File No. 150943 Committee Item No. 5
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation **Date** December 7, 2015

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** _____

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	Motion
☐	☐	Resolution
☒	☐	Ordinance
☒	☐	Legislative Digest
☐	☐	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Youth Commission Report
☒	☐	Introduction Form
☒	☐	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
☐	☐	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
☐	☐	Grant Information Form
☐	☐	Grant Budget
☐	☐	Subcontract Budget
☐	☐	Contract/Agreement
☐	☐	Form 126 - Ethics Commission
☐	☐	Award Letter
☐	☐	Application
☐	☐	Form 700
☐	☐	Vacancy Notice
☐	☐	Information Sheet
☒	☐	Public Correspondence

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

☒	☐	Mayor's Disability Council Recommendation, dtd 11/24/15
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Alisa Somera **Date** December 4, 2015
Completed by: _____ **Date** _____

[Administrative Code - Bicycle Yield Enforcement Policy]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to add Chapter 110 to establish the "San Francisco Right-of-Way Policy" to promote safety, tolerance, and harmony among all users of City Streets; make arrests and citations of bicyclists for failure to stop at a stop sign the lowest traffic enforcement priority, provided that the bicyclist first slows to a safe speed and yields the right-of-way to any other vehicle or pedestrian in the intersection; require quarterly reports from the Police Department on statistics related to traffic enforcement, injuries, and fatalities; and require notification of state officials of this Ordinance.

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. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Chapter 110, to read as follows:

CHAPTER 110:

SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE YIELD ORDINANCE

SEC. 110.1. TITLE.

This Chapter 110 shall be known as the San Francisco Bicycle Yield Ordinance.

SEC. 110.2. FINDINGS.

(a) The City's Transit-First Policy, as defined in Charter section 8A.115, states that "the primary objective of the transportation system must be the safe and efficient movement of people and goods," and that "Bicycling shall be promoted by encouraging safe streets for riding, convenient access to transit, bicycle lanes, and secure bicycle parking." Resolution No. 511-10, adopted by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor in 2010, encourages departments and agencies of the City to adopt a goal of 20% of trips by bicycle by 2020. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") 2013-2018 Strategic Plan sets policy targets to make "bicycling a part of everyday life in San Francisco" and to increase the citywide bicycle mode share to at least 8% by 2018.

(b) The SFMTA's "Annual Bicycle Count Survey 2014" shows a 206% increase in bicycle traffic since 2006.

(c) This dramatic increase in bicycle traffic has led to increased awareness of how some provisions of the California Vehicle Code are not well suited to a multi-modal transportation system.

(d) California Vehicle Code section 21200 states that a person riding a bicycle "is subject to all the provisions applicable to the driver of a vehicle" by the Vehicle Code's Rules of the Road Division.

(e) An average person riding a bicycle generates about 100 watts of power, while the average car generates about 100,000 watts of power.

(f) A bicyclist who slows to five miles per hour at an intersection uses 25% less energy than a bicyclist who fully stops.

(g) The SFMTA has recognized the need for treating bicycles differently than motor vehicles by creating a number of bicycle-specific facilities such as bike lanes, sharrows, and bike boxes.

(h) In March of 2014, the Board of Supervisors unanimously passed, and the Mayor signed, Resolution No. 91-14 to adopt a "Vision Zero" plan to reduce traffic fatalities to zero in the next ten years. As part of "Vision Zero," the Police Department ("SFPD") implemented a "Focus on the Five" strategy to have each police district target traffic enforcement at its five most dangerous intersections

and focus on the five most dangerous traffic violations: running red lights, running stop signs, violating pedestrian right-of-way, committing turning violations, and speeding. The SFPD is committed to focusing traffic enforcement on the behaviors most likely to result in someone being hit or killed on the City's roadways.

(i) In 1982, Idaho adopted a law that allows bicyclists to treat stop signs as yield signs. A 2010 academic study titled "Bicycle Safety and Choice" found that bicyclist injuries in Idaho decreased 14.5% the first year after the law was adopted, and that Boise, Idaho's largest city, had lower bicyclist injury rates than comparable cities such as Sacramento (30-61% safer) and Bakersfield (150-252% safer).

(j) Strict enforcement of bicyclists failing to come to a complete stop at stop signs is counterproductive because it (1) takes scarce enforcement resources away from more dangerous violations, (2) is contrary to the way most bicyclists and drivers currently navigate intersections, (3) could discourage people from bicycling because of the added exertion required to fully stop at every stop sign, and (4) can slow down traffic patterns and increase congestion on the City's residential streets.

(k) All road users have a legal and moral requirement to politely and safely share our streets. Nothing in this Chapter 110 should be construed to condone the behavior of bicyclists who do not slow to a safe speed at stop signs, fail to yield the right-of-way to another vehicle or pedestrian, or otherwise endanger the safety of another vehicle or pedestrian.

SEC. 110.3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Chapter 110 is to:

(a) Establish the "San Francisco Right-of-Way Policy" to promote the City's Transit First and Vision Zero policies, and to promote safety, tolerance, and harmony among all users of City Streets;

(b) Make citations for bicyclists for failure to stop at a stop sign the City's lowest traffic enforcement priority, provided that the bicyclist first slows to a safe speed and yields the right-of-way to any other vehicle or pedestrian in the intersection;

(3) Require SFPD to issue quarterly reports on traffic stops, citations, injuries and fatalities; and

(4) Transmit notification of the enactment of this Chapter to state elected officials who represent the City.

SEC. 110.4. DEFINITIONS.

"Law enforcement officer" means any peace officer employed by the City, and any other employee of the City who is authorized to enforce traffic laws. "Law enforcement officer" does not include the District Attorney or anyone acting on behalf of the District Attorney.

"Lowest traffic enforcement priority" means that all traffic enforcement activities related to traffic offenses other than those for bicyclists failing to stop at a stop sign shall be given a higher priority than traffic enforcement activities related to bicyclists failing to stop at a stop sign, except as provided below.

SEC. 110.5. SAN FRANCISCO RIGHT-OF-WAY POLICY.

The City hereby establishes the San Francisco Right-of-Way policy to promote the City's Transit First and Vision Zero policy; to promote safety, tolerance, and harmony among all users of City streets; and to encourage all users of City streets to respect others' right-of-way and take their turn when navigating intersections, and in furtherance of this policy urges the following:

(a) That all users of City streets—pedestrians, bicyclists, and automobile drivers—immediately yield the right-of-way to an authorized emergency vehicle that is sounding a siren;

(b) That all users of City streets yield to SFMTA vehicles at intersections whenever feasible because yielding to SFMTA makes public transit faster and more reliable, which benefits all users of City streets;

(c) That automobile drivers and bicyclists always yield to pedestrians at intersections and remain vigilantly aware of pedestrians at all times; and

(d) That bicyclists yield to others at intersections in accordance with the right-of-way rules defined in the California Vehicle Code.

SEC. 110.6. LOWEST TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY FOR BICYCLISTS WHO SAFELY YIELD AT STOP SIGNS.

(a) Law enforcement officers shall make enforcement of California Vehicle Code section 22450(a) for bicyclists that fail to stop at a stop sign the lowest traffic enforcement priority provided that the bicyclist:

(1) Slows to a safe speed for the existing conditions when approaching a stop sign and, if required for safety, stops before entering the intersection; and

(2) Yields the right-of-way to any vehicle or pedestrian in the intersection or approaching the intersection so closely as to constitute an immediate hazard during the time the bicyclist is moving across or within the intersection.

(b) Nothing in this section 110.6 shall be construed to discourage law enforcement officers from citing a bicyclist operating a bicycle for failure to yield at a stop sign if the bicyclist fails to slow to a safe speed, fails to yield the right-of-way to another vehicle or pedestrian, or otherwise endangers the safety of another vehicle or pedestrian.

SEC. 110.7. TRAFFIC CITATION AND INJURY REPORTING.

(a) On a quarterly basis (the first Tuesday in February, May, August, and November), the SFPD shall send a written report to the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, the SFMTA Board of Directors, the Bicycle Advisory Committee, and the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, covering the previous quarter (quarters commencing January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1). The report shall contain the following information, if available, for the reporting period:

(1) The total number of traffic stops broken down by mode of transit; and

(2) The total number of traffic citations broken down by type of citation and mode of transit.

(b) On a quarterly basis (the first Tuesday in February, May, August, and November) the SFPD, in consultation with the Department of Public Health, shall send a written report to the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Police Commission, the SFMTA Board of Directors, the Bicycle Advisory Committee, and the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, covering the previous quarter (quarters commencing January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1). The report shall contain the information listed in subsections (1) and (2) below, if available, for the reporting period and for at least the preceding four reporting periods, to provide context with respect to data trends and permit consideration of the statistical instability of smaller numbers and potential seasonal variation. The report should be restricted to bicyclist-involved collisions – defined as collisions in which a bicyclist was involved as either the injured party or as a party involved but not injured in the collision:

(1) For bicyclist-involved collisions, the total number of traffic injuries and fatalities categorized by injury severity, transportation mode of the person injured or killed (bicyclist, pedestrian, driver, motorcyclist), and collision type (e.g., driver-bicyclist, bicyclist-pedestrian, bicyclist only, etc.); and

(2) For bicyclist-involved collisions at intersections, the total number of traffic injuries and fatalities categorized by injury severity, intersection type (e.g. stop signs, traffic signals, no signage/signalization), transportation mode of the person injured or killed, collision type, and party at fault.

SEC. 110.8. TRANSMITTAL TO STATE GOVERNMENT.

To support policies to modernize bicycle laws to better promote safety, tolerance, and harmony among all users of City streets, beginning three months after the effective date of this Chapter 110 and continuing annually thereafter, the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall send copies of this Chapter and letters to the Governor of California, and all elected officials representing San Franciscans in the

California Assembly and the California Senate. The letters shall state, "The City and County of San Francisco has enacted an ordinance to deprioritize offenses by a bicyclist for failure to stop at stop signs, provided that the bicyclist slows to a safe speed and yields the right-of-way to any other vehicle or pedestrian." The Clerk shall send this letter annually until state laws are changed accordingly.

SEC. 110.9. CONFLICT WITH STATE OR FEDERAL LAW.

Nothing in this Chapter 110 shall authorize the City to impose any duties or obligations in conflict with limitations on municipal authority imposed by state or federal law.

Section 2. 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.

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

By: _____
JANA CLARK
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2015\1600066\01043025.doc

FILE NO. 150943

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Administrative Code - Bicycle Yield Enforcement Policy]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to add Chapter 110 to establish the "San Francisco Right-of-Way Policy" to promote safety, tolerance, and harmony among all users of City Streets; make arrests and citations of bicyclists for failure to stop at a stop sign the lowest traffic enforcement priority, provided that the bicyclist first slows to a safe speed and yields the right-of-way to any other vehicle or pedestrian in the intersection; require quarterly reports from the Police Department on statistics related to traffic enforcement, injuries, and fatalities; and require notification of state officials of this Ordinance.

Existing Law

California Vehicle Code section 21200 requires bicyclists to abide by the Vehicle Code's Rules of the Road, including Vehicle Code section 22450(a). Vehicle Code section 22450(a) requires that drivers stop at stop signs. Therefore, under state law, bicyclists are required to stop at stop signs. Neither State law, nor local law require particular traffic enforcement priorities.

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance would amend the Administrative Code to establish the "San Francisco Right-of-Way Policy" to promote safety, tolerance, and harmony among all users of City Streets. In addition, this ordinance would require that law enforcement officers authorized to enforce the traffic laws make arrests and citations of bicyclists for failure to stop at a stop sign the lowest traffic enforcement priority provided that the bicyclist first slows to a safe speed and yields the right-of-way to any other vehicle or pedestrian in the intersection. This ordinance does not intend to prohibit law enforcement officers authorized to enforce traffic laws from citing bicyclists for failing to stop at signs. Finally, this ordinance requires quarterly reports from the Police Department on statistics related to traffic enforcement, injuries, and fatalities; and requires notification of state officials of this ordinance

n:\legana\as2015\1600066\01046904.doc

Mayor's Disability Council

Chip Supanich
Denise Senhaux
Co-Chairs

November 24, 2015

London Breed
President, Board of Supervisors
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Bicycle Yield Enforcement Policy

Dear President Breed and Members of the Board of Supervisors:

The Mayor's Disability Council unanimously opposes the proposed "San Francisco Right-of-Way Policy" also referred as "bicycle yield enforcement policy" and would like to alert you to its potentially negative impact on pedestrians with disabilities and seniors.

The proposed ordinance permits bicyclists to "slowly proceed without fully stopping at stop signs if the intersection is empty" and de-prioritizes police enforcement for bicyclists failing to come to a full stop. The ordinance promises to increase traffic safety for bicyclists while redirecting scarce traffic enforcement resources to more serious offenses that result in high rates of injury or death.

Although we full heartedly support the legislation's end goals, we believe that they come at a high cost for seniors, people with disabilities and other pedestrians for the following reasons:

- San Francisco adopted the Vision Zero policy which we fully support, with the goal of reducing traffic fatalities to zero by the year 2020. We believe that this proposed ordinance is counterproductive to Vision Zero; it gives a class of road users special priority privileges and permission to disobey state traffic rules. As it is today, some bicyclists consistently run red lights and fail to stop while pedestrians are in the intersection with the right of way. Giving bicyclists' permission to use their best judgement rather than following clear traffic laws would only make matters worse.

- Bicycles by nature are smaller and harder to see or hear as they approach a crowded intersection. For blind and visually impaired pedestrians and seniors, this is problematic

because they cannot always rely on sound or visual cues to react in time. Furthermore, bicycles have higher levels of maneuverability and can intersect a slowly moving pedestrian's path suddenly allowing for almost no reaction time.

- The proposed ordinance is vague and leaves much to the individual bicyclist's subjective interpretation of what is a "slow speed" or "empty intersection." We do not currently have accepted definitions for these 2 concepts and there is no mechanism for self-monitoring or enforcement.

- While the legislation might have potential to pursue as a pilot in a residential neighborhood with relatively low pedestrian congestion, it does not make sense to apply this rule across the entire City at busy, crowded and complex intersections. Perhaps location specific legislation may be more appropriate.

- Cars are not the only vehicles that cause injury and death; there have been instances where bicycle and pedestrian collisions have resulted in tragic deaths. We know from our own personal experience and conversations with the disability community that there have been a number of unreported pedestrian injuries where seniors, wheelchair using pedestrians and others with slower mobility have come into contact with an irresponsible bike user who failed to follow current safety laws. While these individuals may not have been hospitalized and therefore the accidents were not tracked by Health Department data, the experience had a negative impact on the physical and emotional well-being of the individual.

Adherence to a common set of rules is the foundation of traffic safety. What gives vulnerable pedestrians confidence in stepping off the curb and into the crosswalk is the expectation that as long as they follow the rules, other road users will do so as well.

For these reasons, the Mayor's Disability Council does not support the proposed legislation. Please ensure traffic safety for all road users in San Francisco by voting against this ordinance. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Chip Supanich, Co-Chair
Mayor's Disability Council

Denise Senhaux, Co-Chair
Mayor's Disability Council

cc: Mayor Edwin Lee
Clerk, Board of Supervisors
Mayor's Office on Disability

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Friday, December 04, 2015 8:51 AM
To: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: File 150943 FW: Do not deprioritize stop sign running by bicyclists - no "Idaho stop" law

From: hlchabner@comcast.net [mailto:hlchabner@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 9:15 PM
To: ed lee <ed.lee@sfgov.org>; Mar, Eric (BOS) <eric.mar@sfgov.org>; scott weiner <scott.weiner@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Avalos, John (BOS) <john.avalos@sfgov.org>; Campos, David (BOS) <david.campos@sfgov.org>; Farrell, Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Christensen, Julie (BOS) <Julie.Christensen@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Johnston, Conor (BOS) <conor.johnston@sfgov.org>; Brown, Vallie (BOS) <vallie.brown@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: hlchabner@jps.net; Wong, Iris (BOS) <iris.wong@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Pollock, Jeremy (BOS) <jeremy.pollock@sfgov.org>; Rubenstein, Beth (BOS) <beth.rubenstein@sfgov.org>; Pagoulatos, Nickolas (BOS) <nickolas.pagoulatos@sfgov.org>; Lim, Victor (BOS) <victor.lim@sfgov.org>; Redondiez, Raquel (BOS) <raquel.redondiez@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Kelly, Margaux (BOS) <margaux.kelly@sfgov.org>; Montejano, Jess (BOS) <jess.montejano@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (POL) <Wilson.Ng@sfgov.org>; Quizon, Dyanna (BOS) <dyanna.quizon@sfgov.org>; Law, Ray (BOS) <ray.law@sfgov.org>; Yadegar, Danny (BOS) <danny.yadegar@sfgov.org>; carol@dr-carol.com; Lang, Davi (BOS) <davi.lang@sfgov.org>; Lee, Ivy (BOS) <ivy.lee@sfgov.org>; Mormino, Matthias (BOS) <matthias.mormino@sfgov.org>; Scanlon, Olivia (FIR) <olivia.scanlon@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Taylor, Adam (BOS) <adam.taylor@sfgov.org>; Power, Andres <andres.power@sfgov.org>; Cretan, Jeff (BOS) <jeff.cretan@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Carolyn Goossen <carolyn.goossen1@gmail.com>; Bruss, Andrea (BOS) <andrea.bruss@sfgov.org>; Chan, Yoyo (BOS) <yoyo.chan@sfgov.org>; Suhr, Greg (POL) <Greg.Suhr@sfgov.org>; Mannix, Ann (POL) <Ann.Mannix@sfgov.org>; Matranga, Benjamin (MYR) (HRD) <ben.matranga@sfgov.org>; Gillett, Gillian (MYR) <gillian.gillett@sfgov.org>; Fraguli, Joanna (ADM) <joanna.fraguli@sfgov.org>; Johnson, Carla (ADM) <carla.johnson@sfgov.org>; MOD, (ADM) <mod@sfgov.org>; chipsupanich@gmail.com; mayoredlee@sfgov.org
Subject: Do not deprioritize stop sign running by bicyclists - no "Idaho stop" law

Dear President Breed and Supervisors:
Please do not adopt the proposed ordinance to make citations for bicyclists who don't stop at stop signs the lowest law enforcement priority and to permit bicyclists not to stop at stop signs if the intersection is empty. Consider the following:

- The analysis, studies and factors from experienced pedestrian safety advocate and expert Bob Planthold, in his communications with you, are compelling reasons not to adopt this ordinance.
- Two things are proposed: 1- enforcement would be de-prioritized; and 2- the "San Francisco Right-of-Way Policy" would permit bicyclists to "slowly proceed without fully stopping at stop signs if the intersection is empty." With regard to #2, it has long been California law that bicyclists are subject to traffic laws applicable to other vehicles, including the requirement to stop at stop signs. Changing this should not be done through the back door of a local policy ordinance. If you believe that the law should be changed, find a sponsor in the state legislature and engage in a full, statewide debate about such a major change. Moreover, purporting to exempt San Francisco from state law by means of a "policy" ordinance may well be illegal.
- The proposed ordinance would deprioritize failure to stop by cyclists who, in the words of Supervisor Avalos's press release, "safely yield at stop signs." Whether or not a cyclist's failure to stop constitutes safe yielding is extremely subjective. Also subjective is whether the intersection is empty. For example, if a pedestrian is at the curb just getting ready to lift their leg onto the street, is the intersection empty? (This gets to Bob Planthold's points about poor visibility, fast-moving bicyclists, etc.) In practice these subjective rules would mean that the

police department would err on the side of non-enforcement even if the failure to stop was not safe or the intersection was not completely empty, for fear of being criticized by the Board of Supervisors and the powerful SF bike lobby. This in turn would encourage unsafe behavior by cyclists.

- People with mobility disabilities, blind people, seniors, and people with baby strollers would feel less safe. This is difficult to quantify, but it is real. I've used a wheelchair since 1990, and before that I walked for many years with increasing difficulty, and decreasing speed and confidence. Falling became an increasing problem, as it is for many people who walk with difficulty. In recent years I've had several near misses from bicyclists who have run red lights, run stop signs and ridden on the sidewalk. From time to time when I am crossing at a crosswalk where there is a stop sign and a motor vehicle is stopped, a cyclist has blown past the stop sign. I wasn't able to see the cyclist until I've been past the motor vehicle. This is stressful and unsafe. Knowing that cyclists wouldn't be required to stop at stop signs, and that the police would be under great pressure not to issue citations, would make this even worse. My feeling of safety as a pedestrian would significantly decline. In my experience (among other things, for five years I was Chair of the Physical Access Committee of the Mayor's Disability Council), many others feel the same way.

- Many times cyclists going fast have come close to me and other pedestrians. The cyclist may sincerely believe they are far enough to be safe, and they may avoid hitting the pedestrian by turning or swerving at the last moment. While I might not classify these situations as full near misses, still, as a pedestrian, this is unnerving. To add subjectivity to the law would increase these situations.

- Supervisor Avalos claims that strict enforcement is counterproductive because it discourages people from bicycling. First, no evidence is cited for this proposition. Second, if it is true, what it means is that some people don't want to bicycle unless they are exempt from stopping at stop signs. In other words, they want special treatment.

- Supervisor Avalos also claims that strict enforcement is "counterintuitive to the way most bicyclists and drivers currently navigate intersections." As above, no evidence whatsoever is cited for this proposition. But to the extent that it accurately describes the way drivers currently navigate intersections, it is most likely not because San Francisco drivers believe that cyclists should be exempt from stopping at stop signs, but because San Francisco drivers have become so used to dangerous, illegal, unpredictable, aggressive and unpunished behavior by cyclists that they are always on the lookout for cyclists coming from any direction, fast, weaving in and out, and violating traffic laws generally.

- Drivers who aren't from San Francisco would not expect that bicyclists are permitted not to stop at the stop sign. This is another reason why the law should be uniform and consistent throughout California.
- Idaho adopted the "Idaho stop" law in 1982. There is a good reason why none of the other 49 states have adopted this law in the subsequent 33 years. It's also important to consider that Boise is much less dense than San Francisco and is not comparable in other ways.

Please oppose this ordinance that would diminish pedestrian safety and give cyclists special treatment. Thank you for considering this email.

Sincerely

Howard Chabner

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2015 10:32 AM
To: Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: File 150943 FW: The Bicycle Yield Law - NO.

From: Cautn1@aol.com [mailto:Cautn1@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 2:59 PM
To: Pointer User0021 <EdwinLee@sfgov.org>; Tang, Katy (BOS) <katy.tang@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Cohen, Malia (BOS) <malia.cohen@sfgov.org>; Avalos, John (BOS) <john.avalos@sfgov.org>; Kim, Jane (BOS) <jane.kim@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Campos, David (BOS) <david.campos@sfgov.org>; Farrell, Mark (BOS) <mark.farrell@sfgov.org>; Mar, Eric (BOS) <eric.mar@sfgov.org>; Wiener, Scott <scott.wiener@sfgov.org>; Breed, London (BOS) <london.breed@sfgov.org>
Subject: The Bicycle Yield Law - NO.

People respond better to clear instructions than to those that are vague and subjective.

Consequently a bicyclist who goes through a stop sign knowing that he or she is breaking the law (even if it is enforced judiciously) is more likely to be alert and cautious than if he knows that the action is sometimes OK. The existing law is consequently safer...for all concerned, not just bicyclists...than the proposed condition.

Under the existing law the police don't find themselves arguing in Civil Court with defense attorneys over whether or not conditions favored a bicyclist's decision to go through a stop sign.

In the name of safety and common sense, leave things as they are.

Gerald Cauthen

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From:	Bruce Oka <bruceoka55@gmail.com>
Sent:	Thursday, December 03, 2015 1:25 PM
To:	Cohen, Malia (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Scott.Weiner@sfgov.org
Cc:	Somera, Alisa (BOS); Bruss, Andrea (BOS); Chan, Yoyo (BOS); Tugbenyoh, Mawuli (BOS); Taylor, Adam (BOS); Power, Andres; Cretan, Jeff (BOS); Lang, Davi (BOS); Lee, Ivy (BOS); Yadegar, Danny (BOS); Bob Planthold; Matranga, Benjamin (MYR) (HRD)
Subject:	Re: Idaho bike-stop law

Dear Supervisors cohen, Kim & Weiner:

Please do not adopt the ordinance proposed by Supervisor Avalos to make citations for bicyclists who don't stop at stop signs the lowest law enforcement priority and to permit bicyclists not to stop at stop signs if the intersection is empty.

As you all know, I am a former member of the SFMTA Board of Directors (2008-2012). I am also a wheelchair user who has spent over 45 years helping to make our transit system and our streets and sidewalks safer for our children, seniors & people with any disabilities. Supervisor Avalos' proposed ordinance will not make our streets safer, it will cause San Francisco streets to be more dangerous than ever. I use the sidewalks and the bicycle lanes everyday in my wheelchair & I see near collisions between bicyclists & pedestrians wherever I travel in the City.

In conclusion, I strongly urge you not to adopt the proposed ordinance. Thank you for your attention and consideration on this very crucial matter.

Bruce Oka

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 10:22 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: File 150943 FW: NO on Idaho Stop Legislation

From: d_b carroll [mailto:bravobill@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 10:07 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: NO on Idaho Stop Legislation

Land Use and Transportation Committee, Supervisors and Staff, re: Idaho Stop legislation

Please oppose any change in the rules that apply to cyclists that would create more confusion on the streets of San Francisco than we already have, including the Idaho Stop for cyclists.

As it is now, we have a bad situation with many cyclists breaking the laws and putting themselves and others in danger. We do not need to encourage those that are upholding the law to break it. There should be no exception to how people respond to a stop sign. That means that anyone who has the right of way should be able to proceed without delay. This is the law of the land and should not be tampered with. By giving some people the right to proceed without stopping, you are opening the door to more accidents.

If the city passes this law, there may be serious repercussions coming from the insurance industry and others who challenge the right of cyclists to drive recklessly on city streets and cause accidents. Who will pay for the damages caused by a cyclist running a stop sign? Will cyclists be required to purchase liability insurance?

Since we have so many new residents and visitors it is paramount that we live by the same rules as every other city, for the sake of everyone's safety. We should not change our rules to confuse others. How many tourists or new residents will know to watch for cyclists running stop signs? How many truckers and out of town

drivers?
Quit making San Francisco an exception to the rules of the road if you care about the safety of others.
Sincerely,
Bill and Diane Carroll, 1650 Jackson, SF 94109
bravobill@Hotmail.com

JOHN L. BURTON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CONSULTANT IN GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Bos-11, Rules, COB, Leg Dep
CPage
File 150943

Oct 5, 2015

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall
1 Carlton Goodlett Place
#244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Supervisors,

During my time in public office I have seen many wacky ideas introduced into law, some of them by me, such as making it a crime to be poor. However a measure to be considered by the Board of Supervisors that basically would give a green light to all people riding bicycles in San Francisco is about the craziest thing I ever heard of.

As I drive through the streets of San Francisco, I am actually surprised to realize that cyclists are supposed to stop at stop signs and red lights because I see that observed more in the breach than in the act.

Where is the liability going to be if people just go willy-nilly through stop signs and red lights as a matter of law? Who will be responsible, the cyclist, the driver, the pedestrian or the city for passing such inane legislation.

I understand the strength of various special interest groups and I have been told that there are 200,000 people who use bicycling as their major if not sole means of transportation. That's a very impressive number, however I would think in the name of sanity and public safety for pedestrians, drivers and cyclists the supervisors would relegate this idea to the legislative trashcan.

I have the greatest respect for Supervisor Avalos but I do believe he is missing the boat on this one.

Peace and friendship,

JOHN L. BURTON

465 CALIFORNIA STREET ▼ SUITE 400 ▼ SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104
(415) 362-4405 OFFICE ▼ (415) 518-5383 CELL ▼ (415) 434-4540 FAX

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 11:27 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: File 150943 FW: NO to Bicycle Yielding Rule

From: eugene chew [mailto:cheweugene@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 11:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lee, Mayor (MYR) <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>
Subject: NO to Bicycle Yielding Rule

Hi,

I am one of the long-time residents in Duboce Triangle, District 8. Recently, I believe that there is a bill introduced (passed?), which will allow cyclists to not stop at the stop signs, if they deem it safe to roll across the stop signs. I believe that it is coined by a certain group as a "common sense" bill.

I have already written to the supervisor of my district and unfortunately, he supports the bill. Hence, I want to write to the entire board to voice my disapproval of the bill. Everyone, and I mean, everyone should abide by the traffic rules. Why should the safety of pedestrians and other motorists take a back seat in order to afford a group of cyclists the luxury of "convenience"?! This is ridiculous! Living in Duboce Triangle by Duboce Park, over the years, I already witness many cyclists who do not stop or yield to pedestrians as well as cars and Muni drivers - almost causing accidents. This bill will just embolden some of the cyclists to run through the stop signs.

Everyone has the right to be safe and it is the board's responsibility to ensure that instead of yielding to a certain group's "convenience". Regardless of how it is argued, I strongly feel that everyone should abide by the current traffic law and stop at all stop signs. Why is this new law necessary and why is there an issue for cyclists to stop at all stop signs?

Yours truly,
Eugene Chew

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 10:37 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: File 150943 FW: Please support the Bike Yield Law

From: Tess N [mailto:tnapili@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 9:31 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please support the Bike Yield Law

Dear Supervisors,

I urge you to support the Bike Yield Law. You already have access to metrics for Vision Zero, and I hope you already agree that SFPD should focus their resources on behaviors that cause the majority of traffic deaths. I'd like to speak to other concerns that I hear from my fellow city residents and how the Bike Yield Law would help.

Removing the fear of unnecessary tickets for safe cycling would make cycling a more practical and convenient mode of transportation, which would improve San Francisco in the following ways:

1. Parking is tight and getting worse. Encouraging people to ride their bikes would reduce the number of households that currently have 1 or more cars per driver. Please help to make cycling practical & convenient, so that each resident no longer feels like he or she *needs* to own a car and take up parking spots on the street. With the many large, multi-generation households in the city, people can easily borrow/share cars with others in their households when bikes won't work well (e.g., when transporting furniture or during heavy rain). Some neighborhoods also have convenient access to car share programs.

2. MUNI is getting crowded. Even though the MTA is making incremental improvements, MUNI can't keep up with the city's population growth. You should always encourage able-bodied people to ride their bikes to make room on MUNI for those who need it, especially those who physically can't bike or drive a vehicle.

3. Safety is important. Cars in many neighborhoods already roll through stop signs, and they're capable of so much more harm than cyclists. We need to enforce *safe* crossings of intersections.

Cyclists can cross stop-sign intersections with a yield as safely as a stop. SFPD should be able to cite *reckless* intersection users whether they are vehicle drivers or cyclists. Remember, it's the *people* who are reckless, not their mode of transportation. Making cycling less practical will move more people (including reckless people!) away from bikes and into cars. It's much safer for everyone to have each reckless person riding a bike instead of driving a car or truck.

I invite you to come watch *cars* roll past the stop signs at intersections in my neighborhood, Central Parkside. I hate that they do this, and I hate that ticketing them currently would also mean ticketing safe cyclists who yield instead of stop.

I realize that you might not actually ride a bike for commuting, running errands, or just getting around, so your idea of a rolling stop is based on seeing or being startled by annoying cyclists who fly through intersections and expect everyone to make way. I frequently find myself thinking the same thing about annoying vehicle drivers who do the same thing...just with a lot more killing power. Unfortunately, those annoying cyclists make all the other cyclists look bad. Not all cyclists are reckless and dangerous. I ask that you watch this video, which I think illustrates well how rolling stops work, and which I hope you find enlightening: https://vimeo.com/4140910

One last point (sorry, I have much to say). Over the last decade, I've noticed fewer and fewer people walking in my neighborhood. Even my bike- and hike-loving family drives more and more for trips that we previously did on foot or on bikes, because reckless drivers make the walking & biking experience unpleasant at best and deadly at worst. Did you know that having fewer pedestrians and cyclists makes our streets significantly more dangerous for pedestrians & cyclists? There's a decent amount of research on this strange effect, but here's just one summary to get you started:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001457509000876
Please think about how safe you'd like San Francisco to be for pedestrians and cyclists. And would you really rather have us all drive? By making cycling a more practical, convenient mode of transportation, you'll get more people outdoors getting exercise instead of spewing smog, and you'll improve safety for everyone.

Thanks for reading.

Tess Napili
tnapili@gmail.com

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 10:35 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: File 150943 FW: outlandish

From: Carpenter, Russell [mailto:Russell.Carpenter@calbar.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 7:29 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: outlandish

Greetings. This message is to express my opposition to permission for bicyclists to run stop signs, red lights, etc. The very thought is chalooshus. I see these scofflaws flaunting their disregard for pedestrians daily. I implore you to vote against the proposition. Thank you.

--

Russell K. Carpenter, Ed.D. I Examinations Technician/Assistant to Director of Examinations
Office of Admissions
The State Bar of California I 180 Howard St. I San Francisco, CA 94105
415.538.2317 I Fax 415.538.2304 I russell.carpenter@calbar.ca.gov

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 12:58 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: FW: Bicycle Safety

From: Patricia De Fonte [mailto:patricia_defonte@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 12:54 PM
To: Avalos, John (BOS) <john.avalos@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Lee, Mayor (MYR) <mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; McFadden, Joseph (POL) <Joseph.McFadden@sfgov.org>; Yahoo! Inc. <neystreetnw@yahoogroups.com>; Nuru, Mohammed (DPW) <Mohammed.Nuru@sfdpw.org>
Subject: Bicycle Safety

Good Morning,

I just learned that the BOS has or will soon vote on whether to allow cyclist to ignore stop signs and stop lights. As a resident and voter who has worked for years to make my neighborhood safer and more attractive, I am frankly shocked.

I live near the corner of Congdon and Alemany in the Excelsior District. There is a stoplight at this intersection. There is also a dedicated bike lane on Alemany. There are car accidents at this intersection on an almost weekly basis. If bikes are not required to stop at the light we are going to have **dead bodies** to count on a regular basis.

I have asked Supervisor Avalos many time to put me in touch with the Bicycle Coalition so that I could work with them to make improvements to the Bike Path - it should be painted green, there should be a proper barrier - not the mostly broken while pylons that are sort of there now. I have received no response. Which leads me to think that the Bicycle Coalition is not active in District 11. So why he is sticking his nose in an issue that has NOTHING to do with representing his constituency is beyond me. I have also tried contacting them directly, to request that they come out and take a look and get some important safety work done. They have not responded to any of my emails.

Can someone reading this email please put me in direct contact with a human being at the Bicycle Coalition so that I can show them how dangerous this intersection is, the tens of thousands of dollars of work Ney Street Neighborhood Watch has done improving this stretch of Alemany, and ask them to lobby City Hall on behalf of their constituents to make safety improvements to this bike lane.

Can someone also please put me directly in touch with someone at SFMTA so that they come out and do an assessment of what this intersection needs in order to ensure we don't have even more, and now probably fatal, accidents in this intersection?

Captain McFadden and Mr. Nuru, please let me know how NSNW can collaborate with your offices to ensure a safe intersection for pedestrians, motorists and cyclist. And thank you for your continued support of NSNW's projects in this area.

I hope that I will not be making 911 calls for dead bodies in the intersection.

Patricia De Fonte
Ney Street Neighborhood Watch

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 12:58 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: FW: Please do not adopt the ordinance allowing Idaho Stop in San Francisco

From: Rob Francis [mailto:robert.francis@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 12:53 PM
Subject: Please do not adopt the ordinance allowing Idaho Stop in San Francisco

To Mayor Lee, President Breed and Supervisors:

Please do not adopt the ordinance proposed by Supervisor Avalos to make citations for bicyclists who don't stop at stop signs the lowest law enforcement priority and to permit bicyclists not to stop at stop signs if the intersection is empty.

If this legislation becomes law bicyclists may go through intersections without stopping when they determine that there is no 'immediate hazard. This proposed legislation **may lead to increased crashes** because many bicyclists, **especially our young riders**, will misunderstand the law and blast through stop signs with tragic results.

The extent that stopping is a burden to cyclists is up to the individual. As a longtime cyclist I've never considered stopping to be a problem. Cyclists who are not fit enough to start and stop multiple times when riding, perhaps shouldn't be on a pedal-bike?

Here's a scenario to consider: a cyclist approaches a red light. She stops, looks both ways, and decides to cross or turn left on the red light. Unbeknownst to her, motor traffic on her left or across the intersection has just gotten a green left turn arrow. Conflict (or worse) occurs. She wasn't aware of that because many such signals are not visible to the cross traffic because there's no reason for them to be when all traffic is supposed to obey them according to the same black and white rules. I suppose you could argue that a prudent cyclist would not cross on the red light under the circumstance where there was cross traffic waiting to turn left across her path. But how many of us would make that determination under those circumstances?

My observation of the "judgment" used by many cyclists when choosing to ignore stop signs or red lights is that they often make very poor and dangerous decisions. Making such behavior "legal" won't reduce the danger to them or others.

Is it REALLY all that onerous to stop at stop signs and red lights?The "Idaho Stop" runs counter to the principles of vehicular cycling and also violates one of the primary elements of traffic safety: predictability.

Please take a moment to view this video and **oppose this ordinance** that would diminish pedestrian safety and give cyclists special treatment.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kqkoib1QdB0

Robert Francis
Eastern Neighborhoods United Front (ENUF)

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 11:21 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors; Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: FW: Proposed bicycle law

From: tam tam [mailto:tamsfo12@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 11:19 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposed bicycle law

Re: Bike law proposal, traffic right of way change. Bicycle stop sign yield only

Dear Supervisor:

I want to express my opposition the proposed Bike Law allowing bicyclist to yield at stop signs in San Francisco. I am asking you to protect all citizens and visitors from this dangerous proposal. Allowing a unilateral right-of-way jeopardizes everyone. As a Supervisor, it is your responsibility to protect the most vulnerable and create laws that allow us to live in harmony. This proposal creates chaos and is not safe.

The population of San Francisco is becoming denser. Our transportation infrastructure has not kept pace with increased populace and visitors and it often creates added problems and frustrations. We now recognize that one out of twenty-four persons is a sociopath. It is imperative that laws are created to set limits protecting us from these individuals and mitigate the stresses of density. Critical Mass represents unrestricted, self regulated bicycle riding that has recently escalated from severe aggression to unprovoked violence. Aggressive bicyclists are becoming the norm in San Francisco. This proposed law will encourage, if not sanction aggressive bicycle riding on a colossal scale.

Also important are the pedestrian fatalities from bicycle riders. The two most recent deaths were both from bicyclist misjudging and not yielding to traffic signals. Statistically, bicycle vs. pedestrian fatality rates are equal to that of automobiles. It is likely that this new law will result in injury and death on a larger scale exceeding the auto rates. Further, bicycles are not licensed (usually) and are not traceable. Accountability for injury and mortality would be by the "honor" system and likely would not result in justice. This new law does not support the "vision zero" agenda in the least.

The proposed law is a simply a convenience for less than 8% of the San Francisco population but places 100% of the population at risk for injury and death. Additionally, the expense to mark every stop sign with notice that bicycles may not stop is dumbfounding. I would suggest that we trial a few routes with this proposed permissive yield no stop for bicyclists before we commit to a dangerous and expensive full implementation.

Better would be to stop this idea that puts everyone at risk for injury. This proposed law is chaos. I strongly urge you to reject this bad idea for our busy city.

Thank you, T. A. Montoya

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 10:56 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Proposed ordinance exempting cyclists from some traffic law.

From: Sue Taylor [mailto:sue.oshun@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 10:24 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Proposed ordinance exempting cyclists from some traffic law.

TO: SF Board of Supervisors
FROM: Sue Taylor, Oakland resident, neighborhood safety organizer, occasional newspaper writer (Bay Area News Group and Post Newsgroup)
RE: Proposed Ordinance Exempting Cyclists from Some Traffic Laws

Dear Supervisors,

I adamantly oppose any ordinance that exempts cyclists from full participation in use of public transportation infrastructure, which includes obeying traffic laws. Leaving compliance with traffic law up to the discretion of anyone using our streets is ill-advised at best, massively dangerous at worst.

That said, I want to express that I fully support increased cyclist traffic infrastructure - bike lanes, appropriate speed limits, encouraging cycling as a full component of transportation.

However, just as we have many examples of unreasonable vehicle decisions in traffic, we have many examples of cyclist poor decision-making. We surely would not leave abiding by traffic law up to drivers, and should not leave it up to the discretion of cyclists either. In fact, we should go the opposite direction and assure that cyclists are full participants in traffic infrastructure in the same way as vehicle operators - we should require licensing, registration, and insurance for cyclists the same as we require them for vehicle owners and operators.

I spoke with Francis in Supervisor Avalos office this morning, to express this same opinion and ask that it be communicated to Supervisor Avalos, and her many objections to my opinion centered around, "wouldn't you rather police enforce vehicle compliance with the law, than cyclist compliance with the law" was a perfect example of the skewed thinking I have witnessed from bicycle advocates.

I would rather that everyone participate fully in both the enjoyment of publicy-funded infrastructure - AND - respect and use it fully in compliance with the law. Enforcement is an entirely "other" discussion.

Example - in my Oakland neighborhood (Upper Rockridge), Oakland Police Department agreed to train rookies at a particularly dangerous intersection. Tickets were issued (many for rolling stops). Traffic safety improved dramatically - speeding almost disappeared, children/families could again use the crosswalk, no accidents or property damage. Then police presence was pulled - BECAUSE THE NEIGHBORS GETTING THE TICKETS FELT THEY HAD A RIGHT TO RUN THE STOP SIGN AND SPEED. Fast forward, and those same neighbors now bemoan the "absence of police presence" and increased number of auto and home burglaries.

Abiding by traffic law is one of the most effective ways to encourage civic presence of mind and participation of any known method. I pray that San Francisco will reject this proposed ordinance or any ordinance that encourages otherwise.

Sincerely yours,
Sue Taylor

Somera, Alisa (BOS)

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 10:55 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: FW: Bike yield

-----Original Message-----
From: NANETTE BURTON [mailto:nanettb@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 6:26 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Bike yield

Have you gone completely MAD? I've nearly been ran over 3 times because they do not have to obey the rules already. They wanted SHARE THE ROAD which they
really mean get out of my way. There is no sharing. As a driver they are a disaster. They are so entitled there is nothing they will not do ie CRITICAL MASS. Have any of you ever been caught in it? You should try it sometime on you way home after a long day at work. You'll really appreciate the MOB mentality they have and now you want them to be even LESS RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS? Does this also apply to motorcyclists? As a walker I've nearly been hit 3 times. If I ever get hit I'll make sure to not only sue them but you as well. There are some bikers that actually take responsibility for themselves but unfortunately they are few. Do they also get to blow the RED LIGHT? Of course they already do now they can do it more often.

NANETTE BURTON
nanettb@mac.com

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: Chief Greg Suhr, Police Department
Sheriff Ross Mirkarimi, Sheriff's Department
Ed Reiskin, Executive Director, Municipal Transportation Agency
George Gascon, District Attorney
Jeff Adachi, Public Defender
Barbara Garcia, Director, Department of Public Health
Louis Liss, Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee &
Bicycle Advisory Committee

FROM: Alisa Somera, Assistant Clerk, Rules Committee
Board of Supervisors

DATE: September 29, 2015

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Avalos on September 22, 2015. This matter is being referred to you for informational purposes since it affects your department.

File No. 150943

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to add Chapter 110 to establish the "San Francisco Right-of-Way Policy" to promote safety, tolerance, and harmony among all users of City Streets; make arrests and citations of bicyclists for failure to stop at a stop sign the lowest traffic enforcement priority, provided that the bicyclist first slows to a safe speed and yields the right-of-way to any other vehicle or pedestrian in the intersection; require quarterly reports from the Police Department on statistics related to traffic enforcement, injuries, and fatalities; and require notification of state officials of this Ordinance.

If you wish to submit any reports or documentation to be considered with the legislation, please send those to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at alisa.somera@sfgov.org.

c: Christine Fountain, Police Department
Inspector John Monroe, Police Department/Commission
Katherine Gorwood, Sheriff's Department
Kate Breen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Janet Martinsen, Municipal Transportation Agency
Dillon Auyoung Municipal Transportation Agency
Cristine Soto DeBerry, Office of the District Attorney
Maxwell Szabo, Office of the District Attorney
Greg Wagner, Department of Public Health
Colleen Chawla, Department of Public Health

BOS-11, Ln Clerk
Rules Clerk
Leg Dep, Dep City Atty.

President, District 5
BOARD of SUPERVISORS

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-7630
Fax No. 554-7634
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

London Breed

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

Date: 11/10/15

To: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Madam Clerk,
Pursuant to Board Rules, I am hereby:

☐ Waiving 30-Day Rule (Board Rule No. 3.23)

File No. _____ _____ (Primary Sponsor)

Title. _____

☒ Transferring (Board Rule No. 3.3)

File No. 150943 Avalos (Primary Sponsor)

Title. Bicycle Yield Enforcement Policy

From: Rules Committee

To: Land Use & Transportation Committee

☐ Assigning Temporary Committee Appointment (Board Rule No. 3.1)

Supervisor _____

Replacing Supervisor _____

For: _____ (Date) _____ (Committee) Meeting

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2015 NOV 10 PM 5:35

London Breed

London Breed, President
Board of Supervisors

Print Form

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

☒ 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion, or Charter Amendment)

☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.

☐ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.

☐ 4. Request for letter beginning "Supervisor _____ inquires"

☐ 5. City Attorney request.

☐ 6. Call File No. _____ from Committee.

☐ 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).

☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. _____

☐ 9. Reactivate File No. _____

☐ 10. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on _____

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission

☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use a Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Supervisors Avalos, Breed, Campos, Kim, Mar, Wiener

Subject:

Ordinance – Administrative Code – Bicycle Yield Enforcement Policy

The text is listed below or attached:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: _____

For Clerk's Use Only: