Van Ness Avenue for Muni and Golden Gate Transit. (DPT, Muni, Caltrans).

See map for item A24.

### Cost Projection

Dedicated Transit Lanes	\$2,990,000
Soft Costs	\$1,993,333
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,983,333</b>

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
 San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
 Department of Public Works  
 Planning Department

## A26. Church Street Improvements

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 4.3.4**



#### ***Enhance the transit hub at Market and Church Street.***

The length of Church Street from Market Street to Duboce Avenue is one of the city’s most important transit centers. It is the transfer point between the Muni Metro and several surface bus and streetcar lines. It is also a center of neighborhood activity, with large volumes of pedestrian and bicycle traffic at all times of the night and day. Despite its importance, the area lacks all but the most basic pedestrian amenities. Relatively simple improvements would dramatically enhance pedestrian and transit rider comfort in the area, making transit a more attractive travel option.

Church Street, north of Market Street, can be re-designed as a pedestrian- oriented transit boulevard with the center reserved for streetcars, but with auto travel still permitted to the right and left.

The opportunity for an enhanced streetcar-loading platform on Duboce Street, west of Church Street, exists as well. When these transit-preferential treatments are installed, care should be taken to ensure safe and comfortable pedestrian connections to transit facilities and to accommodate bicycle traffic on Duboce Street.

Church Street, south of Market Street, features wide sidewalks. The intersection should receive special light fixtures, and the streetcar platform shelters could receive a special “Market Street” design.



Section of Church Street Transit Platforms

## Cost Projection

	QUANTITY	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	TOTAL
Extend Median on Market (east)	4	bulbouts	\$48,703	\$194,812
Extend Median on Market (west)	6	bulbouts	\$48,703	\$292,218
Reconfigure church street platform (North of Market)	4	bulbouts	\$48,703	\$194,812
Reconfigure church street platform (South of Market)	4	bulbouts	\$48,703	\$194,812
Reconfigure Duboce Street Platform	6	bulbouts	\$48,703	\$292,218
Drainage	20	each	\$35,000	\$700,000
Trees	24	each	\$2,000	\$48,000
Tree grates	24	each	\$850	\$20,400
Transit Shelters	2	each	\$200,000	\$400,000
Lighting	8	each	\$10,000	\$80,000
Crosswalk enhancements	10	each	\$3,000	\$30,000
Bench	6	each	\$1,500	\$9,000
Signage	12	each	\$150	\$1,800
Bollards	72	each	\$1,800	\$129,600
Traffic Study	0.10	of total costs		\$191,687
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$2,779,359</b>
Soft Costs				\$1,852,906
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$4,632,265</b>

## Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
Department of Public Works  
Planning Department



## A27. Neighborhood Fast Pass

### Project Scope

Provide transportation passes for residents of new housing to encourage the use of accessible transportation for commuting and daily trips. Establishment of this program would require additional work, as discussed in the 'Future Impact Fees' section of the program document within the 'Parking Impact Fees' section.

### Cost Projection

Planning Department projects that the program could generate transit passes for nearly 1,500 households for at least a six-year period. This program is valued at nearly \$4.5 million dollars. This estimate assumes that program development requires a maximum of two years.

		1/4 of new units (5,960) times
Neighborhood Fast Pass	\$4,470,000	3,000
Administration	\$447,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,917,000</b>	

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
 Department of Public Works  
 San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
 Planning Department

## A28. Transit User Infrastructure

### **Project Scope**

Provide necessary infrastructure for transit users as identified in future community processes.

### **Cost Projection**

TBD.

### **Relevant Agencies**

Municipal Transportation Agency  
Department of Public Works  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
Planning Department

## A29. Transit Services

### **Project Scope**

Adequate transportation services are integral to the successful implementation of the Market and Octavia Plan. The plan does not call for specific service and operation improvements but supports Municipal Transportation Agency and San Francisco County Transportation Authority's work to pursue the appropriate levels of service.

### **Cost Projection**

Specific projects and related studies will be identified and developed through MTA's long range planning efforts, the Transportation Effectiveness Project (TEP), and related transportation planning efforts. Projects should be pursued in coordination with growth in the plan area.

### **Relevant Agencies**

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco County Transportation Agency  
Planning Department

## A30. Bicycle Network Improvements


### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 5.5.1**


***Improve bicycle connections, accessibility, safety, and convenience throughout the neighborhood, concentrating on streets most safely and easily traveled by cyclists.***

In addition to being a major crossroads for transit and automobile traffic, the Market and Octavia neighborhood includes several of the most important and well-used bicycle routes in the city. All streets in the study area should be designed to be safe for bicycles, the following corridors merit special attention:

- Market Street
- Valencia Street and the Freeway Touchdown
- Duboce Avenue
- Howard Street



Bicycle Network



## Cost Projection

Street	Project Scope	Distance	Cost
Market Street, 16th to Rose/Brady Street	Complete bike lanes and add signals as needed	4,090	\$ 295,000
Polk Street	Contraflow lane	1,480	\$ 200,000
Otis/McCoppin Street	Dedicated bike lane van ness to McCoppin stub	2,450	\$ 20,000
McCoppin Stub	Complete Bike Lanes		\$ 4,750
11th Street	Sharrows	1,300	\$ 867
Grove Street	Sharrows	2,900	\$ 3,867
Sanchez Street	Sharrows	2,625	\$ 3,500
Steiner Street	Sharrows	630	\$ 840
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$528,823</b>
Soft Costs			\$352,549
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$881,372</b>

## Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
Department of Public Works

## A31. Muni Bike Racks

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 5.5.3**

***Support and expand opportunities for bicycle commuting throughout the city and the region.***

Bicycle commuting reduces peak-period commutes by car and has a markedly positive effect in reducing traffic congestion. From a citywide and regional perspective, every effort should be made to support peoples' commute by bicycle. The largest obstacle to bicycle commuting, aside from unsafe streets, is the difficulty in taking bicycles on regional transit and the lack of secure bicycle parking at transit facilities.

To support bicycle commuting, bicycles need to be permitted on all regional transit operators at peak commute times and secure bicycle parking needs to be provided at regional transit stations.

- Allow bicycles or provide bike racks on all Muni vehicles.

### Cost Projection

#### BIKE BUS RACKS

	QUANTITY	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	TOTAL
Sportswor ks racks	30		\$600	\$18,000
installation	30		\$200	\$6,000
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$24,000</b>
Soft Costs				\$16,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$40,000</b>

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency

## A32. On-Street Bike Racks

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 5.5.2**

***Provide secure and convenient bicycle parking throughout the plan area.***

Providing bicycle parking is important to "closing the loop" in making cycling an attractive alternative to driving. In urban areas like San Francisco, secure and convenient bicycle parking, placed in appropriate locations, is an essential amenity for everyday cyclists. Such bicycle parking reduces theft and provides a needed sense of security.

- Building on DPT's bicycle parking program, ensure that adequate bicycle parking is provided in centers of activity such as Hayes Street, Market Street, and the new Octavia Boulevard.
- Require a minimum amount of bicycle parking on-site for any new development that includes automobile parking.

### Cost Projection

	QUANTITY	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	TOTAL
Bicycle parking on Hayes, Market and Octavia	20	each	\$500.00	\$10,000

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
Department of Public Works



## A33. Page St Bicycle Boulevard

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 5.5.1**

***Improve bicycle connections, accessibility, safety, and convenience throughout the neighborhood, concentrating on streets most safely and easily traveled by cyclists.***

The entirety of Page Street has been designated a “Bicycle Priority Street,” and it should be treated as a bicycle boulevard. To the greatest extent practicable, stop signs should be removed from Page Street. Where necessary, stop signs can be replaced by traffic circles or roundabouts, as illustrated at right.

### Cost Projection

#### BIKE BOULEVARDS

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	COST
Intersection Roundabout	5	Is	\$75,000	\$375,000
Signs	20	each	\$150	\$3,000
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>\$378,000</b>
Soft Costs				\$252,000
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$630,000</b>

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
Department of Public Works

## A34. Childcare Facilities

### Project Scope

Provide childcare facilities to meet projected demand for community facility based childcare. Project does not include funding for childcare demand met through family childcare facilities or other private programs. Project does not include operation of programs or other costs related to provision of services.

### Cost Projection

Construction costs for new child development centers was provided by the Department of Children, Youth and their Family.

	NEED	SLOTS WITH CAPITAL COSTS	INTERIOR SQ FT	EXTERIOR SQ FT	CAPITAL COSTS
Existing Need	721	476	35,699	35,699	\$ 10,709,660
Future need	435	287	21,514	21,514	\$ 6,454,088
<b>Total need</b>	<b>1,156</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>57,212</b>	<b>57,212</b>	<b>\$ 17,163,748</b>

### Relevant Agencies

Department of Children, Youth and Their Family

## A35. Library Materials

### Project Scope

Growth induced by the Market and Octavia plan should contribute its fair share to the provision of new library materials to service new residents.

### Cost Projection

The San Francisco Public Library estimates that providing services to new residents requires a minimum of \$69 per new resident.

	NEED	UNIT	COST PER UNIT	TOTAL COST
Library Materials	9,875	residents	\$69	\$681,375

### Relevant Agencies

San Francisco Public Library

## A36. Recreational Facilities

### Project Scope

Growth induced by the Market and Octavia plan should contribute its fair share to the provision of new recreational facilities for new residents. Examples of recreational facilities include:

- Indoor sporting facilities
- Community centers
- Adult education facilities
- Community performance venues

### Cost Projection

Cost per square foot is based on costs of like projects.

### Relevant Agencies

Department of Recreation and Parks

Department of Public Works

## A37. Duboce Street Museum

### Project Scope

#### **POLICY 4.3.5**

***Reclaim excess right-of-way around the Muni portal on Duboce Street, west of Market Street, to create a focal point museum that celebrates the reconstruction of historic streetcars.***

East of Church Street, beyond the Muni Portal and beneath the Mint, Duboce Street is presently not much more than a utility yard, albeit one where colorful old streetcars are kept and an important, well-used bike path passes through. This site can be transformed into a museum that celebrates San Francisco's streetcar history. An overhead shed-like structure would provide space for a working museum, while at the same time retaining a public path along its southern edge for bicycles and walkers. The new building would provide a much friendlier edge to this public right-of-way than currently exists.

### Cost Projection

PROJECT (SF)	COST PER UNIT	BASE PROJECT COST
7,500	\$300	\$2,250,000

### Relevant Agencies

Planning Department  
Municipal Transportation Agency

## A38. Economic Development Plan

### Project Scope

Establish an economic development plan for the area within six months of Plan adoption that builds on the existing strengths and patterns and identifies new opportunities for economic development. Area wide objectives should be integrated into larger city development strategies. [The focus should be on small business retention and development](#) Strategies (separate and beyond the business planning and loan packaging assistance services already provided through various NEDOs), both to stabilize and strengthen existing businesses and to get new neighborhood-serving businesses established and viable.

The small business program should draw from a wide menu of potential best practices strategies that have been used in other jurisdictions, such as:

- Tenant improvement grants/loans
- Façade improvement grants/loans
- Visual merchandizing consulting
- Marketing assistance
- Lease negotiation services
- Business incentive grants to assist with marketing, rent and property improvements
- Assistance to small businesses purchasing of their buildings
- Rent write-downs/subsidies
- Land write-downs through city purchasing and re-conveyance for small business development (eg, historic buildings)
- Tax increment financing districts to fund property acquisitions for sale to businesses as retention strategy. Repayment could be at interest only until property is resold or refinanced.
- Establish pool of “patient equity” to make equity investments (not grants or loans) to businesses that received a return on the contribution on a time-deferred basis.
- “Negative sandwich leases” where an intermediary organization assumes negotiated master lease on multiple-unit commercial space, along with management responsibilities, then sublets it to a variety of tenants with low base rent and increase \$1.00 per foot, per year. Would require some money for subsidies as economic development strategy.
- Nonprofit building ownership, to serve as a fallback location for good businesses that cannot, in the short term, be viable by paying rapidly escalating rents.
- Adjusting/creating commercial spaces for small businesses which may be doing sufficient volume to be viable if they weren’t paying rent for a space that’s too large.
- Targeted incentives such as low-interest loans to small businesses threatened by gentrification.
- “Percentage leases”—a base rental plus a percentage of the volume over a set amount (particularly mitigates risk for small start ups)
- Demolition controls on existing viable buildings (commercial rents in newly constructed buildings are typically higher than space in existing buildings)

### **Cost Projection**

TBD; Annual funding pool for business development strategies plus administration/staffing needs

### **Relevant Agencies**

Planning Department

Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development

Mayor's Office of Community Development

Small Business Commission

## A39. Historic Survey

### **Project Scope**

There is an increasing recognition that an important part of what makes a place special lies its historic resources and the manner in which these are preserved and enhanced. In order to further this goal, the Market and Octavia Plan will now as an important pillar of this effort incorporate a comprehensive survey of the Plan Area in order to chart what resources might need protection.

### **Cost Projection**

The Department has issued an RFP and selected for the contract Page & Turnbull. Their task will be to complete the survey of the more than 2,000 properties in the Plan Area by 2007 at an estimated cost of \$254,640.

### **Relevant Agencies**

Planning Department



## A40. Plan Area Monitoring

### Project Scope

The Market & Octavia Neighborhood Plan outlines plan goals that cumulatively frame the community's vision for management of growth and development. The plan introduces innovative policies and land use controls to achieve these goals. Successful fruition of the goals requires a coordinated implementation of land use controls, key policies, and community improvements.

In order to track implementation, the Planning Department will monitor key indicators. The plan's performance will be gauged relative to benchmarks called out below.

If monitoring surveys indicate an imbalance in growth and relevant infrastructure and support, the Planning Department may recommend policy changes to balance development with infrastructure. Appropriate responses may include temporary or permanent alterations to Market & Octavia Neighborhood Plan policies, or heighten prioritization of plan area improvements.

### Cost Projection

The anticipated cost of this will primarily consist of staff time, estimated at .5 Full Time Equivalent for each of the four reports.

\$200,000

### Relevant Agencies

Planning Department  
Department of Public Works  
Municipal Transportation Agency  
.

## A41. Capital Improvements Program Administration

### Project Scope

Implementation of the community improvements programming requires at a minimum: commitment from city agencies, a venue for community input, a managing agent for funds, an agent for program administration, and a long-term finance strategy.

The City family will continue to explore implementation strategies that include the necessary elements and also attempt to rely on existing administrative processes and procedures. For example capital improvements should be incorporated into various agencies capital programming and the citywide capital improvements program. Additionally existing analysis of priorities and phasing, such as the utility and paving 5-year plan, should consider improvements planned for the Market and Octavia Plan Area.

Valid program administration items include, costs related to administering the fund, staff for the Citizens Advisory Committee, and other administrative functions. As discussed in section 36 of the administrative code, this shall not include staffing the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC), as staffing should come from the individual agencies.

### Cost Projection

4 Percent of impact fee revenue and CAC staffing.

### Relevant Agencies

Planning Department  
Mayor's Office  
Board of Supervisors  
Capital Improvements Advisory Committee  
City Administrator  
Interagency Plan Implementation Committee

## A42. Operations and Maintenance, existing and new facilities

### **Project Scope**

Maintenance and operation of new and existing street trees, open space, transportation facilities, bicycle facilities, and recreational facilities is crucial to the successful implementation of community improvements. Numerous strategies should be explored and implemented to meet the maintenance needs of the neighborhood, including assessment districts, seed funds, and future tax increment financing-like mechanisms.

### **Cost Projection**

To Be Determined.

### **Relevant Agencies**

Planning Department  
Mayor's Office  
Board of Supervisors  
Capital Improvements Advisory Committee  
City Administrator  
Interagency Plan Implementation Committee

## A43. Improvements to Transit Service and Capacity in the Hub

### Project Scope

Improvements to transit service and capacity including modernization of Van Ness Station. Van Ness Station upgrades could include widened stairways between platform and mezzanine levels and an additional station elevator.

### Cost Projection

TBD

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency

## A44. 11<sup>th</sup> Street (Market Street to Bryant Street)

### Project Scope

Redesign the street with transit boarding islands, corner bulb-outs, and a parking-protected bike lane. Reconfigure parking to accommodate curb-side bike lanes and integrate new boarding islands with the protected bike lanes. Add raised crosswalks at all alleys. Add infill street trees planting and, where appropriate, sidewalk greening and Upgrade pedestrian lighting along sidewalks.

### Cost Projection<sup>1</sup>

14M – 17M

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>1</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A45. 12<sup>th</sup> Street (Market Street to Otis Street)

### Project Scope

Add a westbound protected bike lane from Valencia to Folsom. Add corner bulb-outs and a raised crosswalk at Woodward Street for pedestrian safety. Add infill tree planting wherever possible. Add pedestrian lighting on the extended sidewalk on the north side of 13th street. Explore opportunities for public art on freeway columns.

### Cost Projection<sup>2</sup>

9M - 11M

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>2</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A46. 13<sup>th</sup> Street (Valencia Street to Folsom Street)

### Project Scope

Add a westbound protected bike lane from Valencia to Folsom. Add corner bulb-outs and a raised crosswalk at Woodward Street for pedestrian safety. Add infill tree planting wherever possible. Add pedestrian lighting on the extended sidewalk on the north side of 13th street. Explore opportunities for public art on freeway columns.

### Cost Projection<sup>3</sup>

12M - 15M

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>3</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A47. Market Street (11<sup>th</sup> Street – 12<sup>th</sup> Street)

### Project Scope

Widen sidewalks and create dedicated safe space for bikes and transit to reduce conflicts and improve safety and comfort for all users. Restrict access for private vehicles along this stretch of Market Street. At the Market Street and Van Ness intersection, widen sidewalks at the corners to create more pedestrian space and to encourage active retail and street life along Market Street, integrate transit boarding islands into the widened sidewalk, and create separated space for bicyclists approaching the intersection. All improvements should be coordinated with the City's Better Market Street Project.

### Cost Projection<sup>4</sup>

TBD

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>4</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.



## A48. Oak Street (Franklin Street to Van Ness Avenue)

### Project Scope

Create a high-quality civic street, while maintaining parking on the north side of the street and providing space for passenger loading and commercial deliveries. Add pedestrian lights, street trees and other streetscape amenities to enhance the pedestrian experience. Accommodate fire trucks traveling from the Fire Station to Van Ness Avenue. Add a new public plaza at Oak Street and Van Ness Avenue.

### Cost Projection<sup>5</sup>

3M – 4M

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>5</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A49. Otis Street (Duboce Avenue to South Van Ness Avenue)

### Project Scope

Redesign Otis Street to allow vehicles to travel north between Duboce Avenue and Gough Street. Create a new public space at the intersection of Gough Street and Otis Street. Upgrade streetlights to city standard, incorporate pedestrian lighting where appropriate and add infill street trees.

### Cost Projection<sup>6</sup>

5M - 6M

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>6</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A50. South Van Ness Avenue (Mission Street to 13<sup>th</sup> Street)

### Project Scope

Redesign as a boulevard with through vehicle lanes separated from local lanes by planted medians. Upgrade sidewalks with a 8' wide furnishing zone, including new pedestrian lighting. Add large new bulb-outs at Mission Street and South Van Ness Avenue, and at 12th Street and South Van Ness Avenue. Add a signalized mid-block pedestrian crossing between 12th and Howard and a new bulb-out at Howard with placemaking elements.

### Cost Projection<sup>7</sup>

10M - 12M

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>7</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A51. Valencia Street (Market Street to 15<sup>th</sup> Street)

### Project Scope

Redesign one of San Francisco's busiest bike streets with one-way parking-protected bikeway. Add corner bulb-outs at all intersections, with greening, seating, or other street furnishings. Add raised crosswalks at all alleys, including Clinton Park, Brosnan, and Rosa Parks. Add infill street trees planting and, where appropriate, sidewalk greening and pedestrian-scale lighting.

### Cost Projection<sup>8</sup>

12M - 15M

### Relevant Agencies

Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

---

<sup>8</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A52. 11<sup>th</sup> and Natoma Park

### Project Scope

The property consists of five separate parcels each developed with an existing structure. The parcels been purchased by the City with the intent of building a park that is owned and managed by RPD. The design of the future park and the specific types of amenities it will include are not yet determined. The design will take into consideration park needs within the rapidly growing neighborhood as well as other new open spaces being developed by public and private developers within the area.

### Cost Projection<sup>9</sup>

22M

### Relevant Agencies

Recreation and Parks Department  
Department of Real Estate

---

<sup>9</sup> This is an estimate. Cost may increase during design development phase.

## A53. Improvements to Buchanan Mall

### Project Scope

The Western Addition community has been activating and re-imagining the Buchanan Street Mall since 2015. Aligned with the goals stated in the 2017 Buchanan Mall Vision Plan published by The Trust for Public Land, RPD is presently completing a concept design process for the full five blocks of Buchanan Mall. The design represents a complete makeover of the Park, and includes two children's play areas, a full basketball court and a half court, drinking fountains, communal gardens, community picnic and gathering areas, several micro-enterprise kiosks, and a stage for performance. Throughout the newly visioned linear park runs a memory walk, elevating the stories of the Fillmore District through art and interpretive installations. New pedestrian lighting will support safety and a variety of design elements work together to promote inter-generational interaction.

### Cost Projection

15M

### Relevant Agencies

Recreation and Parks Department  
Office of Economic and Work Force Development  
Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Public Works

## A54. Improvements to Koshland Park

### Project Scope

Increase safety and activation at Koshland Park and expand recreational offerings by installing lighting. This will help reduce undesirable uses and increase healthy activation as well as extend the use of the basketball court throughout the year.

### Cost Projection

3M

### Relevant Agencies

Recreation and Parks Department  
San Francisco Public Works  
Pacific Gas and Electric or Public Utilities Commission

## A55. New/Improved Civic Center Public Spaces

### Project Scope

The Civic Center Public Realm Plan provides a comprehensive vision for Civic Center’s public spaces, including improvements to Civic Center Plaza, Fulton Street Mall, United Nations Plaza and War Memorial Gateway. Future funds would be used to pay for a discrete element/sub-project ( that are TBD) and that has independent utility and value to the surrounding neighborhood.

The Public Realm Plan proposed improvements include:

- Civic Center Plaza improvements that enhance the space for neighborhood and civic use. Except for the existing playgrounds and, potentially, the existing cafe kiosk, the Plan proposes a complete reconstruction of Civic Center Plaza with a new site plan;
- Fulton Street Mall improvements that convert this block into a new plaza and neighborhood recreation space;
- United Nations Plaza Improvements that provide greater flexibility of existing programming, strengthening of the Leavenworth gateway, and improvement of the BART entry; and,
- War Memorial Gateway improvements that better define the western gateway into Civic Center via a flexible-use plaza and improvements to pedestrian circulation.

### Cost Projection

TBD

### Relevant Agencies

San Francisco Recreation and Park  
San Francisco Public Works  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Real Estate Division  
San Francisco Planning Department



## A56. New Parks and Open Spaces in the Hub Area (TBD)

### Project Scope

Other new parks, open spaces or recreational facilities such as dog parks, playgrounds, or expanding/improving recreational facilities under the Central Freeway, and others. This is yet to be determined.

### Cost Projection

TBD

### Relevant Agencies

San Francisco Planning Department  
San Francisco Recreation and Park  
San Francisco Public Works  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
San Francisco Real Estate Division

## A57. Community Facilities

### Project Scope

Funding for new community facilities in the plan area and adjacent neighborhood. Facilities could include Arts/Cultural Facilities, Social Welfare Facilities and/or Community Health Facilities.

### Cost Projection

TBD

### Relevant Agencies

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development  
Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
Arts Commission  
Department of Public Health  
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing