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Project Overview
WHAT IS ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE?

As defined by the Caltrans, environmental justice is the “fair distribution of environmental burdens and benefits across communities impacted by transportation projects.”

Environmental justice has five main elements:

» Access to affordable transportation options, jobs, employment opportunities
» Frequent transit service
» Pedestrian and bicycle safety
» Air quality and noise control
» Access to affordable housing

PROJECT OUTCOMES

» A strong community vision
» Corridor-wide designs from Van Ness Avenue to Randall Street
» Intersection designs for pedestrian safety
» Plaza designs
» Implementation Strategy

PARTNERSHIPS

Agencies
» San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority (MTA)
» Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)
» Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)
» San Francisco Public Works (PW)
» California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Community Partners
» Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA)
» Mission Small Business Association (MISBA)
» People Organizing to Demand Environmental & Economic Rights (PODER)
» Mission Neighborhood Center
» Galería de La Raza
» Mission Cultural Center
» Southern Exposure
» Mission SRO Collaborative
» Walk SF
» Mission Merchant Association
» Mission-Bernal Merchant Association
» Calle 24
» Central Mission Neighborhood Association
» Mission Community Market

Academic Partners
» University of San Francisco, Art and Architecture program
Mission Street looking north
Chapter 1
Introduction
Mission Street—is in the Mission District of San Francisco—is a vibrant urban corridor, home to a diverse community and known as the heart of the city’s Latino community.

Mission Street is the spine of the Mission District. Mission Street as a place differs from the adjacent streets of Valencia Street and South Van Ness Street. Mission Street is a utilitarian place for residents and workers, and a major transit corridor with two BART stations, and 67,000 daily transit riders on bus routes (14, 14L and 49 lines). It is a block from Valencia Street: a city-wide destination for pedestrians mostly served by restaurants, cafes, and upscale retail, and a bicycle corridor with marked bike lanes northbound and southbound. Mission Street is also a block form South Van Ness Street, which is an automobile oriented thoroughfare, and a main entry and exit point to the freeway.

16th and 24th Streets, two major transit and commercial corridors, 22nd Street, a commercial corridor, and Cesar Chavez, a new boulevard and automobile thoroughfare, all cross Mission Street.

The impetus behind the Mission Street Public Life Plan came from the Mission Area Plan (2008) of the San Francisco General Plan, part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Planning process. The Mission Area Plan established a vision for the Mission District, guiding the long-term life and growth of this area. Through objectives and policies, this Plan focuses on land use, housing, transportation, economic development, and public realm.

The following community-driven goals were established in the Mission Area Plan:

- Preserve diversity and vitality of the Mission
- Increase the amount of affordable housing
- Preserve and enhance the existing Production, Distribution and Repair (PDR) businesses
- Preserve and enhance the unique character of the Mission’s distinct commercial areas
- Promote alternative means of transportation to reduce traffic and auto use
- Improve and develop additional community facilities and open space
- Minimize displacement

Objective 5.3 of the Mission Area Plan calls to “create a network of green streets that connects open spaces and improves the walkability, aesthetics and ecological sustainability of the neighborhood”. More specifically, policy 5.3.7 is to “develop a comprehensive public realm plan for the Mission that reflects the differing needs of streets based upon their predominant land use, role in the transportation network, and building scale”.

The Mission Area Plan specifically called out the need for additional work focused on the public realm. “The forthcoming Mission Public Realm plan [titiled Mission District Streetscape Plan] will focus in detail on the Mission District’s streets and public spaces. This Plan will define the street typologies found in the Mission, with the goals of reducing private vehicle primacy, fostering walking, and strengthening economic vitality of neighborhood commercial streets. The Mission Public Realm Plan will serve as the implementing document for the streetscape improvements proposed in this Area Plan.”

MISSION DISTRICT STREETSCAPE PLAN

In 2008, the San Francisco Planning Department, with funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development, published this public realm plan, titled the Mission District Streetscape Plan. This community-based plan is bound by Division Street on north, Highway 101 on east, Cesar Chavez Street on south, and Dolores Street on west. Completed in 2010, this plan provides a design framework for street improvement, policies to guide the improvement of the public realm of the Mission District’s streets, and designs for 28 specific projects that can be built over time to implement the vision and framework. This Plan has given rise to many public improvements in the Mission District, notably: the renovation of the southwest 24th BART Plaza area (completed in 2014) and the formation of the Mission Community Market, a lively weekly market that has become a neighborhood ritual.

The Mission District Streetscape Plan did not include design recommendations for Mission Street itself, mostly due to the upcoming transit improvement proposals by the SFMTA (See Muni Forward next page). The recommendations regarding Mission Street and 16th Street were deferred until the Muni Forward projects on the Mission 14, 14L and 16th Street 22 lines were developed.
IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS AS A RESULT OF THE MISSION DISTRICT STREETSCAPE PLAN

Mission Community Market (2010–present)

Bartlett Mercado Plaza (forthcoming: Summer 2015)

Bryant Street (between Cesar Chavez and 25th) Road Diet (completed 2012)

Mission/Valencia Gateway (forthcoming: Summer)

Minna/Natoma Traffic Calming (completed 2012)

San Jose Guerrero Park Upgrade (funded)

Mission/Capp Plaza (completed 2013)

Valencia Street (Chavez to Mission) Improvements (funded)

24th BART Plaza and Osage Alley (completed 2013)

Dolores Street and 18th Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements (funded)
OTHER RELATED CITY PROJECTS

MUNI FORWARD: MISSION 14/14L

Pursuant to the Transit Effectiveness Project’s years of research and analysis for service improvements, SFMTA launched Muni Forward in 2014. To improve travel efficiency on the most heavily used routes, the SFMTA is planning a rapid network that will prioritize frequency and reliability. These rapid routes are expected to carry 70 percent of customers citywide and will be the backbone of the Muni network. The Muni 14/14L lines running on Mission Street have been identified as one of the routes in the proposed rapid network. The rapid network will use transit priority lanes with efficient stop spacing to move buses more efficiently along their routes. The initiative will also create passenger boarding zones to allow safer and faster boarding and improve signage to better connect transit users to bus stops and bus shelters. These improvements will be funded through the San Francisco Transportation and Road Improvement Bond – Proposition A, approved by voters in November 2014.

Muni Forward in the Mission neighborhood will provide transit and streetscape improvements for the route from South Van Ness to RANDALL Streets, including transit-only lanes, transit and pedestrian bulbs, stop consolidation, and turn restrictions.

Mission Street carries nearly 67,000 transit riders each day.

INVEST IN NEIGHBORHOODS CORRIDOR

The Invest in Neighborhoods program, one of the 17 points of Mayor Lee’s plan for jobs and economic opportunity (2012), provides focused, customized assistance to meet the specific needs of San Francisco’s neighborhood commercial corridors. Invest in Neighborhoods aims to strengthen and revitalize neighborhood commercial districts around the city by marshaling and deploying resources from across multiple departments and nonprofit partners. These include existing economic development services, such as the Small Business Revolving Loan Fund, the new Citywide Vacancy Tracking System, the Jobs Squad, and urban design services such as support for streetscape improvements, SF Shines and a neighborhood improvement grant program. The commercial corridor on Mission Street from Cesar Chavez Street to RANDALL Avenue is one of the 25 Commercial Districts in San Francisco selected for the Invest in Neighborhoods program. This effort spurred an economic development action plan for the corridor and the formation of the Mission-Bernal Merchants Association to advocate for small business needs along the corridor.

Other ongoing City programs and projects have informed the ideas developed in the Mission Street Public Life Plan.

Better Streets Plan (2010)

The Better Streets Plan is a blueprint for the future of San Francisco’s pedestrian environment. This Plan defines the pedestrian environment as the areas of the street (sidewalks and crosswalks) where people walk, shop, sit, play, or interact.

The Plan defines streets not just as transportation corridors but as places with layers of social, recreational, and ecological functions.

The Better Streets Plan represents a multi-agency effort to develop a unified set of standards, guidelines, and implementation strategies to govern how the City designs, builds, and maintains its pedestrian environment.
The guidelines illustrate sidewalks as space for public life, enhanced pedestrian safety, or complete environments accommodating pedestrians and transit.

Vision Zero SF

Vision Zero SF is the City’s road safety policy that will build safety and livability into our streets, protecting the one million people who move about the city every day. The result of this collaborative effort will be the elimination of all traffic fatalities by 2024. A Two-Year Action Strategy that focuses on high-impact improvements where they are needed most.

The first Vision Zero SF goal is to create measurable progress by the end of 2016, and to initiate future strategies in two-year increments after that.

RELATED COMMUNITY BASED PLANS

People’s Plan for Housing, Jobs, and Community, 2006

The People’s Plan presents a long-term vision for a healthy, sustainable, and equitable community in the Mission District. It is based on the needs and ideas expressed through focus groups, surveys, workshops, and small and large-scale community meetings organized by the Mission Anti Displacement Coalition (MAC). Published in 2006, this plan discusses various areas of work: Land Use, Housing, Economic Development, Arts and Culture, Parks and Open space, and Transportation.

Many of the policies in the People’s Plan relate directly with ideas developed in the Mission Street Public Life Plan (see next page). Objectives 4 and 5 in the Parks and Open Space section, for example, discuss the need for improvement and maintenance of streets as public space for the Mission community.

Calle 24 (Plan in Progress)

24th Street east of Valencia Street to Potrero Avenue is considered by many to be one of the most important corridors to San Francisco’s Latino community. A number of Latino restaurants, grocery stores, and bakeries have served the community for over five decades. Various cultural institutions are also located along the 24th Street and key cultural events take place along the street as well. For many, 24th Street contributes significantly to the San Francisco’s Latino community.

Much like the Mission Street retail corridor, the 24th Street corridor has experienced quality of life issues. In response, merchants, residents, service providers, and art organizations formed the Lower 24th Street Merchants and Neighbors Association. Since 1999, the group has served as a vehicle to address community safety concerns, sidewalk repair and beautification, and overall corridor beautification. It also coordinates community festivals and events.

In recent years concerns have turned to the impacts of escalating property values and commercial lease rates on the integrity of the 24th Street corridor. Displacement of long-time residents is also a concern in the 24th Street community.

In its advocacy role, the Lower 24th Street Merchants and Neighbors Association (now known as Calle 24) worked with Mayor Lee and Supervisor Campos to establish a Latino Cultural District. The Latino Cultural District encompasses the 24th Street corridor and extends north to 22nd Street, west to Mission Street, south to Cesar Chavez, and east to Potrero Avenue. In effect as of May 2014, the Latino Cultural District recognizes the contribution of the Latino community to the development of San Francisco and in particular to the Mission District. It is also the first step in the exploration of land use, economic development, and organizational strategies to help maintain the social and cultural fabric defining the 24th Street Corridor. The next 18 to 24 months will bring a host of new regulations, incentives, and community efforts aimed at preserving and enhancing the character-defining elements of the 24th Street corridor.
OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE PEOPLE’S PLAN FOR HOUSING, JOBS, AND COMMUNITY

Objective 4: Improve the livability of the Mission District streets, sidewalks and public spaces.

Policy 4.1: Improve street and sidewalk maintenance to encourage access to the street as open space.

Policy 4.2: Maintain and expand the planting of street trees and the infrastructure to support them. Provide street trees with tree grates that have removable sections to adequately accommodate tree growth.

Policy 4.3: Encourage the careful location and maintenance of street furniture such as bus shelters, public phones, public toilets, news racks, kiosks, trash and recycling receptacles, drinking fountains, lighting, benches, sidewalk surface treatment, and canopies that provide a sense of identity and cohesiveness throughout the Plan Area. Transit stops should be a priority.

Policy 4.4: Require sponsors of major renovation or new development projects to improve and maintain the sidewalk space abutting their properties.

Policy 4.5: Widen sidewalks where intensive commercial, recreational, or institutional activity is present, where sidewalks are congested and where residential densities are high.

Policy 4.6: Preserve pedestrian-oriented building frontages to encourage its use for free forming gatherings.

Policy 4.7: Provide adequate lighting in public areas, especially on transit corridors and near parks.

Policy 4.8: Encourage pedestrian serving uses on the sidewalk.

Objective 5: Preserve the existing character of the Mission’s streets as multi-purpose spaces for the people who live and work in the Mission.

Policy 5.1: Maintain the residential streets and alleys as safe places where children can play.

Policy 5.2: Recognize as legitimate activities the use of streets and sidewalk spaces by local street vendors.

Policy 5.3: Recognize as a legitimate activity the use of streets and sidewalk by local artists and musicians.

Policy 5.4: Recognize as a legitimate activity the use of streets by day laborers for job placement.

Policy 5.5: Recognize as legitimate activities the use of streets and sidewalk spaces for artistic expression, socializing, and free speech.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION
In 2012, the San Francisco Planning Department received the Caltrans *Environmental Justice* grant to integrate urban design recommendations with SFMTA’s proposed improvement to the 14 bus line.

The *Mission Street Public Life Plan* was designed as a partnership between the San Francisco Planning Department and the SFMTA, to rethink Mission Street as a twenty-first century transit corridor with public space amenities. The project’s premise was to combine transit improvements and creative public space design in the same process to transform Mission Street into a complete street serving pedestrians, commuters, transit users, and tourists alike.

Due to delays in the SFMTA design development process, the *Mission Public Life Plan* focused on the development of a strong urban design framework for the street with the end goal of making recommendation for a clear implementation strategy that could be adopted by SFMTA and any other agency or sponsor when funding becomes available.

The timeline on the right describes the project’s development, which included a community listening phase, an existing conditions analysis supported by numerous field surveys, a community-led design process, and the development of an implementation strategy with prioritized design elements and a pilot art project on Muni buses.
IGNING THE STREET: STRATEGY AND TOOLS

- INTERSECTION DESIGN
- PROGRAMMING THE STREET
- ART ON TRANSIT PROPOSAL COMPETITION

SFMTA Muni Forward FUNDING

MUNI FORWARD DESIGN OPTIONS FOR 14, 14L BUS LINES IMPLEMENTATION* OF SELECTED STREETScape AMENITIES

*(based on available funding and community preference)

2015

JULY–AUGUST
OPEN HOUSE 2

SEPTMBER–DECEMBER
OPEN HOUSE 3

JANUARY
OPEN HOUSE 4

FEBRUARY

MARCH–DECEMBER

- Art on Transit proposal selection
- April 2015: Art on Transit installations– Round 1
- July 2015: Art on Transit installations– Round 2
The Mission Street Public Life Plan is grounded in community input. Between 2013 and 2015 the project team reached out to the Mission Street community through community organizations, nonprofit agencies, residents, or business owners.

We started the dialogue with one on one in-depth discussions with stakeholders, from business owners along the corridor to community organizations, and residents. These hour-long one on one conversations focused on people’s portrait of Mission Street, the great things about the street, or their issues with the street. We discussed how the street has changed and what their ideal Mission Street looks like.

Our team also attended monthly meetings of community organizations to present the project and its goals. Discussions at these meetings highlighted people’s fears, hopes, and concerns about improvements on Mission Street (See Chapter 2).

With the first public open house in February 2014, the Planning Department officially introduced this project to the public. At this meeting, a factual analysis of the study area was presented (See Chapter 3).

At the second public meeting in August, 2014, the community provided input on presented design strategies and tools for Mission Street (See Chapter 5).

After this meeting, the team attended regular events on Mission Street — such as Sunday Streets or the Mission Community Market on Thursdays — to seek input.

With the input received, our team developed three design typologies for Mission Street, presented to the public through an online survey. Preliminary results from this the survey was presented at an open house in January 2015.

Two key locations were repeatedly mentioned by the public: the 16th Street BART plaza and the Randall/Mission intersection.
The need to address the complex challenges of the 16th Street BART plaza was raised repeatedly through these rounds of outreach. The team organized four focus groups with stakeholders of this plaza. We presented observations of the 16th Street plaza to frame discussions around solutions (See chapter 5).

Finally, the team also organized a walking tour for Randall Street intersection as pedestrian safety issues at this location were repeated discussed in our community dialogue.

This report builds on what the community expressed as their needs and hopes for Mission Street. Chapter 2 detailed people’s perspectives, which guide this report’s recommendations.
Chapter 2
Mission Street Identity
Introduction

Mission Street is one of the most vibrant and diverse places in San Francisco. The many layers of culture on this street define its identity, distinguishing the street from any other street nearby. To envision any improvements to public life on this street, one needs to understand the street’s identity: how was it in the past? who has lived there? how has it changed? and how do people feel about the street now — their hopes, fears and concerns?

This chapter explores the identity of the street starting with a historic portrait. This section presents a unique look at the street itself; how it was formed, and how it changed throughout the past couple centuries. The project team worked with community historians in the Mission whose works are identified in this section as well. Our team also conducted oral history interviews to picture people’s memories of the street itself.

This chapter portrays the people who currently live and work on or around Mission Street, first through demographic data, and then through highlights of what people said through our community dialogue.
CHAPTER 2. MISSION STREET IDENTITY
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Mission Street History

BEFORE 1776

The area that we know as the Mission District lies in a broad plain bounded by Twin Peaks to the west, Bernal Heights to the south, and Potrero Hill to the east. Beginning around 15,000 years ago, global water levels gradually rose, filling in the coastal river valley that became San Francisco Bay and reaching present heights around 5,000 years ago.1 At that point the lowlands of the Mission valley filled with seasonal ponds and marshes where creeks ran down from the hills in the east toward Islais Creek in the south and Mission Bay in the north.2 The largest feature of this landscape was a broad estuary at the confluence of Mission Creek and Mission Bay. This marshy body of water, sometimes known as Laguna Dolores, extended northeast around Potrero Hill from a willow-filled spot near present-day 18th and Mission.3 The angled path of Treat St. still roughly traces the eastern edge of this laguna.

With less fog, fewer dunes, and a rich ecology, the Mission valley has been a home to people for a very long time. It’s difficult to say how long, exactly, because so much of the neighborhood’s archeological record has been destroyed; however, the construction of the Transbay Transit Center about three miles away recently uncovered 7,500 year-old human remains.4 The oldest known sites in the Bay Area push the timeline back to 10,000 years ago while even older sites may lie below today’s waterline.5 With careful stewardship and cultivation of the area’s rich ecology, the Mission valley seasonally supported groups of Yelamu, the local subgroup of the Ohlone in the area that became San Francisco.6 By the 18th century, the Mission marshes were the site of a summer village named Chutchui with large nearby shellmounds.7 Found all around the bay, these mounds of shells and domestic debris took centuries to construct.8 As burial sites and as physical reminders of millennia human life, they remain deeply spiritually important to Ohlone people to this day.9

6 Found all around the bay, these mounds of shells and domestic debris took centuries to construct.8 As burial sites and as physical reminders of millennia human life, they remain deeply spiritually important to Ohlone people to this day.9

1776–1847

In the 17th and 18th centuries, the Spanish Empire laid claim to vast swaths of North America. Despite what colonial maps claimed, much of this land lay firmly under the control of native peoples. In order to colonize the northwestern part of this territory, called
Las Californias, Spain planned a network of religious compounds (misións), military fortifications (presidios), and secular towns (pueblos). Juan Bautista De Anza and his party entered the Mission valley on March 29, 1776, scouting locations. Following their information, a settlement party from Monterey arrived a month later coming through what is now known as the Bernal Gap near present day Mission and Randall Sts., and began the work of establishing Misión San Francisco de Asís.10 Employing unfree Native American labor, the Mission used the surrounding valley to support itself through European style agriculture and livestock grazing until 1834 when the recently independent Mexican government secularized church lands for public use. Though the former Mission land became common property for the small pueblo that had grown east of the Mission along the

10 City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, City Within a City: Historical Context Statement for San Francisco’s Mission District, (San Francisco: City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, November 2007), 15.

The 1853 Coast Survey Map shows the newly-constructed Mission plank toll road curving around the dunes in present-day South of Market and the marshes of Mission Bay to meet the older Mission Dolores pueblo at present-day 16th St.

Despite the similarity in names, Mission Street did not begin life as the old Mission Road. That road, connecting the Mission to the Peninsula, weaved between the western hills and the eastern marshes from Mission Dolores at present day 16th and Dolores to the Bernal Gap at present day San Jose and Randall. A portion of this route may still be seen in

The 1850 view shows a pueblo extending eastward down Center St., today’s 16th St, away from the Mission. A year later the new Mission Plank Road would connect to the foot of Center St. through the same break in the dunes as the older route pictured here. The old Mission Road to San Jose can be seen in the foreground heading south east from present day Dolores St. toward present day Valencia and San Jose Sts.
the angled course of San Jose Ave. between 22nd and 24th. The first significant segment of the future Mission Street route was built in 1838, connecting the Mission pueblo at today’s 16th and Mission to the new town of Yerba Buena. The curve of Mission Street between today’s South Van Ness and Division marks where this wagon route curved between dunes to the northwest, and Mission Creek to the southeast. Even before the discovery of gold, the alignment of these two routes placed the future Mission District along a busy commercial transportation route, connecting ranchers down the Peninsula to the global trade of the Yerba Buena waterfront.

1848–1905

Much of the development of Mission Street as it might be recognized today took place in the second half of the 19th Century. Following the American capture of Yerba Buena at the outset of the Mexican American War in 1846 and the discovery of gold in 1848, the formerly distinct Mission pueblo was subsumed into the growing port city of San Francisco. In 1851, Mission Street’s present route between 3rd and 16th Streets was built out as a forty-foot-wide toll road of wooden planks and a sort of public transit, horse-drawn omnibuses, began operating along the route nearly as soon as it was completed. During the 1850s Mission Street was continued all of the way across the valley to Precita Creek where it eventually bent west to meet the old Mission Road to San Jose. As the first surveyed road to cross the valley, it was essentially the spine upon which the rest of the future Mission District was platted. As a complete route from the waterfront to the Peninsula road, Mission Street developed into a significant commercial thoroughfare. In 1860, Mission Street traversed an agricultural

The 1857 (left) and 1869 (right) Coast Survey Maps show rapid development transforming the Mission valley into the Mission District. Within the short 12 years that separate these two maps race tracks gave way to rail lines, marsh lands to reclaimed land, and furrowed fields to suburban streets.

In this 1860 view looking west up 16th street from near present-day Bryant St., the Mission District appears strikingly suburban. Along with the fields and livestock, a sail boat can be seen tied up to the banks of Mission Creek next to a Woolen Mill, one of the first industrial buildings in the northeast Mission District.

This 1886 photograph shows a neighborhood with an increasingly urban quality. The horse car and paving stones show a well-developed transportation infrastructure while the broad sidewalks and awning-covered storefronts show a growing neighborhood commercial center.

11 San Francisco Planning Department, City Within a City, 16.
12 Ibid., 19.
13 Mission Housing Development Corporation, A Plan for the Inner Mission, Book I (San Francisco: Mission Housing Development Corporation, March 1974), 9. AND San Francisco Planning Department, City Within a City, 27.
14 San Francisco Planning Department, City Within a City, 25.
valley just outside city limits, but showing signs of impending change. Heading south from the already commercial intersection of 16th and Mission, the street passed a picnicking resort called “The Willows” along the mouth of Mission Creek between 18th and 19th. A pair or race tracks to the east between 20th and 25th dominated much of the middle of the route. At its southern end where it met the few older structures along the old San Jose Road, the road passed by the un-built lots of the area’s first subdivision, called Horner’s Addition, just to the west. By the turn of the 20th Century the Mission valley had transformed into an urban neighborhood, complete with filled marshes, residential neighborhoods, shopping districts, public infrastructure, and transportation networks. Mission Street itself bore the mark of these changes. Along it could be found a range of entertainment from small social halls to Woodward’s Gardens, the city’s first amusement park. Rail infrastructure helped collapse the distance between the neighborhood and the rest of the city as horse-drawn, and later electric, streetcars ran down Mission Street with key intersections at 16th and 22nd and car barns at both ends of the corridor. Though long gone, the route of the neighborhood’s main 19th Century heavy passenger rail line is still visible in the angled property lines on either side of Mission Street just south of 24th.

1906–1942

As it did in the rest of the city, the 1906 earthquake both marked an end for Mission Street as it had been and a start for what it would be through the rest of the 20th Century. The damage from the earthquake on April 18th was most intense where the channel and marshes of Mission Creek had been filled with earth, between 17th and 18th Streets. In the following days, however, the entirety of Mission Street burned between the waterfront and 20th Street. The rebuilding efforts over the subsequent decade left Mission Street as a solidly commercial shopping district serving the neighborhood’s white-ethnic, working- and middle-class population. The neighborhood’s demographics could be read in the street itself. Along Mission, Irish, German and Italian social halls were joined by political and union halls, such as the massive Labor Temple just east on 16th. Following the curve of Mission Street heading north, the expanded streetcar network linked the neighborhood to the industrial jobs South of Market and in the Northeast Mission. The new National Guard armory stands as a conflicted symbol of this working-class heritage, as it was both a popular venue for well-attended boxing matches and probably built where it was in order to easily muster troops to

---

16 Ibid., 41, 43, 45.
17 Ibid., 31, 45.
18 Ibid., 55-59.
20 San Francisco Planning Department, City Within a City, 31.
In the 1920s the intersection of Mission and 22nd Sts. was a heavily trafficked corner, anchored by the Mission Market and served by multiple streetcar lines. Without traffic signals or designated crosswalks here pedestrians, trolleys, and cars all shared the road. Note the line of pedestrians on the sidewalk to the right, possibly waiting for a streetcar, as well as the news racks tilted against the streetlights and telephone poles.

Mission and 19th Sts. in 1919 shows a more developed urban streetscape. Mission Street had been paved making the road more accessible for cars as well as electric streetcars. The stores fronting the street show high windows allowing natural light to enter the shop, as well as large display windows attracting shoppers like the woman in the lower left. Pedestrians also benefitted from new lighting and business supplied amenities such as retractable canvas awnings and a public drinking fountain. Though there are no formal benches, a man may be seen resting in the lower left using a crate as informal street seating.

For a brief time following its completion in 1912, the Armory at 14th and Mission stood incomplete without its iconic covered drill court. Though this space would become a popular community destination for boxing matches, its presence also signaled the State’s power to suppress labor struggles in the neighboring industrial district.
In the first half of the 20th Century, the Mission District was the seat of much Union activity, as symbolized by the Labor Temple just off of Mission Street at 16th and Capp Sts. In this 1942 photo, members of the Carmen’s Union meet to vote on a potential action against MUNI.

fight striking workers. The legacy of the neighborhood’s working-class, Irish Catholic heritage from the late 19th and early 20th centuries is still audible in older residents’ New York-sounding “Mission Brogue” accent.

The street also reflected the neighborhood’s commercial tastes. In 1909, the newly-formed Mission Merchants’ Association succeeded in lobbying the City to pave Mission Street, further helping the corridor become an alternative shopping district to the more expensive Downtown and Market Street stores. New businesses along the street, such as department stores, furniture shops, and photo studios, show a city where more and more people could buy the domestic markers of middle class life. New storefront designs with large glass window displays made the street a popular destination for strolling and window shopping, and new theaters, such as the New Mission and El Capitan, kept the street bustling with people into the evenings. Individual store owners further facilitated this sidewalk culture by installing storefront amenities such as canvas awnings, water fountains, and newsracks.

1943-1967

American cities changed substantially in the years following the Second World War, and Mission Street bore the mark of those changes locally. The rise of a mass culture of car and suburban home ownership meant that urban shopping districts had to adapt in order to stay competitive. The early stages of this change could be seen in the 30s when the Chamber of Commerce named Mission Street as a designated auto route. Through the 40s, the city replaced the streetcars through the neighborhood with busses, in part to ease auto congestion. The rails were removed from Mission Street in 1949 and the road was repaved. The Mission Merchants Association marked this turning-point toward a more car-friendly thoroughfare by designating the “Mission Miracle Mile,” following the lead of other cities’ major auto shopping routes, such as the Wilshire Miracle Mile in Los Angeles. Through these years, Mission merchants gave their buildings modernist facades, installed large glass windows, built larger stores, and, where possible, added parking lots. Along with well organized promotions, such as Mission Dollar Days, these changes managed to keep the street a thriving destination for affordable shopping amid growing competition from suburban shopping centers.

Larger changes were afoot in the homes just off Mission Street as well. After the war many of the neighborhood’s older white ethnic population took the

21 Ibid., 65-66.
23 San Francisco Planning Department, City Within a City, 64-72.
24 Ibid., 68-69.
25 Ibid., 80-81.
26 Ibid., 77.
27 Ibid., 85.
29 San Francisco Planning Department, City Within a City, 89.
opportunities afforded by government subsidized suburban construction and moved to the western neighborhoods or out of the city altogether. At the same time, changes in national immigration policies and in local development patterns meant that Latinos were increasingly moving to the Mission District, instead of to older Latino neighborhoods in North Beach and Rincon Hill. Illustrative of these changes, the neighborhood’s largest Catholic parish experienced an over 60% turnover in registered parishioners between 1954 and 1959 while the entire Mission District’s so-called “Spanish-surnamed” population grew from 11% in 1950 to 45% in 1970. Like in other older, mixed-race neighborhoods in the city, government agencies saw the Mission as a potential development site. The highly disruptive plans floated for the neighborhood in these years included a freeway running 1 to 2 blocks east of Mission, a complex of dense high rises between 16th and 24th, and an urban redevelopment project. The many changes hovering above the community at the close of the post-war decades, both real and proposed, spurred the politics of Mission Street for years to come.

1968–1989

The years 1968 to 1970 were, undoubtedly, among the most significant turning points in the post-war cultural history of Mission Street. From 1967 through 1973, BART was built through the neighborhood in order to serve the city’s downtown interests. This turned Mission Street into a long, impassible construction site and its sidewalks into narrow canyons. This proved a heavy blow to the street’s businesses. With this potent backdrop, a remarkably diverse group


of neighborhood organizations came together as the Mission Coalition Organization, organizing as many as 12,000 residents and successfully lobbying against a larger redevelopment project in the neighborhood.33 The same years saw a broadening of Latino activism. The struggle for recognition of minority voices that led to the Third World Strike at San Francisco State also inspired a mini student strike to Mission High School and birthed the bilingual newspaper, El Tecolote.34

Similar political energy also fueled the formation of El Comité para Defender Los Siete which organized around seven neighborhood youths who had become the focus of a state-wide manhunt following the death of a neighborhood officer.35 This new generation of Latino activism laid the foundation for the neighborhood’s continuing legacy of political dissent.

In the following years Mission Street became an increasingly significant space for the Latino community. In 1974, three local artists painted “Homage to Siqueiros” in the Bank of America branch at 23rd and Mission, a major moment in the birth of the Mission Muralismo movement.36 In 1977, a group of local poets and artists secured funding from the new Moscone-led city government to open the Mission Cultural Center. From this new home near 25th Street, a host of significant community art projects were nurtured, including Carnaval, Celebration de las Americas, and other events that used Mission Street as a ceremonial space.37 The neighborhood’s vociferous South American solidarity movement made similar use of the street for major demonstrations, especially at the 24th Street BART plaza, which activists dubbed “Plaza Sandino.”38 Mission Street also became a key space for the neighborhood’s nightlife with Latin Dance clubs, Spanish-language movie theaters, and a major lowrider cruising scene. The crackdown on lowriding by police and city officials, still visible in the “No Left Turn” signs along the street, spoke to the tensions over these uses of Mission Street that arose during these years.39

1990–PRESENT

The last 25 years have seen a mixture of stasis and change along Mission Street. In the mid-90s, papers reported that businesses were closing along Mission due to a combination of increased rent, decreased business, and increased crime. Little had changed in the physical appearance of the street since the post-war decades, but one 1995 count reported 25 vacant or closing storefronts between 18th and 22nd.40 In response, the Mission Economic Development Association created projects to improve the streetscape, including facade improvements, tree plantings, sidewalk washing, and increased public amenities.41 The starkly-appointed 16th Street BART plaza, which informally serves as an outdoor living space for many of the low-income residents of the neighboring SROs, became a particular focus of some community mobilizing for better street conditions. This attention led to the creation of a short-lived police kiosk in 1989-90 and, ultimately, a nearly decade-

---

37 BART’s trench-and-cover construction technique left Mission Street largely impassible to cars and unwelcoming to shoppers. The heavy machinery, trucks, and wooden barriers pictured in this 1969 photo hint at how difficult it was for the businesses fronting the street all throughout the construction process.

---

As the lowrider-centered nightlife scene on Mission grew in the early 80s, so too did the city’s policing of these activities. One of the tools the city employed to restrict cruising along Mission were “No Left” signs, meant to speed traffic and restrict recreational driving. Though the enforcement times on these signs have changed, they remain as silent reminders of this contest over the use of the street. Today, they are joined by other signs and public security measures, in their own ways marking past and present conflicts over the use of public space along Mission Street.

Through the 70s and 80s many businesses along Mission Street began catering specifically to the neighborhood’s Latino community, including Spanish language movie houses. The 1990s and 2000s saw an influx of discount stores while all of the street’s cinemas were converted or went dark. These two photos of the 1940 Art Deco style Grand Theater document that transition between 1986 and 1993.

The long redesign process begun in 1997.42 At the same time, major demographic and economic changes were affecting the neighborhood. With the growth of technology companies in the city and region, rents increased and people with higher incomes and different shopping habits moved into the neighborhood. One report showed that the businesses of neighboring Valencia Street experienced a 50% turnover rate between 1990 and 1998, most of which had formerly been Latino-serving.43 In the late 90s and early 2000s, higher-priced restaurants and nightspots began appearing on Mission Street as well. Today, following the Recession of 2008, rents and evictions are back on the rise as they were in the late 90s. Older businesses along the street are increasingly being joined by newly-constructed residential projects while many older storefronts remain vacant.

---


Community History Projects

While there is no single group organized around the history of Mission Street, there is a large and layered patchwork of community-driven projects underway documenting the history of the neighborhood. With their many subjects, methods, and goals, these projects reflect the remarkable diversity of the Mission District itself. Those listed below are just a small slice of this rich community history landscape.

**NUESTRA HISTORIA: DOCUMENTING THE CHICANO, LATINO, AND INDÍGENA CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Nuestra Historia: Documenting the Chicano, Latino, and Indígena Contribution to the Development of San Francisco is a major project funded by the city’s Historic Preservation Fund Committee to produce a citywide Latino historical context statement. Under the umbrella of this joint effort, the San Francisco Latino Historical Society and San Francisco Heritage have organized a broad group of scholars and community advisors to document and raise awareness of the city’s diverse Latino heritage. When finished, the organizations hope that the document will lead to the conservation of important community sites and to a fuller understanding of the city’s Latino cultural resources among city officials. For more information about this collection, visit http://sflhs.com/sflhs_resource_jt_project_context_statement and http://www.sfheritage.org/cultural-heritage/latino-heritage.

**THE MISSION LEGACY PROJECT**

In recent years, the Latino media and arts organization, Acción Latina, known for publishing the 45 year old bilingual community newspaper, El Tecolote, has been working to catalogue and consolidate their historical archives. The Mission Legacy Project aims to make their impressive collections accessible for students, researchers, and the community at large. These holdings cover the long publication history of El Tecolote, including large collections of photographs, artwork, and posters produced for the paper. In addition, the organization has archived a full run of the former North / New Mission News, material from the San Francisco State University Strike, and a number of oral history interviews with long-time neighborhood residents and activists. For more information about this collection, visit http://accionlatina.org/specialprojects-en/los-veteranos-2.

**THE IRISH ORAL HISTORY ARCHIVE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA**

The Crossroads Irish-American Festival seeks to educate people about the arts, culture, and history of the Irish in the Americas, with a particular emphasis on the local Irish and Irish-American communities. Among their cultural programs is The Irish Oral History Archive of the San Francisco Bay Area, funded, in part, through a grant from the Irish Government’s Emigrant Support Programme. Edited clips of these interviews are currently viewable online. In addition, the group is working to find a home for the archive where full interviews will be made available to a wider audience in the future. The project is currently focused on the elder generation of Irish emigrants (the “1950s generation”) and their Irish-American contemporaries. In the future, they plan to expand the focus of the archive to other generational experiences. For more information and sample interview clips, visit: http://www.irishamericancrossroads.org/oral-history-archive/

**UNSETTLERS: MIGRANTS, HOMIES, AND MAMMAS IN THE MISSION DISTRICT OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Since moving to the neighborhood in 2008, writer, researcher, and activist, Adriana Camarena has been documenting the stories of the Mission District’s traditional residents. Her project, Unsettlers: Migrants, Homies, and Mamas in the Mission District of San Francisco, uses a number of storytelling media (writing, photography, videography, and storytelling circles) and overlapping themes (“Home & Eviction,” “Mothers & Sorrow,” and “War &Migration”) to collect the narratives of Mission community residents and the sense of place of this former working class and rapidly gentrifying neighborhood. In 2013 she partnered with the organization, Shaping San Francisco to pursue the project with support from a Cal Humanities Community Stories grant. For updates and information about the project, visit: http://www.unsettlers.org and http://shapingsf.org/special/unsettlers.
Mission Oral History Project

In preparing the Mission Public Life Plan, the Planning Department collected oral history interviews with long-time business owners, residents, and community members. These interviews covered many aspects of peoples’ lives, but in order to not duplicate stories told elsewhere, they placed a particular emphasis on peoples’ memories of Mission Street itself. Unlike a general survey, these interviews were unscripted so as to create a more full account of the interviewee’s perspective. Unlike a media interview, they were conversational and unconcerned with getting down to specific facts. Most of all, they sought to create a space for interviewees to speak freely about their memories on a broad range of topics.

These interviews were also conducted with the goal of giving interviewees as much control over the process as possible. Interviews were arranged around interviewees’ schedules and were conducted at the location of the interviewee’s choice, usually in their home or business. Upon completion of the interview, interviewees were sent a copy of the interview to review and request edits. All requested edits were respected without question. Lastly, permissions were designed such that interviewees maintain right of refusal for any future requests for publication going forward.

In order to make these interviews available and useful to a wider audience, they have been archived with the growing collection of Mission District historical material at Acción Latina.

To contact Acción Latina regarding these interviews, visit: http://accionlatina.org.

Here is a small sampling of the stories that people shared with us:

“If I was supervised ... we stayed within the alleyway, but otherwise I used to wander anywhere, I used to go anywhere from Army down to around 16th Street: ... I guess I was around 7 [years old], yeah 7 or 8.”

“During the war, I remember right there on Precita and Mission they had just on the little corner there was the drug store, Discernia’s Drugs, and right about 4 doors up there was this little grocery store, and during the war we couldn’t get, we didn’t have sugar and everything was on rations, so maybe once every 6 months or something you got bubble gum, penny bubble gum, and you saw all along Mission Street going almost to Army Street you saw this whole line of kids, all lined up so they would get one piece of bubble gum.”

“In the Mission here, a lot of the kids, especially on the weekends ... we would spend all day in the movie theaters ... You didn’t have much money, and you buy a little bit of candy, and you’d spend all day in there while your parents were out shopping and doing whatever.”

“They used to have Dollar Day Sale on Mission Street, and they would have sidewalk sales and they would do this big old sidewalk sale, and everything was on special, on discount, I mean major discounts ... and so you would save your money every year just for that sale, and I knew exactly what I wanted to buy, and what stores.”

“Mission Street was a very pretty street. Businesses had a lot of neon lights and signs, and I remember it very lit up at night.”

“Downtown you probably had to get dressed up more ... [Shopping on Mission] was a little more casual: ... You didn’t have to get dressed up. It
was a little more down home, you know, and probably not as expensive. You probably thought you’d get a little bit better deal.”

“People would always stand out in front of their businesses, I remember, and wait for customers to come in. You would, the thing was you’d open your door, you’d stand out in front of your business and say hello to people as they walked by.”

“[The] Sunday strolls on Mission Street were wonderful. People would go to church and then when they got out of church … they would stand up and down Mission Street and they would visit and talk and it was a very small town.”

“It was definitely a union bar, and a working class bar, and I can remember my husband, you know, if someone was having a baby and didn’t have the money to pay them out of St. Luke’s, my husband would go down and pay the hospital bill, or if someone couldn’t make their rent, you know. Back then the barkeep was kind of, people went to them for a lot of different things. So yeah, it was like a second family, really.”

“24th and Mission has been the center of a lot of movements. Cesar Chavez, the United Farm Workers, many rallies have taken place on that corner, 24th and Mission; to the Sandinista movement, to the movement in El Salvador, to the movement in Chiapas, and the Zapatistas. Many protests as far as … the way people were treated in Apartheid South Africa; … And to this day it’s still used, you know, as a center. … That’s been a center of a lot of the protests against the evictions that have been going on in the community currently, here in 2014, 2015. In 1996 and 1997, 98 the same thing. A lot of the protests took place there on those corners.”

“I remember there was a car club from Daly City that used to start from the Top of the Hill, Mission Street, called Street Edition, and they’d be cruising down. And then … [a car club] from the Excelsior, called Low Creations, would start cruising. And then there was a car club called Las Estrellas from Bernal Heights and they’d cruise down Cortland, and they’d cruise down Mission Street. And then of course on the North Side you had Lords of Frisco and Queens of Frisco and you and all these other cars clubs. And they would come cruising this way and then by the time you’d hit 24th and Mission it was just like this parade of cars, I mean, cruising back and forth on Friday and Saturday nights. And then people that had lowriders from Oakland heard about San Francisco, they started coming down here, San Jose, San Mateo. At one point we had cars coming from Fresno, as far as Sacramento.”

“There was a store, it was kind of like a big discount store … and it caught fire one night and everybody went down here to the Mission and thought the whole place was gonna burn down, you know, it was just huge. And so that took out a big chunk of this Mission street. … And then after they moved that whole thing down they made a parking lot out of it, so it became just a parking lot … and then they built the Los Portales building which is down there now, but it was a parking lot for years, so that kind of changed it.”

“The Police Department did not want lowriding, at all. They couldn’t stand lowriders. They would cite us for the most insane stuff that wasn’t even on the books. And we fought every ticket we got, we’d go to court. … I remember I had a ticket that the judge looked at it and said, “You’re a lowrider, yeah? I have never even heard of this violation. Hold on let me look for it in the book.” Couldn’t find it, he said, “Dismissed!” You know, it was insane, it was just harassment.”

“We had several times we had our glass broken at night. People would be out here on the streets late, be fighting or whatever, and break the glass. … We went through that period when a lot of the gangs were out here fighting and they’d be running down the streets and fighting and throwing things … that was probably in the 90s. I mean, people didn’t want to come down to the Mission. So we put the gate in, we’ve had it up there a good 15 years now.”
“We’re lucky that we have some long-time institutions that remain there [around 16th and Mission]: Instituto [has been there] for the last 20 years, but Victoria Theater’s been the same family for 30 years, and Mission Hunan across the street, and Hwa Lei Market, and even City Club—we’re talking multi-generation families that have owned these businesses and have employed their cousins, their children, their grandchildren, as newcomer immigrants who had language barriers who had no other opportunities to work. And this is ... the American dream.”

“[During Carnaval] Mission Street becomes the theater, it becomes the stage for children, for teenagers, for adults, for seniors, and it’s just a day of fun, you know, and celebration.”
## Mission Street Population Today

The Mission Street Corridor\(^4\) has changed considerably since the 2000 Census. By 2012, the area’s population shrank to 62,100, a drop of 5%. Its racial composition also shifted with a significant increase in the number and proportion of Whites and a marked decline in its multi-racial and “Other” populations. The Latino population along the Corridor has dropped significantly from 46% to 36%. Nevertheless, the Mission remains the city’s Latino heart with a higher than average concentration of Hispanic Americans. Latinos can be of any race: 44% identify as “Other Race” and another 43% as White.

\(^4\) The Mission Street Corridor stretches from South Van Ness to Randall and this demographic study covers a quarter mile buffer along this corridor. (Census Tracts 177, 201, 202, 207, 208, 209, 210, 215, 228.01, 228.01, 228.03, 229.01, 253, and 254.01)

### 2000 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Citywide Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>65,289</td>
<td>776,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>62,105</td>
<td>807,755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2000 Median Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Citywide Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2000 No. of Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Housing Units</th>
<th>Citywide No. of Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25,632</td>
<td>358,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>28,085</td>
<td>375,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Citywide Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>62,105</td>
<td>807,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 Median Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Citywide Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 No. of Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Housing Units</th>
<th>Citywide No. of Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>28,085</td>
<td>375,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2000 Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Citywide Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$50,676</td>
<td>$70,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$75,269</td>
<td>$73,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 Percent of Households Without a Car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Citywide Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mission Corridor is better off, as household incomes have not only increased over time but have surpassed Citywide median household income. Family households, however, have not fared as well and have lower median incomes than the rest of San Francisco. The area’s poverty rate has dropped slightly from 15.7% to 14% and is comparable to the City (13%).
### Race / Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Citywide 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American / Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / Two or More</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male / Female Ratio: 54/46%

Foreign Born: 42%

Linguistic Isolated Households: 14%

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Citywide 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 17</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 59</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Citywide 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School or Less</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College / AA Degree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Measure</th>
<th>Citywide</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Household Income</td>
<td>$89,610</td>
<td>$49,051</td>
<td>$73,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$47,278</td>
<td>$24,880</td>
<td>$44,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Poverty</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Citywide 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Person Households</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Household Size</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2007–2011 American Community Survey (Census tracts used to approximate Mission Street study area based on a quarter-mile buffer)
Mission Street Portrait

Throughout the two year course of this project, our team engaged with the Mission residents, business owners, and stakeholders. This section provides the highlights of our two year conversation with the community, through interviews, focus groups, and public meetings.

One of the first questions our team asked when talking with the community was: What are the three words that come to mind when you think about Mission Street? The graphic highlights the words that were mentioned repeatedly: people, diversity, culture, affordable, character. These words are a great snapshot of Mission Street identity.

This section summarizes the community’s portrait of the street, their fears, hopes, and concerns, through some recurring themes.

DIVERSITY

“I absolutely love the diversity of Mission St.” (Note from Mission Community Market activity map)

Mission Street thrives in its diversity: residents and visitors of Mission Street span across ages and lifestyle; the street offers a rich Latino culture; the businesses serve all sorts of goods and services.

[the greatest thing that come to mind when thinking about Mission Street is…] “Its diversity - Central American, Mexican, Asian, Middle Eastern. There is a great diversity there on Mission Street. It’s a plus for the area. And a lot of small mom and pop businesses in the area.” (Erick Arguello)

“What I like is the immigrants helping immigrants in that the corner stores tend to be owned by Arab immigrants and then they rent out space to Latino immigrants who are trying to get a start in business.” (Oscar Grande)

Mission Street serves as the spine of the Latino community either for the neighborhood or within the region. It’s their connection to their place of origin, which remains strong even when they move out of the neighborhood.

“A lot of people are coming from Daly City, from South City, Richmond, Oakland, Pittsburg for the services and to buy things that are from their country of origin. These folks used to live in the Mission and they return to shop, to eat, for food stuffs. They come for the social services. There are a lot of resources. This is a
very well served neighborhood.” (Diro Romero)

“I like La Taza... this place still has a multigenerational feel to it, it has a large Latino clientele. It’s also just a nice place inside... We’re in the Excelsior for the last 3 decades, but to this day we still come to Mission Street, to 24th Street to shop. That connection when you first come to this country, this is the entry point. On Sundays or weekends we like to stop around 24th Street and walk to about 21st Street and go the 99 cent stores for the kids...” (Oscar Grande)

Mission Street is diverse in its role: transit, commerce, and pedestrian. With two BART stations, and many Muni bus lines on or crossing the street, it serves as a transit hub; variety of shops on the street creates a commercial corridor feel inviting people to walk up and down.

“Mission does its role relatively well: it’s a urban pedestrian corridor as much as it’s a transit corridor and there’s a variety of things to do there. Little markets with fruits and vegetables... Mission to me is pleasantly utilitarian. Really great street life just because people are around doing things whether it’s getting on the bus or going to the store.” (Resident)

“On Mission Street everyone is carrying something in their hands, and they’re either selling it, or just bought it, so there is a lot of commerce happening or destinations.” (Business Owner)

“so to me the Mission represent a lot of flow of people walking up and down. A lot of shops, restaurants. And a lot of diversity.” (Business Owner)

“we are an evolving society. What it used to be good before is not good now. Before you would have those telephone companies, you would have a lot of telephones all over the Mission, now all of that is gone, people don’t use those telephones anymore. People don’t have a landline at home. So it’s always evolving. And the Mission has been like that all the time. It’s always changing.” (Business Owner)

“Mission Street has changed and it’s not changed. There are certainly some new businesses but there are certainly some familiar businesses that are still there. The mix of businesses that was there when I moved there are still there but certainly the hip businesses that are creeping in were not there. All of the dollar store and pharmacies are still there. Record stores are gone.” (Resident and Community Activist)

Some changes are seen as positive enhancing the feeling of safety on the Street.

“The area is completely changed. For me it was surprising to see so much open air drug dealing when I first came to Mission Street. Now there is much less of that activity.” (Resident and Activist)

“...what they did about a year and a half ago where they repaved it. That’s when they tore up the street for about 6 mos, took the 14 and 49 off the street. The fact that the street is flat and smooth now, just for me who works on mission street, has made a huge difference as far as noise level, remember like trucks and cars just rumble over the street and it would be really loud. That been one really good positive change.” (Business Owner)
But change has not always been welcomed on the Street. With the economy booming, many residents and small businesses do not survive the rent increase competing with businesses that can afford higher rents.

“...the lease has tripled. You are not going to stay open just to pay the lease. This has happened to many bakeries, Chinese bakeries, not latino bakeries. There were 2 or 3 that are now gone - one on 17th that was really good. This woman was paying $3000 and then it was increased to $12,000.”

“Most Latinos, working in restaurants, are moving to the Tenderloin. It’s cheaper, and in talking with them, they feel safe. Because even though there is drug use and prostitution, there are no shootings like in the Mission, they are not targeted either because they don’t look like a gang member.” (Resident and Activist)

“It used to be a lot of Hispanic, Chinese, you know, it’s an evolving area, especially now with all the high real estate. The old people who had those leases are being pushed out. So it’s always evolving, the Mission is always evolving into something else.” (Business Owner)

DISPLACEMENT AND NEED FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Since 2012, when the country’s economy started to recover from the 2008 recession, the number of units developed on Mission Street* has more than doubled. Similar to many other neighborhoods in San Francisco, this boom creates a fear for some existing residents and business owners. As the real estate market prospers, property owners ask for higher rents for either housing or commercial spaces. Many tenants have to leave their long-term residence or business on Mission Street, where they built a community or a clientele. Affordable housing need prevails as people’s major concern and priority.

“Wherever you get high-end condominiums built the rents go up and the property owners raise rents and people feel like you’re bringing in a new market and restaurants want to be there because of the new market; the property owners want to cash in on this and so when leases come due they double and triple the leases to get the older tenant out.”

“I see a lot of turn-over in business and buildings for sale and see who the new population coming in is and the amount of money coming into the neighborhood, it’s ridiculous because it’s pushing a lot of long-time family merchants … who have lost their lease, from Salvadoran restaurants to Indian-owned Mexican restaurants, these merchants are finding it harder and harder.”

“We need to push more affordable housing, workforce housing and for teachers. We have had too much market rate.”

“Affordable housing for the community - no more market rate housing here” (near 16th St: BART plaza)

“No luxury apartment. Need more low income housing keep the poor and middle class in San Francisco. Height limit of 3 or 4 stories. The Mission is sunny, we don’t need dark building shades.”
“More affordable housing please!!

RETAiN CHARACTER

“We can “save” the neighborhood – the existing businesses and culture” (Note from Central Mission Community Organization focus group)

The diversity, local shops, Latino Culture, and social services define Mission Street’s character: a value that the community strongly would like to retain.

“We need to find a way to keep the creativity in the Mission – the artists and working people the range is important. I am concerned about the flattening of the culture.” (Open House February 19)

“We need to keep the arts and culture groups that are on Mission Street as they are the vibrancy and the identity of the place” (Note from Central Mission Community Organization focus group)

“We need seating in the BART plazas but they need to be designed and integrated with the existing core structure. Community mosaic seating.” (Note from 01/21/15 Public Meeting)

“One example of thoughtful intervention is an approach towards street vendors. Street vendors enliven on the sidewalk because of their informality, flexibility, and proximity to the people walking by. This informality is part of Mission Street’s character. Rearranging these vendors in form of an outdoor market would remove the fear and sense of being marginalized. One successful example is the 24th Street plaza Saturday craft market.

“MISBA [the Mission Small Business Association] started in the McDonald’s parking lot… It started about 6 years ago. We were all merchants who had no brick and mortar location. After that we contacted BART and made an agreement with them and we continue to work with them: … As part of the Crafts Market we play music, families with their kids come out to see and hear the music…” (Note from 01/21/15 Public Meeting)
is an African American couple and a man from China. The Crafts Market is multicultural. We all work there to show off what our countries have to offer; all the goods are artisanal.” (Business owner)

“There are some street vendors, those selling some stolen merchandise, some not stolen, who approached me to help them organize sales at the 16th Street plaza, but the police were making (opposing it?); but the street vendors are still there in spite of it. It could be better if we could get resources to organize it” (Resident and Activist)

Mission Street sidewalks as public spaces are wonderfully flexible and versatile. Permanent improvements could disturb what makes Mission Street a dynamic public space.

“I feel like the communities here and decades and generations before have always been on the street, the street without street furniture, without plazas- all you need is a stoop, a milk crate, all you needed for people to socialize and to congregate for people to grow gardens without any public investment or improvements, it’s been people doing it themselves, bringing a bit of the old country into the neighborhood and they create it without much public resources and have created something beautiful, though from an outsiders perspective it might seem unsafe.” (Community Activist)

Being a block from Valencia Street, the fear of improvements changing the street character is very present in people’s minds, aggravating the sensitivity of what could happen on Mission Street.

“The other thing I’d like to see is the ability to keep neighborhood serving businesses on Mission Street, not just restaurants. There are already a lot of restaurants on Valencia and they are moving to Mission Street and they are taking storefronts.” (Resident and Activist)

Fear of turning Mission Street into another Valencia sometimes creates resistance to any improvements. While development brings change to the neighborhood, some would like any change to stop.

“Do NOT remove any parking, please! Do NOT add any seating, please! Do NOT install any bulb outs, please; Do NOT widen sidewalks, please, Do NOT install any bike lanes, please” (Note from Open House activity table on February 19, 2014)

“Mission Street is already vibrant and amazing. Cosmetic improvements designed to increase real estate values will price out existing businesses, raise rents and cause more of the already devastating displacement. Who wants these “improvements” and why?” (public meeting 08/07/2014)

Others may not carry as much doubt and fear about what happened on Valencia Street. They see opportunities in changes coming to Mission Street, through which the street’s character can be maintained.

“There’s a lot of tension now. People don’t want to see the ‘Valenciaization’ of Mission Street. I don’t know if it’s even possible. Valencia is way wider than Mission Street. It wasn’t like it was Mission Street and it turned into
what it is now: It was like white hippy artist kind of area, and now it’s like very northern European. It wasn’t like there were 99 cent stores on Valencia.” (Greg Dicum)

“New development can be a source of money and resources for preserving the character of Mission Street” (Note from Central Mission Community Organization focus group)

“More new people = more people to care for Mission Street” (Note from Central Mission Community Organization focus group)

“Is it possible to require/encourage new businesses/renovations to respect historic integrity of buildings? Brand new, complete overhauls of street level facades in irrelevant aesthetics destroys neighborhood.” (public meeting 08/07/2014)

**IDEAL MISSION STREET**

Mission Street ideally would have cleaner sidewalks and business façades. Cleanliness was a very common theme among residents and business owners across different ideologies.

“One thing I’ve been trying to do is somehow get businesses or even building owners to cooperate with the City on a power-washing program on the sidewalks. Right now I have a company that comes in and power-washes in front of my store once a month.” (Nabeel Selmi)

“I think public bathrooms would be a huge help. Urination is out of control. You see it in the morning, during the day, at night from all walks of life, everybody from the homeless to the yuppies in the Marina.” (Greg Dicum)

“One could renovate the facades, give them another look and improve their appearances. We as Latinos are part of the problem as we do not invest in façade improvements, we are content with how our businesses look. How about lowering permitting costs for sidewalk seating?” (Diana Medina)

Some strongly oppose any streetscape improvements, concerned that these improvements are aimed at the people recently moving into the Mission. But even within these comments, clean streets and storefronts portray a nostalgic ideal for Mission Street.

“The ideal Mission Street was what it was when we grew up... First, the streets were clean, the tiles were all there. Everybody knew the store owners, you could look into the stores. The fact that the store windows are blocked, I don’t think that is right. Have a street that is actually community, where neighbors are greeting each other, people are interacting, the BART plaza with all the Mercado stands, that’s life and to me growing up that is what I remember the Mission being about.” (Miguel Bustos)

This distrust of some community members expands to the level that, while recognizing the need for improvement, they dismiss proposed changes in hopes of maintaining the status quo neighborhood and its residents.

“The tension is especially around gentrification issues, so we sacrifice quality of life to keep our neighborhood in the condition it is, just so the speculators stay out, just so we can keep it affordable. It’s a trade off...” (Oscar Grande)
The fear of losing one’s home or business in the Mission is aggravating, the extent to which many would like to halt any change.

“We need height limits for condos!” “No more development!” (written notes on the activity map at Public Meeting 08/07/14)

Some highlight the need for business improvements and assistance, building on what Mission Street already has.

“I think we need to focus more on enhancements and on technical assistance to the businesses: Storefront improvements, loans, improving existing businesses ... Provide loans for people trying to start up businesses so they can move into smaller spaces. The first step is to secure what is there, give it the support that it needs. And then you can do other things that won’t displace folks, but even then you need to be very careful for a corridor that big.” (Business Owner and Activist)

People also want a safer street for pedestrians, better transit, more trees, and public seating. They would like to see investment in their street.

“Here in the Mission we have diversity, we have character/style, we have love, family, everything. Why don’t we invest here so that our neighborhood improves?” (Business Owner)

“I wouldn’t mind 100% transit: two lanes of transit and much wider sidewalks and bike lanes. But I do realize this is a major corridor and you have to move the cars somehow.” (Resident)

“At the cafe, we have tables and chairs outside. I made it a point to have the tables and chairs there. Here I am on Mission Street, I don’t try to police those tables and chairs, we’re close to a bus stop, and you know if an old lady with her groceries or a woman with kids is waiting for the bus, they want to sit down, like yeah awesome, have a seat.” (Business Owner)

“More like some small benches that people can sit down. Because if you walk all of Mission, there is no place for people to sit down for a minute.” (Business Owner)

“Street seating: add short benches on either side of street trees.”

“Canopies similar to Folsom. Promote bicycling, bike racks. More seating, bike racks.” (Notes from Sunday Streets activity map)

“Historic + educational placard/installation/storefronts.” (Notes from Public Meeting on 08/07/14)

“More street food carts.”

“Emphasize improvements for public transit and pedestrian safety. Particularly for families and elderly. Mission Street is a very important hub for services for the Bay Area-wide Latin Community with Spanish-speaking doctors, dentists, immigration services, etcetera. As such, its daytime functions are most important. Mission Street should not become any more of a tourist/party destination...” (Notes from Public Meeting on 08/07/14)
“Yes more trees! And flower pots! When visitors come to the Mission via BART they see trash, misc: It’s embarrassing for the community.”
(Note from Public Meeting on 08/07/14)

“29th St: is crazy dangerous! Please do something.”

“More public art.” (Notes from Public Meeting on 01/21/15)

MAINTENANCE

Despite fears, hopes, and controversy around improvements on Mission Street, the need for maintenance on the street is prevalent in people’s comments. This theme was repeated continuously in all conversations and meetings about the Mission Street Public Life Plan.

“I am always concerned with the cleanliness of the street. Other neighborhoods are cleaner, our Mission Street is dirty. This should be the main responsibility of the City because this is a main commercial corridor, it connects to Daly City. From 16th to Chavez is completely dirty; one gets used to it.”

“The money used for new paving, lamp posts, shelters, grates, etc: would be better spent making the existing lights brighter, adding public restrooms, engaging those who have no place to go during the day. Mission St: is already unique, it already has an identity. Restore defaced murals. Have DPW repair and clean the streets they are supposed to.” (Note from Public meeting on 8/7/2014)

“Maintain and clean what is on Mission Street (in the way of public goods, structures, facilities, etc:) before bringing in new and more” (Central Mission Organization Focus Group)

“We need many public bathroom facilities to be ones that do not provide the privacy for drug use; and we need more public bathrooms (public urination is a problem!)” (Central Mission Organization Focus Group)

“For example the sidewalks and the tile work on it. The City never kept it up. They had beautiful tiles all along Mission Street from 16th to 24th Streets, laid around the trees, and connecting through 24th Street. But whoever maintains that let it go. Downtown is kept up all these years” (Business Owner and Activist)
Chapter 3
Anatomy of Mission Street
A Walk Along the Street

Strolling down Mission Street reveals transitions in the pedestrian experience. The character of the street shifts based on many factors: what the buildings have to offer — both in terms of use and form, people’s types of activity, sidewalk amenities, or physical condition. This map identifies segments that mark transitions in the street character and thus the pedestrian experience.

The rest of this chapter provides a detailed analysis of the layers that define Mission Street’s character: an anatomy of the street.

The southern end of Mission Street prioritizes cars over pedestrians. The intersection of Mission and Randall, the southern end of our project area, is very unsafe for pedestrians due to the complex road geometry. This stretch of the corridor transitions from a neighborhood commercial corridor on the north to predominantly residential on the south.

The businesses in this neighborhood are mostly restaurants, retail, auto services and a large supermarket.

The average lot size is relatively large (6,000 sq ft); wide lots like Safeway and Big Lots as well as two gas stations interrupt the tight neighborhood feel immediately north of Virginia Street, creating a landscape dominated by blank walls and cars.

The commercial character of the street has been strengthened by the Invest in Neighborhood Initiative, promoted by the Mayor’s Office of Economic Development (OEWD). This section of the corridor was identified as priority corridor for the program. As a result, a new merchant association, the Mission-Bernal Merchant Association has been formed by active business owners.

The average lot grain along this stretch is large (7,000 sq ft), mostly due to the very wide lot of Mission Link Career Center as well as several parking lots along the segment. These wide storefronts and blank walls create an unpleasant pedestrian environment. Some positive elements of this stretch are popular restaurants in the area between 29th and Valencia and the upcoming Valencia Green Gateway Plaza (Mission and Valencia) a new public space funded by the Public Utilities Commission that will be installed in March 2015. The plaza will become a great opportunity to combine transit, art and new community events and it could become a center for the Mission Street area South of Chavez.

This stretch of Mission Street has a neighborhood commercial feel — here we are approaching the historic Mission Street core. Retail is varied: historic businesses such as the hardware store and the Italian pastry shop Diana’s mix with new but equally beloved retail such as Mission Pie, a cafe, bakery, and gathering place. The Mission Cultural Center, another key Latino institution, provides opportunities to celebrate the neighborhood’s cultural heritage.

The 24th Street BART station is a gateway to the neighborhood and a link to the rest of the city. The McDonald’s restaurant across the street from the BART plaza was recently renovated and is a tremendous asset to the residents: seniors and families are found here socializing, playing cards, reading the news and having a break from the day’s activities. The sidewalks on this stretch are very well maintained. Pedestrian volumes are particularly high in the 25th block stretch: benches on the sidewalk with floral landscaping (unique to the 25th and 26th blocks of Mission Street) provide very pleasant seating and socializing, transforming this block in an “open-air living room”.

[Map Image]
The average lot size in this stretch is very small (5,000 sq ft). Similar to the stretch south of 18th, the tight urban fabric creates a dense storefront condition that attracts a significant volume of foot traffic. The 18th street corner, nicknamed “the fancy block” in community interviews, has attracted new restaurants and business in the last few years and is the bookend of a new informal gourmet district along 18th street that extends all the way to Dolores Park.

The 16th Street BART station on the other end of the stretch is another gateway to the neighborhood and the rest of the city. The 16th Street BART plaza is also a place for commuting, gathering, and living. The northeast plaza more specifically provides an outdoor living room for residents living in the residential hotels mostly between the 16th and 18th blocks, and for homeless individuals who spend the day sitting on the benches.

Mission Street on this stretch is less pedestrian oriented. The freeway over-pass on 13th Street imposes automobiles on the street, where intersections prioritize movements of cars over pedestrians. The lot grain is significantly larger than the other segments (about 11,000 sq ft). The main business type in this segment is auto service, followed by professional services. There are several vacant lots along the stretch — they make up a significant portion of street frontage. These vacant lots include an abandoned School District property between 15th and 16th on the west side, an abandoned building between 14th and 15th on the east side, and a vacant lot on the north-east corner of 14th and Mission. The imposing presence of the San Francisco Armory building — with its thick, blank walls — creates a harsh, unpleasant edge to the block of 14th Street. These businesses or lack thereof do not attract foot traffic within this segment and in most cases create an empty and uncomfortable environment, especially at night. This is also a segment that often times serves as a living room for SRO residents or homeless individuals especially in front of the above mentioned vacant lots. The lack of maintenance in this stretch augments the feeling of grittiness and disrepair.
Introduction

This chapter outlines what Mission Street feels like as public space, focusing on the pedestrian environment. Walking on the sidewalks of Mission Street, like any other street, is affected by what one could see or sense in the environment:

How many people are hanging out on the street? Is it empty or are there many other people walking on the street? Do people pass through or stay and spend time?

What types of businesses or residential buildings front the street? What’s the form and quality of the building and the façade?

How is the sidewalk? Is there any seating or enough lighting? Is the sidewalk clean? Is the pavement in good condition?
These layers of conditions found in the environment collectively shape the experience of a pedestrian walking on the sidewalk. Depending on how pleasant the experience is, people feel safe, happy, and comfortable when walking on the street. For this chapter, we organized the environment of the street in three areas: the people using the street, their movement and activities; the buildings fronting the street, their use and the interaction of the façade with the sidewalk; and the sidewalk, its horizontal plain and the vertical elements defining it.

SECTION I. PEOPLE ON THE STREET

Mission Street blocks vary significantly in how many people walk or spend time on the sidewalks. Some blocks remain fairly empty throughout the day compared to other blocks where high volumes of people walk through. This section summarizes volumes of people on Mission Street sidewalks, based on observational surveys. These observations indicate that people on Mission Street use the sidewalks in three different ways: walking, staying, or waiting for transit. Through these three types of activities, this section analyzes volumes of people on Mission Street in its different roles as a pedestrian corridor, as a place to stay, and as a transit corridor.

SECTION II. BUILDINGS

Mission Street is a thriving and multicultural commercial corridor, with a great diversity of businesses. Most buildings on Mission Street have commercial uses on the ground floor and apartment units above. The continuous wall of businesses and storefronts on Mission Street create a vital commercial corridor, including locally-owned bars, cafes, and shops, as well as service providers, such as laundromats, convenience stores, hair salons, and more.

The types of businesses along the street contribute to the character of the street as public space. The physical conditions of these storefronts also contribute to the quality of public space. This section provides an overview of the building uses fronting Mission Street sidewalks and a survey of storefront façade conditions.

Recognizing the historic significance of Mission Street as a commercial corridor, this chapter also looks at buildings through the lens of history. Remnants of the rich historic architecture — on the building façades and storefronts — contribute to character of Mission Street as public space and positively affects the pedestrian experience.

SECTION III. SIDEWALKS

Sidewalk space includes the paved space for pedestrians as well as many streetscape furnishings present for aesthetic or utilitarian purposes. These elements include trees, landscaping, seating, bike racks, bus shelters, art installations, historic tiles, and other special markers. This section also discusses sidewalk conditions: whether the pavement is in good condition or in disrepair, and whether the sidewalk is clean or dirty.

SECTION IV. PUBLIC SPACE ANALYSIS

While Mission Street is a corridor for walking and transit, it can also be an exemplary public space for people to stay. A great part of the life along Mission Street is observed in a stationary position. This section seeks to reconcile findings about the people, buildings, and sidewalks along Mission Street to make an assessment of the corridor’s capacity as a public space.

---

1 Our data was gathered through direct survey observation (walk throughs) and through public life surveys (observations of pedestrian flow and stationary activity). For the pedestrian flow data we collected data about people walking in north and south direction at 1 hour intervals for 12 hours, one weekday and weekend day, at six equally spaced locations in the project area. Stationary activity was collected by observing gender, age, posture and activity through “activity scans”, snapshots of activity at spaced time intervals, for 12 hours, one weekday and one weekend.
I. People on the Street

People using Mission Street sidewalks contribute to the character of the pedestrian environment. This section discusses how people use different blocks of Mission Street differently: some blocks are bustling while others remain tranquil. People on Mission Street use the sidewalks mainly in three ways: walking, staying, or waiting for transit.

THE PEDESTRIAN CORRIDOR: WALKING

Mission Street is one of the busiest pedestrian corridors in San Francisco\(^1\). It is located in a fairly dense area of the city with many people living on the street and nearby. The great number and diversity of local businesses also draw many people to this street on both weekdays and weekends, throughout the day. Several major transit hubs are along Mission Street, including two BART stations and a bus transfer node at 30th Street.

The Public Life study conducted in Spring 2014, observed street users. Observations were conducted for 12 hours, at 1-hour time intervals at six equally spaced locations, one weekday and one weekend day. Pedestrian movement is concentrated in the core of the corridor, between the 16th Street and 24th Street BART stations. Of the locations where pedestrians were counted, the highest volumes were observed at the mid-block location between 22nd and 23rd Streets. These patterns concur with counts of people staying on the sidewalk (see ‘The Public Space: Staying’ on pg. 52-53).

The block segments with the highest pedestrian volumes is between 21st Street and 24 Street with 1,853 people southbound and 1,974 people northbound in 1-hour intervals observed for 12 hours. The blocks with the highest number of seniors were 19th and 20th (14% of total observed) and between Cesar Chavez and 24th Streets (10% of total observed). Gender balance seems to be consistent across the corridor with an approximate 65% male-35% female ratio at all times of day.

---

\(^1\) Based on “Key Walking Streets and Areas” from the Walk First: Improving Safety & Walking Conditions in San Francisco report. October 2011
Map: Pedestrian volumes per count location, by time of day and weekday/weekend. Observations conducted for 12 hours, at 1-hour time intervals at six equally spaced locations. People counts were split in northbound and southbound direction (indicated by the two arrows by the bar charts).

* Data for some hours were not recorded for some blocks, however the trends reported are representative of changes over periods of the day and individual blocks along the corridor.
THE PUBLIC SPACE: STAYING

Lots of people spend time on the sidewalk to browse windows or shop and often meet up with friends and family, and socialize. To get a snapshot of social interactions on Mission sidewalks we conducted a “stationary activity scan” to observe how many people use the sidewalk and how at specific locations. The study counted people on the sidewalk who were not walking, standing or sitting.

The highest concentration of people on Mission Street sidewalks are found around the 16th and 24th Streets BART stations. The two plazas are highly used, and catalysts of interaction as well as transit nodes. People observed were probably transit users getting off, on, or switching transit, and public space users who call the plazas their own outdoor social space. As with counts of pedestrians walking along the street, volumes of pedestrians staying on the sidewalks is generally higher in the core of the corridor between the two BART stations. The number drops off north of 15th Street and south of 25th Street for the uses and the grain of the blocks starts becoming wider and less engaging.

Of the people staying on Mission Street sidewalks to spend time, the vast majority were observed standing (82% of total observed). Only 11% were observed sitting on a bench or other formal seating: people sitting generally occupy the few available benches along the street or else sit in chairs of outdoor cafes and restaurants, not a common amenity on Mission Street. Interestingly 7% of people observed were sitting in an improvised fashion — for example, on the ground, curbs, fire hydrants, mailboxes, or crates and boxes. Informal sitting was observed along the entire corridor, on both weekday and weekends. Informal seating is often a sign of vitality and participation in sidewalk life: at the same time, observers noted that seating such as public benches, chairs, and seatwalls were almost always occupied. This might suggest that more seating along the corridor is needed, perhaps in moveable fashion to accommodate the ever-changing needs on the street.

Map: Posture by Block and weekday/weekend

* Data for some hours were not recorded for some blocks, however the trends reported are representative of changes over periods of the day and individual blocks along the corridor
BLOCKS WITH HIGHEST % OVER 65 YRS.

» 18% elderly between 22nd and 23rd (West)
» 18% elderly between 26th and Cesar Chavez (West)
» 17% elderly between 19th and 20th (East)
THE TRANSIT CORRIDOR

There are three bus lines within the study area (14/14L, 49 and 33 lines). Cross-streets serve another six bus lines. Two BART stations also bring a constant flows of people to the street.

Most Mission Street blocks have at least one bus stop with bus stops on cross street corners as well. Almost all blocks along the corridor had people waiting for buses. Most people waiting for buses were at the two BART plazas.

Of all the people on sidewalks, the percentage of those waiting for transit is fairly balanced between the east and west sides of the street; with a slightly higher percentage on the west side of the street (southbound buses). Similar to citywide commute patterns there are more transit users during the weekday, especially in the evening, as opposed to weekend days.

Map: Volume of people waiting for the bus per count location, by time of day and weekday/weekend

* Data for some hours were not recorded for some blocks, however the trends reported are representative of changes over periods of the day and individual blocks along the corridor.
VOLUME OF PEOPLE WAITING FOR TRANSIT

# of people waiting for the bus by time of day
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II. Buildings

BUILDING LAND USE

The design and use of buildings contribute significantly into the character of a street. The Planning Department has nine categories for land use types as shown in this map. On Mission Street, just under 30% of the buildings are “mixed use residential” (apartment units on top of a ground floor commercial storefront). Also, just under 30% of the buildings are commercial only (retail and entertainment). This indicates that almost 60% of the buildings on the street have commercial on the ground floor. The residential only parcels are mostly located in the northern part of the study area in the “Auto District” (as defined in Chapter Two). The area adjacent to Mission Street is more residential, with over 25,000 households.

This section focuses on the commercial character on Mission Street; first because the building use along this street is mostly commercial; and second because ground floor uses interact directly with the sidewalk and affect the pedestrian experience.

USES ON THE GROUND FLOOR

A colorful display of goods punctuates the corridor. It is a district patronized by both local residents and visitors, a melting pot of neighborhood-serving as well as destination businesses, well-regarded restaurants, cafes and bars, and cultural points of interest. Many of the storefronts display goods or have seating outside to attract people passing by.

Approximately 70% of the corridor ground floor storefronts are occupied by nonresidential uses, with the balance being a mix of residential and vacant storefronts.

Out of all the nonresidential uses, restaurants, hair salons, apparel shops, neighborhood-serving establishments such as grocery stores, and the like occupy nearly 50% of the corridor’s storefronts.

There is a separate “retail” category, as shown in the graph on the next page, that has the highest distribution of storefronts (22%) in the Mission Corridor. These are composed of stores that sell clothing and accessories, electronics, variety/discount goods, and various other tradeshops. Eating and drinking places compose approximately 21 percent of the storefronts. Office uses like walk-in business and professional services, such as travel agents, insurance agents and
bookkeepers, comprise approximately seven percent of the storefronts.

The balance of the corridor is a mix of uses that complement the retail and surrounding residences. Institutional uses, such as schools, churches and medical offices comprise approximately six percent of the storefronts. Residential and tourist hotels, arts and entertainment uses, and parking lots together comprise approximately seven percent of the storefronts along the corridor. Approximately nine percent of the storefronts are vacant.

Government offices and lots, light industrial uses, and unknown commercial uses, are grouped into a particular category that comprise seven percent of the total storefronts.
Changes of Use in the Mission

Over the last 10 years the corridor has seen a majority of land use changes from retail sales to food and beverage and to retail establishments. Secondarily, land use changes have been changed to apartments, lending institutions, massage parlors, and offices.

Examples of changes are when a space with retail sales (retail sales and services) changes to apartments (residential), or when a theater (entertainment) changes into a health studio or gym (personal service).

The data represented in the graph above is change of uses completed between March 2004 and November 2013.
**Zoning**

Zoning controls for parcels regulate the uses. Almost 60% of the corridor is zoned Mission Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit District), about 30% is zoned for other neighborhood commercial; the rest of the corridor is spotted with publicly-owned sites and sites zoned for downtown commercial, urban mixed-use, and production, distribution, and repair (PDR).

The Mission Street Commercial Transit District is between 15th and Cesar Chavez Streets, and includes adjacent portions of 17th Street, 21st Street, 22nd Street, and Cesar Chavez Street.

Controls are designed to permit moderate-scale buildings and uses, protecting rear yards above the ground story and at residential levels. Most but not all commercial uses are prohibited above the second story. Continuous retail frontage is promoted by requiring ground floor commercial uses in new developments and prohibiting curb cuts for driveways or delivery. Housing development in new buildings is encouraged above the ground story. Housing density is not controlled by number of units per lot but through height limits, and by requirements to supply a high percentage of two or three bedroom units, and by open space requirements. Existing residential units are protected by prohibitions on upper-story conversions and limitations on demolitions, mergers, and subdivisions.

**ZONING USE DISTRICTS**

Mission NCT, Individual (Named, Controls Vary) Neighborhood Commercial Transit
Mission NCT-3: Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit
C-3-G: Downtown General Commercial
RTO-M: Residential Transit Oriented, Mission
NC-3: Moderate-Scale (3+ Commercial Stories) Neighborhood Commercial
NC-1: Cluster (1 Commercial Story) Neighborhood Commercial
RH-2: Two Units Per Lot Residential, House Character
UMU: Urban Mixed Use Eastern Neighborhoods
P: Public
PDR-1-G: General Production, Distribution & Repair
MISSION STREET PUBLIC LIFE PLAN

STOREFRONT CONDITIONS

Mission Street has a wonderfully textured collection of buildings with a variety of ground-floor businesses and services. These businesses interact with the pedestrians on the sidewalk through their displays and façade. This section describes the physical condition of the storefronts and how sidewalks are used to extend activities from inside the buildings onto the public space of the street. The volumes of people on each block from the last section is included on each map to indicate the relationship between storefront conditions and how many people use the sidewalk as a place to hang out.

Storefront Transparency

Activities inside buildings, when visible from the sidewalk, add variety to the everyday pedestrian experience. In the evenings and at night, light from the interior of storefronts spills onto the sidewalk. By contrast, large expanses of blank wall separate the street and sidewalks from vital activities inside the building. This separation negatively impacts the pedestrian experience.

Many buildings along Mission Street are traditional commercial buildings built between the 1900s and the 1960s, and typically feature large, elaborate glass storefronts in the ground floor. These uncovered windows display goods and merchandise from within, and allow passersby to browse, window shop and interact with the business merchandise from the sidewalk. This condition of permeability is referred to as “transparent storefronts”. This visual link connects the inside and outside, encourages pedestrian vitality and, indirectly, increases safety on the street.

The map above shows a rating for transparency of ground-floor storefronts for every building on Mission Street. Many storefronts, about 53%, are highly transparent. Another 30% have potential for better transparency: modifications to the interior or exterior arrangement of merchandising furniture and the removal of other blockages to existing windows. 17% of building storefronts are not transparent at all, due mainly to specific architectural features or opaque windows. While the more transparent storefronts might increase transparency by minor modifications the most enclosed examples would achieve transparency by full architectural remodel of the ground floor façades.

This map shows a discrete correlation between active storefronts and stationary pedestrian activity, especially in blocks where there is a predominance of transparent storefronts, such as between 21st Street and 25th Street where both sides of the street have a considerable number of interactive façades. The high peak in stationary activity at 16th Street is most likely linked to the BART plaza and to stationary activity unrelated to storefronts and window shopping.
Active Storefronts

Some business operators place merchandise or tables and chairs on the sidewalks directly outside their businesses, referred to as an ‘active storefront’. By doing so, the business on the ground floor extends their use to the sidewalk and interacts more directly with pedestrians. This interaction adds variety and excitement to the pedestrian experience on the sidewalk. Tables and chairs or displayed merchandise are often the reason a pedestrian stops on her walk and hangs out at that spot. About 76% of businesses on Mission Street maintain active storefronts.
Façade Maintenance
Storefronts with well-maintained façades contribute to a clean and pleasant public space.

Most ground floor façades along Mission Street appear to be well maintained although some might need historic restoration. Certain segments of the street have a greater percentage of well-ranking façades, for example between 29th Street and Cesar Chavez as well as 16th Street and South Van Ness. These segments have newer, less ornate buildings that can contribute to the impression of cleanliness and good maintenance. Other segments, especially the historic core between 18th Street and 24th Street have fairly well-maintained façades, but may have minor, reversible disruptions or accretions that compromise the coherence of the original buildings’ architecture.

A minority of properties rank poor or very poor. These façades are the best candidates for façade improvement grants or historic restoration. Many historic blade signs, box signs, and historic façade details are very costly to maintain and might require subsidies to be restored. These architectural elements should be integrated in any building renovation and should be preserved for future generations as historic heritage. The historic relevance of these architectural features is discussed in the next section.
Mission Street’s architecture includes buildings from different periods executed in many different styles. Walking along the street, one finds remnants of the past. The historic remnants visible on the sidewalk from 16th Street to Cesar Chavez Street include: cornices, windows and old neon signs, faded paving inscriptions, exquisite decorations and window displays, and faded murals.

Mission Street’s building stock has two distinctive styles due to the great earthquake and fire of 1906. Most of Mission Street north of 20th Street was damaged in 1906, and its architecture represents the post-disaster architecture. In contrast, southern Mission was spared and retains intact pre-disaster residential architecture. However, commercial storefront architecture has been modified throughout the years, representing innovations and changes in the American retail economy throughout the Twentieth Century.

Many original storefronts include tall glass windows for display of merchandise, often on a raised platform. Entryways include a semi-private space: a vestibule that is shaped mostly in a sharp angled trapezoid and usually tiled or terrazzo paved. Many new businesses have adopted these original shapes and display their goods. The map above indicates the locations of storefronts that maintain their original vestibule in some shape or form.

Many other remnants of history are visible: terrazzo pavements, historic signs, or significant cultural buildings or spots. These traces of history give a unique identity to Mission Street, which can be preserved through preservation guidelines for business owners.
Original Vestibule Shape: A vestibule is the space that connects the street to the interior of a building. Vestibules were used strategically by merchants along Mission Street to attract customers inside their store. These are examples of vestibules that have preserved their shape for over 50 years.

Original Display: Some display windows in the Mission corridor have remained intact in shape or in their materials. Examples that have been preserved throughout the years were selected.

Raised Display Platform: There are a number of examples of raised displays along Mission Street, mostly used to make merchandise noticeable to customers.

Tile Paved Vestibule: A number of vestibules have preserved their original ceramic tile paving, some of them dating back to the 1910s.

Terrazzo Paved Vestibule: Terrazzo paving dating as far back as the 1930s.

Original Cladding Material: A variety of materials (ceramic tile, wood, marble, and others) have been used to cover the front of the buildings. The map shows some examples of preserved original cladding materials.

Historic Sign: Many signs on Mission St. have existed for more than 50 years. Even if the businesses have changed, most signs have been well preserved. Signage is one of the strongest identifying elements of the district. The variety on Mission Street includes: projecting (perpendicular to the façade), flat, blade (vertical, perpendicular to façade), neon, electric light bulbs around frame, and a few other variations.

Transom Windows: Horizontal format windows positioned above the doors or displays of a storefront. Most transom windows on Mission St. have been covered up.

Vault Lights: These prismatic glass blocks are embedded in the sidewalk. They are often used to let light into a basement or store room underneath. Some fine examples have been preserved throughout the corridor.

Relevant Architecture: In one of the oldest neighborhoods in San Francisco, Mission Street has a number of buildings dating back to the early 1910s and even before, that are excellent examples of Classic Revival architecture style. The corridor displays fine examples of residential and commercial architecture. The examples were sometimes completely altered over the decades, sometimes are found in a state of arrested decay, and other times finely preserved. Other architecturally important types are the historic theaters, currently not used, but nevertheless contributing significantly to the cultural heritage of the district.

Culturally Significant: Some buildings are part of the Mission history and have hosted a number of events or characters, becoming culturally significant to the community.
III. Sidewalks

In San Francisco, sidewalk maintenance — which includes daily cleaning and physical repair — is the responsibility of the fronting property owner. This explains why cleanliness and maintenance vary by streets, blocks, and even parcels. Sidewalks are the living rooms of public life and can include many amenities such as trees, pedestrian lighting, street furnishings for seating, historic and contemporary signs, trash cans, and bicycle racks. Mission Street includes almost all of these amenities although their distribution along the corridor, their style, their spacing varies. The following section examines how streetscape amenities are distributed along Mission Street and where the greatest areas of need might be.

Sidewalk Maintenance

Sidewalks on Mission Street vary in maintenance: a variety of factors affect the cleanliness of the sidewalk, including high pedestrian use, the presence of blank façades with no relationship to businesses in the buildings, or simply a lack of maintenance by the property or business owner.

We looked at four degrees of maintenance — from very clean to dirty by parcel. Although several stretches were “very clean” or “clean” there is an equal number of areas along the corridor that ranked really poorly as they rarely receive maintenance by fronting property owners: these areas have debris, litter, or biological waste from people and pets and might affect the perception of Mission Street as neglected and unsafe. Our conversation with the community also highlighted the wide-spread perception of the street as being generally in need of more power washing, regular sweeping, and needing trash cans in every block.

Interestingly, the block of 21st Street appears in our analysis as the best maintained of the whole historic core: the Mission Merchants Association, an historic Business Improvement District dating back to the years of the Miracle Mile, is intensely focused on this block, which is power-washed regularly and swept daily. Some additional beautification elements, such as hanging baskets, contribute to its clean and well-kept appearance. New projects at this location will bring more residents and visitors and it will potentially add more resources for maintenance of this block.

Unfortunately, north of Cesar Chavez this is the only organized effort. More coordination among businesses is urgently needed to ensure the rest of the street can be maintained as well as the 21st Street block.

South of Cesar Chavez has the largest areas of clean sidewalks. This might be due to the significantly lower pedestrian volumes on this stretch of Mission Street.
as well as the more consistent presence of business owners willing to invest in the public space in front of their businesses. In 2014 the Mission-Bernal Merchant Association was formed, which is a positive sign of engagement in this area, historically less defined in character and community participation.

While our analysis shows that physical conditions of the sidewalk surface is generally good, there are areas of disrepair, especially where the blue tile work form the 1970s is cracked and uneven. The most uneven blocks are again the ones in the historic core — due to the high pedestrian volumes and the more high-maintenance tile work that have deteriorated over the years without a specific plan of maintenance and replacement.
STREET FURNISHINGS

Benches, chairs, transit shelters, and other fixtures provide formal seating. Seating is critical for transit users, especially the elderly and young people, who may wait for a long time for buses. Other elements, such as bicycle racks, can support people arriving by bicycle, especially in busy transit nodes and plazas. Bicycle racks are more evenly distributed throughout the corridor, with at least one appearing on every block in the Plan area. However, bicycles locked to tree trunks, gates, parking meters, and traffic poles show a need for more bike racks, especially at busy locations.

Not all amenities are evenly distributed along the street. For example, blocks with the most seating are associated with BART plazas as there is a natural demand given the high number of pedestrians, many waiting for transit.

Some areas along the corridor, for example the blocks between Cesar Chavez and Valencia Street and the blocks between Virginia Avenue and Randall Street, offer more seating, especially with movable tables and chairs provided by merchants. Most other blocks, especially on the northern end of the corridor, have only six or fewer seating opportunities: these numbers include seats at bus shelters, further lowering the number of seats actually available for people watching, resting, or socializing along Mission Street. As shown on the map illustrating posture (The Public Space: Staying – see page 52-53), higher percentages of informal sitting were observed on the northern end of Mission Street where there are fewer seating opportunities.

Some blocks with high percentages of informal sitting, for example between Duboce and 14th Street (15.4%), have few public seating opportunities. The only seating provided in these blocks is “movable” and most often available only to customers. In contrast, there was no informal sitting observed between 26th and Cesar Chavez Streets, where there is a high number of fixed (public) seating opportunities.
**STREET TREES**

Street trees have many environmental and health benefits, including producing oxygen, metabolizing and storing carbon dioxide, and catching particulate pollutants. Street trees also provide habitat, help reduce the urban heat island effect, and shade pedestrians from the sun.

Trees are unevenly distributed along Mission Street. Tree species vary from dense ficus to tall Mexican fan palms. Some blocks have many trees with consistent coverage; while other blocks such as Mission Street between 25th street and 26th Street or between 15th and 14th Streets have few or unevenly spaced trees, creating a bare street environment.

The blocks with the highest relative number of trees are found near BART stations, with a few other outlying examples at the ends of the Plan area. The longer blocks south of Cesar Chavez Street have sidewalk trees.

Over time, trees can uproot and damage the pavement. Tree wells should be repaired in order to safeguard the health of the tree and provide maximum accessibility for pedestrians on the sidewalk.
Some blocks are conspicuously without trees. These areas contrast sharply with sidewalks nearby or across the street, where trees are more abundant.

Tall Mexican fan palms punctuate the sky, providing an accent and visual landmark.
Public Space

Throughout our outreach process, many community members identified challenges with how Mission Street currently functions as a space for residents, merchants, and visitors. This section summarizes these challenges, juxtaposing them with the layers of conditions described in this chapter. (See map on next page)

At the heart of Mission Street, from 18th to 25th Streets, many people use the sidewalk more as a public space than just to walk through. This stretch includes many shops with outdoor vending, tables and chairs, historic signs and features, and sidewalk amenities. Additional amenities can enliven the public space. The major challenge in this stretch is the need for cleaning, which is intensified due to high levels of sidewalk use.

Blank façades and lack of activities to engage pedestrians prevail the street on the northern and southern ends of the Plan area. Façade improvements, additional lighting, and seating can help bring vibrancy to these areas as well.

The two BART plazas have the highest number of people walking through and also staying. The community repeatedly highlighted the need to create a more inclusive public space of 16th Street BART plaza, where some activities create an unsafe perception. The 24th Street BART plaza was recently renovated on the southwest side. Neighbors and commuters make use of this plaza. Additional amenities — seating, art, or greening — can enhance the public life experience at these plazas and the adjacent bus stops.

I. PEOPLE

The two BART plazas present the highest pedestrian volumes and the highest congestion due to people walking through the area, people changing buses and people standing or sitting, waiting for the bus.

Variety of uses for the sidewalk: commercial, pedestrian, leisure.

Poorly marked crosswalks are found at some intersections. Busy intersections and lack of protection for pedestrians can both result in collisions.

“MORE SEATS FOR SENIORS.” – Public Meeting Participant

“HAVE A STREET THAT IS ACTUALLY COMMUNITY, WHERE NEIGHBORS ARE GREETING EACH OTHER, PEOPLE ARE INTERACTING.” – Stakeholder

Transit shelters don’t offer many seating opportunities and block visibility for transit users. They are often observed as the most crowded spots along the corridor, especially at the two BART plazas.

Often people organize themselves and improve informal seating along the street; great for people watching, informal arrangements can also indicate a lack of more formal amenities for people to sit.
II. BUILDINGS

“SUPPORT LOCAL BUSINESSES, ENCOURAGE WALKABILITY.”
– Public Meeting Participant

Competing signage can create visual chaos but can also add to the character of the street. Vintage signs are contributing to Mission Street identity and should be restored.

Façade maintenance varies according to the different blocks: some blocks are cluttered with poorly kept façades and could benefit from a formal maintenance program.

Historically significant signage punctuates Mission Street and can be found especially in the historic core. Many signs are falling into disrepair and need to be restored.

Underutilized spaces and blank façades do not foster street vitality and negatively affect perception of safety.

A more consistent lighting program could benefit the street at night.

III. SIDEWALKS

“A more consistent lighting program could benefit the street at night.”
– Public Meeting Participant

Lack of cleanliness and maintenance is found at some locations.

Large stretches with blank walls and no shade or greenery create a monotonous environment.

Although at least one bike rack is found on the street, many instances of informal bike parking are found, suggesting the need for more bike racks, especially at busy plazas.
I. PEOPLE

BART Plazas
Blocks including the two BART plazas have the highest numbers of people staying, walking, or waiting for transit. A large presence of people is usually associated with a vibrant public space. The types of activities on BART plazas, and specifically the 16th Street plaza, however, present a more challenging environment that may not be perceived as safe or pleasant to some people.

Congestion at transit shelter
Mission Street is a transit hub, especially at the two BART plaza locations. High numbers of people were observed waiting for transit at these locations compared to other blocks. These congested bus stops create an unpleasant environment for transit riders. Additional seating opportunities and other public space amenities would enhance the experience of people waiting for transit and create a more inclusive public space at BART plazas (See Chapter 4, Plazas).

Public Space Opportunities
Our observational surveys indicate high numbers of people staying on the sidewalk in certain blocks on the street where a variety of uses or pedestrian amenities attract people to stop and stay. This indicates a need for more seating, greening, and other amenities to improve the sidewalk as a public space. (For this item, blocks adjacent to BART plaza were excluded in order to highlight other blocks that attract people to stay and spend time. BART plazas are discussed in other items.)

Informal seating
Blocks where informal seating — sitting on the ground, curb, or other elements not meant for seating — is observed indicate a need for more seating.

II. BUILDINGS

Outdoor vending
Blocks where storefronts provide merchandise or tables and chairs on the sidewalk invite pedestrians walking by to stay and spend time.

Poor Façade Conditions
Some storefront façades are not well maintained, affecting the quality of the environment on the sidewalk. A façade maintenance program can focus on better maintenance and repair for storefronts.

Blank façades
Blocks with few transparent façades create the blank wall effect. The lack of ‘eyes on the street’ create an unfriendly environment for the pedestrian. Transparent façades engage pedestrians with storefront displays and make the street a more interesting place to be.

Signage
Signage, and specifically historic signs, give life to the sidewalks, bringing storefronts onto the sidewalk.

Historic signs
Identified historic signage on buildings along the stretch of 16th Street to Cesar Chavez are remnants of Mission Street’s history. These signs should be preserved when renovating buildings. Façade improvement programs can help restore the ones that are currently in disrepair.

III. SIDEWALKS

Lighting
Need for better lighting was heard repeatedly in conversations with the community. Along certain blocks very few pedestrians stay and spend time during darker hours. Additional lighting can help create a more welcoming environment at night.

Cleanliness
Dirty sidewalks were repeatedly discussed as a major issue for Mission Street. Our streetscape surveys indicate the need for trash cans as one of the top rated preferences. Our observational surveys identified specific blocks that need more frequent cleaning.
12 Bike racks
More and more people use bicycles as their preferred mode of transportation. Some blocks do not have any bike racks. Other blocks, especially in the heart of the corridor, need more racks as they maintain higher foot traffic.

13 Lack of Trees
Some blocks have only few or no trees, creating a plain and rough environment. New trees on these blocks, planted as new development comes in or through community partnerships, can soften the space.
Introduction

Our public space analysis highlighted the need for public space for the community to use especially in dense pedestrian areas. Attention to building and sidewalk maintenance of both low density and high density pedestrian areas could also improve quality of life along the corridor. A walk along Mission Street shows different areas with different design character and different needs: this diversity calls for a variety of design solutions to address specific issues and enhance the individual character of a block.

Our design strategy is scaled around the whole corridor: elements that unify the street can enhance the idea of Mission Street as a special place with recurring design characteristics; elements that signify the street's cultural history can help celebrate the unique identity of Mission Street, its striking architecture, its strong commercial and transit character, and its rich heritage in community art. Our public space analysis did highlight the gaps in the streetscape infrastructure of the corridor: the introduction of elements that can complete the interrupted urban character of the street can create a place that is special and unique. Unify, signify and complete are the three main design strategies under which our multi-layered design toolkit is organized.

Zooming out again to the corridor-wide scale, the plan identified three main design areas: sidewalk designs that create a unified place with a strong identity and healthy transit function; intersection designs that can help strengthen pedestrian safety at key locations, and plazas, which are the main public space catalysts that can become destinations for residents and visitors using the street.
**Sidewalk Design**

**DESIGN STRATEGIES**

The segment of Mission Street stretching from South Van Ness to Randall Street is approximately 2.5 miles long and traverses many “neighborhoods” with cultural institutions and established identities.

The public realm, also known as the space between buildings, includes the building’s use and façade, the sidewalk’s horizontal plane, and the vertical elements on the sidewalk. The public realm is the space of the street and its neighborhood, a place of negotiated identity and exchanges, a place of public dialogue and interaction.

The Mission Public Life Plan design strategy recommends a palette of tools organized around the three design strategies of unify, signify, and complete that speak to this interaction and public dialogue.

**UNIFY**

Mission Street is known as a vital corridor in the city as well as destination for many people from many backgrounds and cultural heritage, more prominently for the Latino community. Its importance as a corridor is similar to Market Street citywide for its transit character and strong identity. This identity can be strengthened and celebrated with urban design elements and installations that repeat throughout the corridor.

The elements that can help unify the identity of Mission Street as a place include sidewalk treatments such as sidewalk paving, sidewalk landscaping and tree grates; and street furnishing elements such as permanent and moveable seating, lighting, and bike racks.

**SIGNIFY**

The striking architectural features of Mission Street are seen mostly in the grand façades of its buildings: architectural details, ornate shop windows, old movie theatres marquees, historic signs, and art murals are a charming backdrop for street life, while terrazzo paving and other interesting sidewalk signage decorate the horizontal plain of the sidewalk. Each of these elements contributes to the cultural landscape of Mission Street over time, layer upon layer. These signifying elements emphasize the special places of Mission Street by telling the story of this iconic corridor and its architecture, sidewalks, and street art.

The elements that signify include building features such as historic signs; sidewalk treatments such as special sidewalk paving or historic markers; and street furnishing such as street art and information signage.

**COMPLETE**

Mission Street is also a utilitarian street where a variety of businesses and services are located. Mission Street’s infrastructure, however, often falls behind the demand of its users. The introduction of elements that can complete the gaps in the urban fabric can help create a place that is special, unique and functional for the life of its users. The elements include: street furnishings such as trees, transit amenities, public art, and information kiosks.

**DESIGN TOOLS**

The public realm is comprised of many different elements that shape one’s experience of the space. These elements can encourage interaction and exchange, or can create an efficient, transitory space.

Our public space analysis and extensive community outreach identified goals for the street, including: promoting interaction, providing visual interest, and supporting existing businesses and uses. We developed this design toolkit to be deployed specifically along the Mission Street corridor.

Each set of design tools are targeting the building, the sidewalk or suggest street furnishings and are organized under the three strategies unify, signify, and complete. These design tools can be customized and adapted during design development to best complement the existing character of the site. They are related to action items that map out a path to implementation.
### DESIGN TOOLS - UNIFY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Tool</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT SEATING</td>
<td>Seating contributes to increasing activity on the street for people to socialize, engage in commerce, and people-watching.</td>
<td>Except for the 25th and 26th blocks, there is little permanent seating along Mission Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVEABLE SEATING</td>
<td>Moveable seating is a flexible way to introduce activity along the sidewalk. This includes tables and chairs sponsored by fronting merchants. It is generally less expensive and easier to maintain, as it can be brought in at night.</td>
<td>There is already movable seating along the corridor. Much of this seating was improvisational, both standard and creative. There is a need for this type of seating along Mission Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDEWALK PAVING</td>
<td>Sidewalk paving can help unify the overall sense of place of a district. A uniform, neutral sidewalk paving can help avoid a clutter effect while highlighting significant elements unique to the corridor.</td>
<td>The current dark concrete paving is in very poor condition with cracks and holes, making the sidewalk uneven and potentially hazardous for pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTING</td>
<td>A continuous rhythm of lighting elements along the corridor can help define a unified identity of a district. Pedestrian-scale lighting can be complemented by accent lighting during festivals and special holidays.</td>
<td>Design a prototype that is flexible, easily foldable, easily stowable for reuse. Individuals, neighborhoods, and merchant organizations could help procure and maintain a stock for their own block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREE GRATES</td>
<td>Tree grates are an easy way to introduce art on the sidewalk along a commercial corridor, while protecting the tree and minimizing opportunities for trash deposits.</td>
<td>There are few tree grates along Mission Street. Often tree pits are open with exposed dirt and in a poor condition that collects trash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIKE RACKS</td>
<td>Bike racks can incorporate art along the corridor to express the identity of the district. It is also a way to attract more people to the corridor by providing an amenity used by those who reach the corridor by bicycle.</td>
<td>Observed lack of bike parking along Mission Street. Bikes often locked to various improvised structures. There is only one bike corral along the stretch and standard MTA racks at some locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDEWALK LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>The community has expressed interest in greenery along the corridor. Some business owners have added greening features to their façades. Planted areas can be at grade, within raised planters, or within hanging baskets.</td>
<td>Lack of greener and sidewalk landscaping throughout the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer planters that also work as seating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HISTORIC SIGNAGE**

Historic signage is a unique part of the Mission District and it expresses the neighborhood’s cultural identity. Signage speaks to the different eras of Mission Street and should be preserved wherever possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Tool</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HISTORIC SIGNAGE</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Example Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Example Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are many historic signs along the corridor; few are well preserved while many are faded, altered, or in disrepair.</td>
<td>Bring back signage as an important element of the streetscape. Historic signs should be incorporated as much as possible in streetscape design concepts at specific locations. A program for an inventory of historic signs could be followed by individual restorations depending on individual funding, an incentive program or redevelopment at the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIAL PAVING**

Special paving identifies the uniqueness of the Mission District at specific locations along the corridor at storefront entries or moments along the sidewalk that highlight a building, corner, or public space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Tool</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL PAVING</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Example Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Example Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are many examples of special paving treatment along the Mission Corridor, especially in its historic “heart”; a considerable number are well preserved while other examples have been painted over or damaged.</td>
<td>Integrate special paving restoration in streetscape proposals at specific location. A program for historic special paving could be followed by individual restorations depending on individual funding and/or an incentive program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STREET ART**

Mission Street has many murals and street art. This art represents Mission’s past, present and future and adds to the color and vibrancy the corridor is known for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Tool</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STREET ART</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Example Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Example Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A considerable number of murals have fallen into disrepair, have been damaged, or have faded over time.</td>
<td>Create a program for mural restoration to complement historic murals with new styles and themes that express the Mission’s ever changing identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATION SIGNAGE**

Signs that welcome and inform can orient visitors to this diverse and unique neighborhood. Signs to area attractions, parking, and transit can make Mission Street more legible for all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Tool</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SIGNAGE</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Example Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Example Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signs that inform visitors and residents of area attractions, transit options, and events happening in the Mission District can help spread awareness to all that is available.</td>
<td>Improve signage for Muni stops is already planned. Additional signage programs that promote area attractions and navigation could also take place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DESIGN TOOLS - COMPLETE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Tool</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREES</strong></td>
<td>The iconic palms of Mission street are one of many species found along the corridor. By filling the gaps, trees can help unify the corridor while also calling out the unique character of each segment.</td>
<td>Gaps and inconsistencies within the tree canopy create a fragmented streetscape and compete with building form. A design intent with palms at Mission Street’s core is already in place and can be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **BUS SHELTERS** | Transit amenities can support the identity of Mission Street. It can also improve the comfort and function of the transit stop. | Transit amenities are not consistent along the corridor. Fill gaps by reconsidering the design of the current shelters at key locations; provide new seating, infoboards and other amenities to support transit users and transform Mission Street into first class transit corridor. |

| **TRASH CANS** | Litter is a challenge on Mission Street, as are trash receptacles that are widely spaced, poorly located, and overflowing. Additional trash/recycling cans can provide a place to deposit trash. | Trash cans are currently only at select transit stops, are often overflowing, and impede the flow of pedestrians. Fill gaps by placing trash/recycling cans at greater frequencies along the corridor. Encourage merchant sponsorship or greater City funded trash collection to prevent overflowing. |

| **PUBLIC ART** | Transit amenities can support the identity of Mission Street as one of the main transit corridors in San Francisco. Art installations such as sculpture and interactive pieces can complete transit spaces and public plazas. | Existing community art beautifies the BART plazas, greeting commuters, residents and visitors. The current art stock could be integrated with new permanent or rotating art installations. Explore an art program that can complement transit amenities, new public spaces and significant street corners. Work with the great local community of artists to express what Mission Street was, is and will become. |

| **INFORMATION KIOSK/BULLETIN BOARD** | Kiosks not only provide services for locals and visitors, but they also provide eyes on the street and create a safer environment for residents, merchants and visitors. | Considering that 16th & Mission St. are one of the most important transit gateways in San Francisco, there is little information or signage to welcome and inform. Installation of signage and an information booth operated by the City. Potential services include: WiFi, charging stations, and social services. |
Beyond elements that repeat along the corridor, such as tree planting, pedestrian-scale lighting and paving, the community expressed interest in other, more customized, place-specific streetscape elements. These three urban design typologies can be implemented in conjunction with the corridor-wide design elements. These are New Streetscape Improvements, Storefront Public Space, and Community Public Space. Each vary in scale, method of implementation, fiscal sponsor, and intensity of activation. Each sets a guideline for what could be implemented should the opportunity arise and is backed by community feedback and priorities.
NEW STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS

When new development projects are approved, the San Francisco Planning Code requires improvements to the fronting sidewalks. This typology will build on these requirements. This could include sidewalk extensions, landscaping, seating, special paving, tree planting, and other sidewalk elements. The illustration at right demonstrates how these elements would be integrated into the sidewalk space.

**Goal:** Improve sidewalks conditions along the street  
**Sponsor:** Project Developer  
**Potential Locations:** Pipeline project sites  
**Cost:** $$$

NEW STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS:  
SURVEY RESULTS

In a survey from January–February 2015, people were asked to indicate their preferences from a list of new streetscape improvements along Mission Street. In this section, people were asked to visualize which of these elements (see right) they would like to see on the sidewalk as part of new development projects. Responses favored the installation of trashcans, landscape planters, expanded sidewalk space as well as community art. Benches and bulletin boards were the least desired streetscape elements of this public space typology.

**Illustrated plan showing elements for New Streetscape Improvements**

**Total responses: 580, February 2015.**
LIST OF ELEMENTS REFERENCED ON ILLUSTRATED PLAN

1. BENCHES (PERMANENT SEATING)
2. BULLETIN BOARD / NEIGHBORHOOD INFO
3. SPECIAL PAVING
4. EXPANDED SIDEWALK SPACE
5. LANDSCAPE PLANTERS
6. COMMUNITY ART INSTALLATION
7. CULTURAL HISTORY MARKER
8. DECORATIVE CUSTOM TREE GRATES
9. TRASH/RECYCLING CAN

Streetscape elements for New Streetscape Improvements
STOREFRONT PUBLIC SPACE

Existing merchants can provide improvements on their fronting sidewalk. Such improvements can serve their patrons and all street users at the same time. The improvements could include elements outside the storefront on the sidewalk such as tree grates, seating, landscaping, vending infrastructure; or elements integrated in the building entrance or façade such as special vestibule paving, façade improvements and vintage sign restoration. The illustration on the right demonstrates how these improvements might be integrated into the sidewalk space.

**Goal:** Support businesses or other sponsors by providing amenities on the street for their customers

**Sponsor:** Fronting businesses, neighborhood organizations, institutions.

**Potential Locations:** Multi-locations along corridor

**Cost:** $

---

STOREFRONT PUBLIC SPACE: SURVEY RESULTS

People were asked to indicate their preferences from a list of elements to improve the storefront spaces along Mission Street. In this section, people were asked to visualize which of elements (see right) they would like to see on the sidewalk as part of storefront public space. Improvements to storefront façades, bicycle parking, and trashcans were the most desirable improvements to the public space in front of businesses. As in the previous section, benches ranked as least desired streetscape feature of this public space typology.

### List of Elements Referenced on Illustrated Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#: 1</th>
<th>SPECIAL PAVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#: 2</td>
<td>DECORATIVE CUSTOM TREE GRATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: 3</td>
<td>STOREFRONT OUTDOOR VENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: 4</td>
<td>BENCHES (PERMANENT SEATING)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: 5</td>
<td>MOVEABLE SEATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: 6</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE PLANTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: 8</td>
<td>BICYCLE PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: 9</td>
<td>STOREFRONT FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: 10</td>
<td>TRASH/RECYCLING CAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Streetscape elements for Storefront Public Space*
COMMUNITY PUBLIC SPACE

Along Mission Street, there are places where existing sidewalk space is underutilized and could be better used. Special paving and landscaping; seating opportunities such as benches, seatwalls, and shade structures, public art elements such as art installations and information boards, and other elements, can create new and appealing public spaces along the street. The illustration on the right shows how these elements might be incorporated into the sidewalk space.

Goal: Provide additional sidewalk space for the community to gather
Sponsor: City of San Francisco
Potential Locations: Corners, mid-block extensions, alleys
Cost: $$

COMMUNITY PUBLIC SPACE: SURVEY RESULTS

People were asked to indicate their preferences from a list of elements to repurpose existing underutilized spaces along Mission Street. In this section, people were asked to visualize which elements (see right) they would like to see on the sidewalk as amenities of new community public spaces. Similar to the previous sections landscape planters were considered most desirable together with community art installations and trash cans. Movable seating and bulletin boards were less supported by the results of this survey.

Illustrated plan showing elements for Community Public Space

LIST OF ELEMENTS REFERENCED ON ILLUSTRATED PLAN

1. BENCHES (PERMANENT SEATING)
2. MOVEABLE SEATING
3. BULLETIN BOARD / NEIGHBORHOOD INFO
4. COMMUNITY ART INSTALLATION
5. CULTURAL HISTORY MARKER
6. SPECIAL PAVING
7. LANDSCAPE PLANTERS
8. TRASH/RECYCLING CAN

Streetscape elements for Community Public Space
Mayor’s Lee 2013 *Pedestrian Safety Strategy* and the Vision Zero initiative call for zero pedestrian fatalities by the year 2020. In order to reach this goal, it is imperative to think about the way our crosswalks perform and how we can redesign them with people, especially children and the elderly, in mind.

On Mission Street, one of the city’s corridors with highest pedestrian volumes, intersections are spaces where a complex network of modes have to negotiate the right-of-way. Although still designed around the car, intersections in the project area also need to accommodate transit lines, commercial trucks loading and unloading in the travel lane, high volumes of pedestrians of all ages and physical conditions, and bicycles.

Our project identified six priority intersections that need improvements based on the quantitative analysis of collisions between modes, pedestrian volumes at the intersection, and qualitative analysis such as activity and perception of the intersection.

The intersections at the beginning and end of project area — South Van Ness Avenue and Randall Street — are complex, multi-lane intersections, with low pedestrian priority, multiples transit lines and great expanses of unprotected right-of-way that need to be negotiated daily by pedestrians (predominantly workers in the Van Ness area and residents, students, and workers in the Randall Street area). For these two intersections we provided preliminary design recommendations to shorten crossing, create pedestrian refuges, and increase comfort at the pedestrian scale.

13th Street in the north part of the project area is a very unpleasant, car-dominated intersection where pedestrians are overwhelmed by noise, the freeway underpass and unsafe turn pockets that present high-risk of collisions. Simple interventions to address both traffic and aesthetic issues could increase safety at this intersection.

16th, 24th and 30th Streets are key transit nodes that are currently congested, experience many car-pedestrian conflicts, and do not perform well for pedestrians who need to transfer bus lines. These intersections could be improved with simple interventions such as making crosswalks more visible and better signal timing.
MISSION STREET AND SOUTH VAN NESS AVENUE INTERSECTION

San Francisco City Hall and major cultural institutions are in the city’s Civic Center, a short walk north along Van Ness Avenue from the intersection of Mission Street and South Van Ness Avenue. One of the City’s principal north-south thoroughfares and a state highway, the avenue carries large volumes of traffic and multiple bus lines. Already an important transit transfer point, the intersection’s crucial role in the city’s transit system will increase as transit service on Van Ness Avenue is upgraded to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in 2018. Very high density residential development, already in place a block to the north, is slated to expand to parcels at the intersection, adding several thousand new residents to the area.

Yet multiple traffic lanes, very long pedestrian crossing distances, inadequate bicycle facilities, and other deficiencies combine to make the intersection challenging and often unpleasant for pedestrians, transit riders, cyclists, and drivers. With multiple public and private construction projects anticipated in the near future, there are many opportunities to improve safety and enhance the public realm at this central node.

The Car-dominated Intersection Area Today
(key to numbers is on opposite page)

» Degraded public realm with unpleasant walking conditions.
» Very long pedestrian crossings with frequent pedestrian/vehicle conflicts
» Important transit crossroads, but busses often sit in traffic, and bus stops are unpleasant.
» Important bicycle corridor, but connectivity is poor and bike lanes are unprotected.
» Multiple traffic lanes, but frequent backups due to upstream bottlenecks
The Market and Octavia Area Plan envisions a pocket park where 12th Street meets the intersection. With large residential developments expected on either side, there is an opportunity for a more substantial public space spanning the underutilized public right of way.

The Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project will add transit-only lanes to this block of South Van Ness Avenue and a pedestrian refuge to the seven-lane pedestrian crossing.

A substantial bulb-out at this corner would significantly shorten excessively long pedestrian crossings on Mission Street and on South Van Ness Avenue.

The MUNI Forward project will add transit-only lanes to this block of Mission Street. A substantial pedestrian refuge would make crossing Mission Street safer for pedestrians.

Wider sidewalks, a transit boarding island, and a protected bicycle lane would improve Otis Street for all users.

If available for purchase by the City, the triangular lot between Mission and Otis Streets could become a public space. The historic Spanish Colonial Revival building at the site (see photo below) could be adapted for use as a community center, while the undeveloped portion of the lot could accommodate many open space uses. The existing sharp turn from Mission onto Otis Street could be reconfigured for greater pedestrian safety, and an eastbound protected bicycle lane (under study in the Better Market Street project) could also be accommodated.

Dedicated transit lanes and boarding islands were studied under the MUNI Forward project, but there are currently no immediate plans to route transit service through this block of South Van Ness Avenue. The excessively long pedestrian crossings should be shortened with bulb-outs and a pedestrian refuge.

Potential Improvement Concept Diagram

- “Vision Zero” requires that safety concerns be addressed at the intersection.
- The Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and MUNI Forward projects will add dedicated bus lanes and more dignified bus stops.
- New developments are expected to add many residents and workers to the immediate vicinity.
- New open space improvements are envisioned under the Market and Octavia Area Plan
- The new private and public developments could also provide additional public realm improvements.
- The Better Market Street Environmental Impact Report will study improved bicycle infrastructure in the area.
13TH ST UNDERPASS INTERSECTION DESIGN

The elevated Central Freeway crosses Mission Street at the intersection of Mission, 13th, and Otis Streets and Duboce Avenue. A freeway off-ramp discharges directly into the intersection, and a freeway on-ramp is located one block to the east. We heard concerns about this intersection throughout our public outreach. The design of the intersection favors the fast movement of large volumes of traffic, while pedestrians are relegated to cramped and unappealing paths that often feel unsafe. The resulting environment under the freeway is a barrier to pedestrian movement along the corridor.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

1. Visually unattractive electrical boxes give the appearance of unattended space.
2. Ineffective marking of pedestrian refuge. No real protection from high-speed vehicles.
3. Vehicles often run over the curb when making a right turn, endangering pedestrians.
4. Short intervals for crossing the whole stretch. Usually pedestrians have to wait at a small refuge while vehicles speed through.

The 13th Street intersection is dominated by the dark overpass and is confusing for pedestrians and bicyclists, and is dominated by asphalt.
Following the example of the Octavia Boulevard project, many in the neighborhood would like to see the overhead freeway structure replaced by a surface boulevard. But there are numerous improvements that can be made while the Central Freeway remains. The diagram below identifies some of these ideas to discourage traffic from speeding and to provide a more dignified and safer pedestrian environment. Combined with ideas for lighting and activation of the public realm, the intersection could connect, rather than divide, the northern and southern sections of Mission Street.

**CONCEPTUAL IMPROVEMENTS**

1. The existing plaza north of the intersection is an unattractive, neglected space, but has potential to humanize the intersection area if properly designed and maintained.

2. The existing mid-crossing pedestrian refuges should be improved with bollards or other devices to protect pedestrians from straying vehicles. When properly designed to visually narrow the vehicular path of travel, these measures have the secondary benefit of discouraging speeding.

3. Pedestrians waiting at the south-east corner of the intersection are particularly vulnerable to vehicles jumping the curb, as drivers accelerate towards the freeway on-ramp. This corner should be protected with bollards or other devices, and the curb should be extended to tighten the turn radius.

4. The split phasing of the pedestrian signal at 13th Street leaves many pedestrians stranded at this narrow median, vulnerable to oncoming traffic. There is ample excess right-of-way to widen the median, providing a safer pedestrian refuge.

5. Using corner bulb-outs would shorten pedestrian crossing distances. When properly designed, corner bulb-outs also discourage speeding by tightening turn radii and visually narrowing the vehicular path of travel.

6. Widening existing islands would shorten pedestrian crossing distances, discourage speeding, and increase space for landscaping and other amenities.

**EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE ACTIVATION UNDER FREEWAY**

- Increased lighting and visibility
- Art exhibitions
- Farmer’s or flea market, retail spaces, pedestrian priority
30TH STREET INTERSECTION DESIGN

The intersection of 30th and Mission Streets is a key transit node, as it connects Mission Street transit lines (14, 14L and 49), the Bernal line (36) and the J-Church light rail. Our Public Life field observations indicated many incidences of jaywalking across Mission Street and across the west side of 30th Street for people to transfer between bus lines. Moreover, the bus stop on the southwest corner of Mission and 30th Streets, currently a neglected corner along the existing gas station, could be a more pleasant transit transfer point. Improvements to connect these major transit stops across the streets are imperative.

San Jose Ave. at 30th St. (North)
Mission St. at 30th St. (South)
30th St. at Mission St. (South)
30th St. transit stop (East)

The intersection of 30th and Mission is at the same time a very important transit transfer point and a very unfriendly place for pedestrians.
These examples of streetscape design options can increase the attractiveness and functionality of the intersections by providing visual interest, amenities that increase gathering space, nighttime safety, and a better transit waiting environment.
RANDALL STREET INTERSECTION DESIGN

The intersection of Mission Street, Randall Street, and San Jose Avenue is a very challenging place for pedestrians. Throughout our outreach process the intersection has been one of the top concerns for pedestrian circulation and safety. The proximity of the 280 freeway entrance, Fairmount Elementary School and the Mission Street bus lines, make this intersection a complex place with conflicting uses. Children and their families crossing the intersection are overwhelmed by the freeway-like speed of cars driving south to the 280 on-ramp and north along San Jose Avenue from the 280 off-ramp. Signal timing for crossing the street is also very tight leaving pedestrians “stranded” at the Muni J-Church platform, an unprotected median in the middle of a very wide avenue. On February 3rd, 2015, a group of concerned citizens, engineers and planners participated in a walking tour to observe these challenges. The pictures below illustrate some of the issues at this intersection.

CURRENT CONDITIONS - VIEWS

The intersection of Randall Street, San Jose Avenue and Mission Street is car-oriented, but close to an elementary school, major bus lines, and a light-rail transit stop.

San Jose Ave. at Randall St.  Mission St. at Randall St. (North)  Randall St. at San Jose Ave. (East)  Randall St. at San Jose Ave. (North)
**280 FREEWAY APPROACH**

“**DRASTIC CHANGE IN SPEEDS. TOO FAST AND close to the SCHOOL.**”
— Walking Tour Participant

**PEDESTRIAN CHALLENGES**

“**PEDESTRIAN ISLAND IS TOO SMALL FOR DENSE GROUPS OR SCHOOL GROUPS.**”
— Walking Tour Participant

**EAST- WEST CROSSING**

“**NOT ENOUGH TIME FOR SENIORS AND CHILDREN.**”
— Walking Tour Participant

**BIKE LANE NEEDS SEPARATION.**”
— Walking Tour Participant

**FAIRMONT SCHOOL AREA**

“**CARS REST IN THE CROSSWALK WAITING FOR THE LIGHT, MAKING IT DANGEROUS FOR PEDESTRIANS.**”
— Walking Tour Participant

“**J-TRAIN BLOCKS PEDESTRIAN CROSSWALK AND COUNTDOWN WHEN STOPPED.**”
— Walking Tour Participant

Pedestrian refuges too narrow, unprotected, and poorly marked.
In 2005, the San Jose/Guerrero Coalition to Save Our Streets, a local neighborhood group, developed a neighborhood plan in collaboration with the Project for Public Spaces, an organization that specializes in creating public space. Intensive community participation led to the development of ideas for public space and traffic calming at several intersections along San Jose Avenue and Guerrero Street, including two alternatives for the intersection of San Jose Avenue and Randall Street. Alternative 1 is shown here.

Overview: Slow traffic; Remove the third lane (D); Extend sidewalks (B, C, F, G); Add angled parking (A); Convert the teacher’s parking lot to a public garden facing San Jose.

A Angled parking can increase parking and slow drivers by narrowing Arlington Street. 90 degree parking is shown here. Back in Angled parking with the back of the car against the curb is considered safer.

B Add pedestrian bulb-out. Adding a bulb-out will help prevent drivers from racing up Arlington.

C Add pedestrian bulb-out. Elementary school children stand here on school days.

D Remove a lane. Widen sidewalk. Currently there are three lanes of traffic. Add an “advanced stop line.” Setting the stop line some distance back from the intersection helps prevent cars from stopping IN the crosswalk.

E Replace parking with a park. Currently there is a teacher’s parking lot here with 6 parking spots. Unfortunately, state law prohibits designating street parking expressly for teachers, but teachers can get special parking permits. Another proposal is to sell this lot and build housing here.

F Remove the “free” right-turn. Currently, westbound drivers can turn north without waiting for the light. They would have to wait at the light. Connect the pedestrian “island” to the sidewalk. Filling in the free right turn extends the sidewalk to the island where elementary school children stand on school days.

G Create a sharper right-turn. A sharper turning angle reduces turning speed.
REDESIGNING THE RANDALL STREET INTERSECTION AREA AS A PLEASANT AND SAFE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSET

Building on community input and on past and ongoing City projects, the diagram below shows several improvements that could enhance pedestrian safety and add public space to the area. Some of these ideas could be implemented in the short term as they do not require reducing lanes or otherwise changing traffic patterns, while others would require more study. In combination with ideas from the community-produced plan shown on the previous page, the entire intersection area can be redesigned as a pleasant and safe neighborhood asset.

1. The very short stretch of Randall Street between Mission Street and San Jose Avenue currently accommodates two-way traffic, which introduces considerable complexity to the intersection area. Removing eastbound vehicular access from this section of Randall Street was initially proposed in the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP). The idea may have considerable benefits for pedestrian and bicycle safety and should be studied further.

2. The existing wide right turn lane allows vehicles to turn at high speed while considerably lengthening pedestrian crossing distances, thus degrading pedestrian safety and comfort. Reclaiming excess right-of-way could shorten crossings and discourage speeding, and would also result in a substantial amount of open space. If properly designed, this could be an amenity for children going to and from the nearby elementary school.

3. The intersection of Mission and Randall Streets is currently unsignalized. The Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) proposes adding a traffic signal at the intersection.

4. The existing MUNI passenger boarding island are narrow, while adjacent auto travel lanes are overly wide. Widening the boarding islands while narrowing the travel lanes would enhance riders’ comfort and discourage speeding. Extending the boarding islands into the intersection would provide mid-crossing refuges for pedestrians traversing the wide San Jose Avenue, while discouraging turning vehicles from speeding.

5. The City is planning to install protective barriers adjacent to the existing bicycle lanes on San Jose Avenue. If extended to the crosswalk and properly designed, these barriers could discourage speeding at the intersection by visually narrowing the vehicular path of travel.
16TH ST AND 24TH ST INTERSECTIONS

The 16th and 24th Streets intersections along Mission Street are two major nodes with high volumes of pedestrians. People primarily use intersections to take transit or to walk to their destination after getting off transit. Reported high levels of pedestrian collisions at these intersections highlight the need for pedestrian safety improvements (20 injuries at 16th Street and 7 at 24th Street from 2005-2011, see map). The following pages show potential improvements that address these challenges.

The 16th street intersection is very busy and has had numerous fatal collisions past years.

The 24th street intersection accommodates large volumes of people. Giving space back to the pedestrian and making the intersection safer for all was heard as a community priority.

“PEDESTRIAN BULB-OUTS WOULD HELP WITH CONGESTION AT CORNERS.”
– Meeting Participant

“SCRAMBLE CROSSWALKS AT KEY INTERSECTIONS.”
– Meeting Participant

“WIDEN THE SIDEWALK ON 16TH AND MISSION. TOO MANY PEOPLE, THERE’S NO ROOM TO WALK.”
– Meeting Participant

SFPDH Pedestrian-Vehicle Injuries from 2005-2011
Decorative crosswalks and intersection murals are affordable and easy ways to improve the pedestrian right-of-way while introducing playful elements like art patterns and colors that can identify a community. In San Francisco, numerous communities have started requesting special crosswalk and intersection treatments as a way to increase safety in their neighborhoods. Advocacy groups, especially Walk San Francisco, are designing new programs to encourage residents to rethink these spaces as canvases for art and solutions for traffic safety. At 16th and 24th Streets these special treatments could also tie the two BART plazas together as one place.

Bulb-outs are medium to high-cost permanent improvements that dramatically increase pedestrian safety by shortening crosswalks and creating additional public space opportunities. They would add much needed space for pedestrians at these two locations.

A pedestrian scramble is a pedestrian crossing system that stops all vehicular traffic and allows pedestrians to cross an intersection in every direction, including diagonally, at the same time. As it prioritizes flow of pedestrians over flow of car traffic, this solution might affect transit efficiency at these two locations. However, the benefits in terms of pedestrian amenity and safety have led to new examples being installed in many countries (especially in the UK and Japan) in recent years, and they could create a signature gateway on Mission Street, especially at the 16th Street intersection.
Street vendors are popular at the 16th Street BART Plazas
Various old and new public spaces punctuate the Mission Street corridor, including Duboce Skatepark at 13th Street, the BART Plazas at 16th and 24th Streets, Capp Street Plaza at Cesar Chavez Street, and the forthcoming Mission-Valencia Green Gateway Plaza at Valencia Street. Refining the design of existing plazas, and creating new spaces is a long term investment to respond to open space needs in the neighborhood. These open spaces are used as transitory spaces for visitors and transit users as well as living rooms for residents who live in constrained spaces. We analyzed the way the two most important of these public spaces, the 16th and 24th Streets BART plazas, work today and identified the opportunities and resources currently available to make them into neighborhood destinations. The 16th Street Bart Plaza was especially identified by the community as both a challenging and important space, a space that satisfies many needs, yet experiences many safety, maintenance, cleanliness, and, most recently, identity challenges. Our outreach process included a close-up look at this plaza, an in-depth dialogue with community stakeholders and several design charrettes to review community priorities and brainstorm design ideas.
16TH ST BART PLAZA CURRENT CONDITIONS

From observations and input from the community, here are the most mentioned issues throughout our project. Four meetings with community stakeholders held in Summer 2014 helped to identify challenges and opportunities for the 16th Street Bart plazas.

Pedestrian crowding occurs when boarding and deboarding buses.

The BART plaza is a gathering space that provides many opportunities for reaching out to the community, socializing, and people-watching.

The northeast plaza at 16th Street is a major transit hub, open space, and gateway to the neighborhood. The use of the sidewalk often blurs with the plaza making the area one large open space.

Vandalism and lack of cleanliness are issues in both BART plazas.

Trash collects on the sidewalk and in various areas of the plazas. Trash management is a great challenge at both BART plazas.
16TH ST BART PLAZA COMMUNITY DIALOGUE

What is the community saying?

The Mission Street Public Life Plan looked at how Mission Street is currently used and explored new ideas that can address the needs and transmit the identity of its users.

The 16th Street BART Plazas have been brought up at each point during the community engagement process. Here are some of the things that the community said about the plazas:

"People on the street are not all bad."

"People use 16th and Mission as toilet."

"(…) To meet neighbors to work with one another it’s going to be about building community. There is a rich network of organizations that can facilitate that community building."

"People use 16th and Mission as toilet."

"One thing that Mission could see is maybe little plazas that would enhance the beauty of the Mission but at the same time, you want to keep that flow of people and you want to have some nice sidewalks."

"Cause if you walk around 16th, it is a little bit crazy. From 16th to about 18th, it’s a very, you know, hard core."

"Socializing with people is nice, sunshine, conversation, not all are drug dealers."

Map recording community input collected at the 16th BART plaza focus groups.
16TH ST BART PLAZA:
FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY

Throughout the two years of public outreach for the Mission Street Public Life Plan, the 16th BART Plaza was consistently identified as an important place in the heart of the Mission neighborhood. The reasons are many.

Several community members commented that both the northeast and the southwest 16th Street BART plazas are gathering places and “living rooms” for residents living nearby, “storefronts” for many small scale vending operations, connection points for Muni trips, and gateways to the regional BART system. These plazas are important for the Mission District community and heavily used every day.

In response to this input, the Mission Street Public Life Plan team held a public workshop on May 22, 2014 to report back to the community and to announce a series of three focus groups to discuss three areas of concern: commerce, public safety, and public art.

**Commerce**
On July 1, 2014 interested stakeholders convened to discuss the possibility of new micro-vending opportunities at the 16th Street BART Plazas. An overarching theme of the discussion was the importance of balancing the needs of the universe of 16th Street BART plaza users (commuters, existing informal vendors, neighborhood families, seniors, nearby hotel residents, and homeless). We heard an interest in pursuing micro-vending opportunities on these plazas while recognizing the existing congestion.

**Public Safety**
On July 8, 2014 concerned community members brainstormed opportunities for community-based efforts to improve maintenance and monitoring of the 16th Street BART Plazas. We learned about a new pilot effort called the Community Ambassadors sponsored by the Mission Neighborhood Center: the initiative provides services to plaza users by walking the plaza at specific times of the day, talking to its users and providing services as needed. The goal is to prevent penalization or displacement, while improving public safety. We heard an interest in reinforcing this program as resources become available.

**Public Art**
On July 15, 2014 participants in a focus group discussed the need to collaborate with the existing Mission Street arts community. We heard a great enthusiasm for public art events (visual and performance art) on these plazas on a rotating basis. Participants also discussed the need for a funded position to curate such rotating public art program. Ideas were discussed, especially installations about the neighborhood’s recent social history.
The BART plazas are sites of informal and formal commerce. There was an interest in expanding new, micro-vending opportunities. Several existing vending events in the neighborhood have successfully highlighted local merchants.
There are many safety concerns for those who use and pass through the BART plaza. Lack of appropriate lighting, crime incidents, lack of cleanliness, and threats to personal safety are all challenges identified by the community.
Public art and special events are excellent ways to positively affect a public space. The BART plazas already include some of these events but outreach participants would like to see more programs and activities at these locations.
16TH STREET BART PLAZA: PUBLIC LIFE SURVEY

People congregate mostly around bus stops and the center of the plaza. 43% of people in the area were observed within Muni shelters along 16th Street and Mission Street. Of the people waiting for the bus, 73% are standing and 9% are leaning or sitting informally. While all formal seating was occupied throughout the day (34% of people were observed sitting formally). Most cases of informal seating (sitting on the ground, laying, and leaning) were observed on the perimeters of the plazas, against walls of adjacent buildings and the rail surrounding the stairwell, both of which are prime locations for people-watching.

POSTURE AT 16TH ST BART
The two 16th Street BART plazas are hubs of activity. Although waiting for transit is the primary function, these plazas are also gateways, backyards, and open spaces to congregate. Redesigned in the early 2000’s, the 16th Street BART plazas accommodate many users, however a perceived lack of cleanliness, safety, and programmed activity prevent the plaza from being used to its full potential.

The first step in public space analysis is to see how people are moving through and using the space. The diagram on the left illustrates how people are moving through the 16th BART plazas and how such spaces may be organized in different functional areas to facilitate uses such as seating/waiting and gathering/activation.
16TH ST BART PLAZA - CONCEPTUAL DESIGN ELEMENTS

These design elements showcase what could happen on the BART plazas and on the sidewalk edge. By providing different types of seating and activities it would be possible to accommodate a wider range of users. Keeping specific areas of the plaza clear and open would provide visibility and increase safety in areas that are currently blocked off or not very visible.
The 16th Street BART Plazas need transit amenities that allow for better circulation and address current congestion. The majority of users remain standing until transit arrives. Eliminating selected bus shelters, providing different seating and replacing them with leaning bars might better accommodate the needs of the users and would allow for greater circulation.

Informal seating like steps encourages a more active flow of users and allows them to customize their experience. Located at the core of the plaza, informal seats could provide a lookout onto the plaza. The success of this layout is already apparent in the current circular step seating on the southwest plaza.

The 16th Street and Mission intersection is a key place for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit. Creating intersection murals could help prioritize pedestrians while adding vitality to the intersection with color and pattern. This intersection may also provide a pedestrian ‘scramble’ (defined in pg 107) to increase safety while crossing.

Providing services to visitors and residents of the Mission is an important function that should be integrated into the plazas. Kiosks and vending not only provide transit, neighborhood, social service information to locals and visitors, but they also create informal monitoring and promote a safer environment.

Architectural and light canopies could vertically anchor the plaza. They would create a more comfortable environment for users and provide shelter from sun and wind. Canopies would eliminate the need for traditional transit shelters, while providing greater interest and flexibility of the space.

Providing lighting and transit information in the plazas' pavement it could promote better pedestrian circulation. These LED installations can also provide floor lighting and can indicate (by flashing) when transit is approaching, bringing an artistic element to traditional transit information.
24TH STREET BART PLAZA - PUBLIC LIFE SURVEY

Most people were observed on the sidewalk edge and in parts of the plaza adjacent to bus shelters. Of those waiting for transit, 61% of people were standing, and 16% sitting informal, which suggests a need for more seating near the bus stops. Only 24% of all people observed were sitting formally on a bench in the plaza. The remainder were standing (63%) or sitting informally (13%). Most of the informal seating takes place on the ground and up against the walls near the rail surrounding the stairwell.

POSTURE AT 24TH ST BART

STANDING
SITTING FORMAL
SITTING INFORMAL

Weekday (8 AM–4 PM)

Weekend (8 AM–4 PM)
The two Bart plazas at 24th Street are hubs of activity. Although waiting for transit is the primary function, these plazas are city gateways, backyards, and open spaces to congregate. The southwest plaza, rebuilt in 2012, improved pedestrian flow to and from the BART entrance by removing a tall fence along the west edge of the plaza (at Osage alley). Ideas to add trees and an info kiosk at the corner of Mission and 24th were discussed at our meetings. The northeast plaza has not been renovated in the recent past and could be improved by opening up the business on the east side edge and by restoring the historic mural by Michael Rios on the northern edge.
24TH ST BART PLAZA - CONCEPTUAL DESIGN ELEMENTS

These design elements showcase what could happen on the BART plazas and on the sidewalk edge. By providing different types of seating and activities it is possible to accommodate a wider range of users.

1. RELOCATE OR REMOVE THESE TREES
2. RESTORE HISTORIC 1974 BART MURAL BY MICHAEL RIOS
3. INSTALL LOW LANDSCAPING
4. INSTALL LIGHTING TO LIGHT MURAL
5. CONSIDER INSTALLING CUBE SEATING
6. WORK WITH BUSINESS TO INCREASE FAÇADE TRANSPARENCY
7. REPLACE CURRENT FENCE WITH DECORATIVE FENCE (AS 16TH ST)
8. KEEP CUBE SEATING (SOCIALIZING AND TRANSIT WAITING)
9. PLAN TREES
10. CONSIDER LIT ART INSTALLATION INSTEAD OF TREES
11. PLANT TREES
12. ENCOURAGE FOOD TRUCK ACTIVITY
13. PROGRAM AREA AS COMMUNITY SPACE
14. ENCOURAGE ROTATING COMMUNITY EVENTS AND GROUPS
15. RELOCATE TRASH CAN THAT IMPedes TRANSIT USER FLOW
1 WAITING FOR TRANSIT

The 16th Street BART Plazas need transit amenities that allow for better circulation and address current congestion. The majority of users remain standing until transit arrives. Eliminating selected bus shelters, providing different seating and replacing them with leaning bars might better accommodate the needs of the users and would allow for greater circulation.

2 ACTIVE SEATING

Active seating is proposed to accommodate both transit users who prefer to sit facing outward and users who prefer to sit facing the plaza, people-watching, waiting, or have a conversation with others. This second tier of seating will be low maintenance, visually interesting and could provide lighting at night.

3 DECORATIVE INTERSECTION TREATMENT

The 16th Street and Mission intersection is a key place for pedestrians, bicyclists and transit. Creating intersection murals could help prioritize pedestrians while adding vitality to the intersection with color and pattern. This intersection may also provide a pedestrian ‘scramble’ (defined in pg 107) to increase safety while crossing.

4 INFORMATION | VENDING | ART

Providing services to visitors and residents of the Mission is an important function that should be integrated into the plazas. Kiosks and vending not only provide transit, neighborhood, social service information to locals and visitors, but they also create informal monitoring and promote a safer environment.

5 LED INTERACTIVE TRANSIT INFO

Providing lighting and transit information in the plazas’ pavement it could promote better pedestrian circulation. These LED installations can also provide floor lighting and can indicate (by flashing) when transit is approaching, bringing an artistic element to traditional transit information.
“Si Se Puede,” 1995, mural by Susan Kelk Cervantes at Cesar Chavez Elementary School’s exterior east wall on Shotwell Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets
Chapter 5
Programming
As discussed in previous chapters, throughout the outreach, comments emphasized the importance of programming. Ideas ranged from programming that focuses on small business improvements, organized street markets, art performances, exhibits or installations, to maintenance and stewardship of sidewalks for cleanliness and repair.

At the time of this report, the major concern for residents and businesses owners was the escalating rents, for residential or commercial space. Small businesses are losing space as more lucrative businesses offer higher rents to the property owners. The need for affordable housing is the prevailing concern of Mission Street neighbors and all San Franciscans.

This Plan’s scope focuses on public space and pedestrian experience. On Mission Street, small businesses contribute significantly to the public life and pedestrian experience on the sidewalks. Thus, while a comprehensive economic development strategy falls outside of the scope of this project, this chapter includes some ideas on small business retention and small business improvements.

While affordable housing strategies fall outside the scope of this Plan, many City agencies focus on affordable housing strategies, including the Mayor’s Office of Housing.

Sidewalk and storefront maintenance and cleanliness was another major theme of concern highlighted repeatedly in the community dialogue. The conditions of the sidewalk impact the quality of the pedestrian experience. This section identifies ideas for enhancing maintenance and stewardship on Mission Street sidewalks.

Finally, as we will illustrate in this chapter, Mission Street has been historically the heart of public art in San Francisco. The identity of this street is intertwined with murals and festivals; art organizations are major community stakeholders. This project explored expanding public art on Mission Street and also funded a community art exhibit on Muni buses. This chapter summarizes the findings.
Ideas for Economic Development

What follows are a number of ideas for economic development strategies to strengthen the Mission Street retail corridor. Many of these strategies have been tested in cities around the country and abroad; a few are currently being implemented in San Francisco.

IDEAS FOR BUSINESS RETENTION

The concern about the affordability of commercial spaces was mentioned multiple times in the context of the corridor’s character and stability. Existing businesses are seeing lease rates escalate, sometimes by factors of two or more, upon renewal. This often results in the loss of long time businesses that contributed to Mission Street’s character.

**Strategy 1: Direct Acquisition**

“...the rising rental costs for businesses... that it’ll just become a free for all in terms of the market up and down the corridor to allow those businesses to come and displace others... And that’s why I think it’s important to talk about the diversity of the neighborhood, and that’s what we want to see solidified and strengthened.”

One response to escalating commercial lease rates and subsequent displacement of long-time or family businesses is to purchase the building in which at-risk businesses operate. However, many of these businesses do not have the resources or the option to purchase their buildings. The following two programs are examples where a municipality has stepped forward to purchase properties for the benefit of maintaining character-defining or community-serving uses in identified neighborhoods undergoing rapid change.

**Community Arts Stabilization Trust: Preserving Local Arts. San Francisco, CA**

For years, San Francisco’s Tenderloin and Central Market areas have been home to many community arts organizations. These organizations located in the Tenderloin and Central Market in large part due to the accessible lease rates. With the recent focus on revitalizing these neighborhoods, property values and lease rates have soared, making it difficult for the arts to remain. The Community Arts Stabilization Trust (CAST) was established to purchase buildings to permanently securing space for local arts organizations in this rapidly changing area of the city. CAST started with grant funding and today partners with the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and uses New Market Tax Credits to achieve its mission. To date, CAST has purchased two buildings, and is also providing technical assistance to building tenants.

**Vital’ Quartier: Preserving Local Retail Character. Paris, France**

Paris faced significant increase in real estate values and changes in the retail market that impacted older and smaller retail establishments. These establishments serve residents’ daily needs and are often cultural markers, contributing to livability of the neighborhood. Unfortunately, many of these smaller shops have closed, leading either to vacancy or a monotonous retail offering. In Paris’ Latin Quarter, for example, the loss of bookstores has caught the most attention.

The Vital’ Quarter program’s goal is to revitalize existing retail corridors and maintain retail diversity. The City of Paris has created a quasi-public entity, SEMAEST, to acquire properties in identified at-risk neighborhoods, including the popular Latin Quarter. The City has granted SEMAEST “Right of First Refusal” to facilitate acquisitions and it lent SEMAEST acquisition funds. Once SEMAEST has acquired property, it leases commercial spaces to prioritized retail uses in neighborhoods across the city. SEMAEST then looks to sell the building to a tenant or a real estate subsidiary with a deed restriction or covenant maintaining the prioritized use(s). Sales proceeds are eventually used to reimburse the City of Paris.

These two programs directly address the most complex problem facing Mission Street today: the risk of loss of affordable commercial spaces and long-time commercial tenants, with a potentially negative impact on the corridor character.

However, since these two programs rely on the purchase of property, they are capital intensive; allocating public resources in the amounts needed to create a substantial impact requires substantial political will and commitment.
Strategy 2: Acquisition Assistance

It is not right to have a business for 10 years, you have a customer base, you have a working business model and upon renewal of the lease, the lease has tripled. You are not going to stay open just to pay the lease. This has happened to many bakeries, Chinese bakeries, not Latino bakeries.”

A healthy business maintains and attracts clients. Stable tenure also contributes to a vital commercial corridor. Mission Street stakeholders frequently mentioned the need for businesses to expand their clientele in addition to securing long-term, financially-accessible leases or ownership of their buildings. The two programs below are examples of such efforts to meet those needs.

Assets of Community Value and Community Right to Bid: Preserving community-centered retail. London, United Kingdom

Much like Paris and San Francisco, London has experienced dramatically escalating real estate values. As a result, London began to lose local pubs, often places with strong community significance. Communities in London grew concerned about this loss as the pub has been historically the center of social life and a traditional community gathering space in the United Kingdom.

The Assets of Community Value and the Community Right to Bid processes are tools for local communities to identify commercial establishments of social interest and attempt to acquire them. The Assets of Community Value process allows a community to nominate a property or commercial establishment as an “asset of community value.” The local Borough Council reviews the nomination and once the property is designated as an Asset of Community Value, any change of commercial use to the property is subject to additional scrutiny; in case of sale, a six month moratorium is applied on the property transfer to allow the community to potentially raise funds to submit an offer (Community Right to Bid).

Legacy Business Registry and Rebate Program (footnote link to proposed Ordinance). San Francisco, CA

At the time of this report, the current economic climate has caused many long standing businesses to suffer from sharp increases in lease rates or even lease terminations. As already discussed, losing these establishments can adversely affect communities. As a response, similar to London’s program described above, Supervisor David Campos introduced legislation to create the Legacy Business Registry and Rebate Program.

The legislation proposes creating a registry of long standing businesses defined as “legacy businesses,” including bars, restaurants, art/performance spaces, and light manufacturing establishments, which have contributed to the neighborhood history or identity. The Board of Supervisors will establish programs offering a wide array of technical assistance. The legislation proposes offering technical assistance to legacy businesses, waiving the real estate transfer tax, and extending leases by 10 years for buildings in which Legacy Businesses operate.

These programs provide assistance in acquisition and marketing, two common concerns related to the Mission Street retail corridor. Such programs require modest amounts of public subsidy, making them feasible from a budgetary perspective.

IDEAS FOR BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT

“I know a lot of people that come from the East Bay to shop in the Mission because they find a lot of things they don’t find over there, over here. A lot of ethnic foods and whatever... So they come here because they say ‘oh I know where to go there’ but they used to live here and they moved over there.”

A theme of corridor character was the importance of preserving businesses that serve the ethnic demographics of the neighborhood and even in the region. Many mentioned that former residents come to Mission Street from East Bay cities such as Richmond and Pittsburgh to patronize the businesses (and religious institutions) they went to upon first coming to San Francisco.

Strategy 3: Marketing Efforts

Increasing revenues by expanding the clientele base through marketing can be an effective method of sustaining long term businesses. These businesses often need technical assistance in marketing, including creating a presence on social media outlets.

Bares Notables. Buenos Aires, Argentina

In Buenos Aires, the local bar, café, confectionery or billiard hall play a large role in the social fabric of the city, where people meet with family, friends, or co-workers. Many of these establishments are pillars in the cultural and architectural history of Buenos Aires. The “Bares Notables” designation celebrates their significance for the city’s heritage. The program is sponsored by the Ministry of Culture and a local citizens group. It uses social media and special events to attract visitors and residents.
Smaller entrepreneurs are often troubled by what appears to be Byzantine permitting processes inherent in larger cities. They are also often unaware of the breadth of assistance that the City offers. The public sector can improve this situation through technical assistance and advocacy. Ideally this support is found in one City department as a one-stop shop.

Invest In Neighborhoods. San Francisco, CA
The Mayor’s Office is home to the Invest In Neighborhoods initiative, a program serving and assisting selected neighborhood commercial corridors throughout San Francisco. General services include: educating small businesses about existing city resources and programs, technical assistance to small businesses, and loan programs in coordination with partners in the private sector. Place-specific services include: a grant program for façade and tenant improvements; assistance establishing a Community Benefit District; coordination with San Francisco Public Works to maintain corridor cleanliness.

In terms of resources for physical improvements, small loans geared toward storefront repairs or enhancements were often cited as needed to maintain and enhance the existing corridor businesses.

This initiative is currently in place in 25 selected retail corridors citywide including Mission Street, south of Cesar Chavez, and portions of Mission Street abutting 24th Street. Mission Street north of Cesar Chavez Street is not within an Invest In Neighborhoods retail corridor. A similar program should also be considered for Mission Street north of Cesar Chavez Street.

Legacy Bars and Restaurants. San Francisco, CA
Similar to Buenos Aires, the Legacy Bars and Restaurants program also inventories and promotes culturally important retail destinations. The program was motivated partially in response to a recent spate of closings or threat of closings of city icons, including the Gold Dust Lounge and the Eagle Tavern. Legacy Bars and Restaurants are found throughout the city and benefit from online and social media marketing, publicity, participation at special events, and inclusion in print media and publications.

An effective marketing program would highlight points of interest along the Mission Street retail corridor. These programs address stakeholder’s requests for desired technical assistance and are a relatively inexpensive means of improving the perception of the corridor. As such, these types of programs are readily applicable to the Mission Street Corridor.

Strategy 4: Small Loans and Technical Assistance

“I think we need to focus more on enhancements and on technical assistance to the businesses. Storefront improvements, loans, improving existing businesses that are there, promote Mission Street, not just promoting business by business... Provide loans for people trying to start-up businesses so they can move into smaller spaces. The first step is to secure what is there, give it the support that it needs.”

In light of rising lease rates, multiple stakeholders cited the need for increased public and nonprofit provided technical assistance around lease negotiations, permitting processes, and small capital loans. This was often mentioned given the absence of commercial rent control.

IDES FOR COMMUNITY STEWARDSHIP

“There’s still people who would rather walk down a different street than Mission Street, especially in the morning. [What] I’ve been trying to do is somehow get businesses or even building owners to cooperate with the city on a powerwashing program on the sidewalks.”

Many communities organize efforts to address neighborhood issues around sidewalk and façade cleanliness, landscaping, or even streetscape improvements. Other efforts may focus mostly on advocating for improvements with the City. Mission Street includes some examples of such community driven efforts in a few locations. However, many blocks do not benefit from any form of centralized community stewardship.

Strategy 5: Community Partnerships

Community Benefit Districts
Community Benefit Districts (CBD) are collaborations between private and public partners to spur quality of life improvements within a defined geographic area. Most often these areas are centered along a principal retail corridor and may include residential properties, given the mixed-use character of San Francisco neighborhoods.

To form a CBD, property owners and business owners agree to form a governing body that proposes a special assessment on top of the customary property taxes paid to the City Assessor. The assessment provides a stable source of revenue to fund a number of improvements within the defined geographic area, including sidewalk cleaning, public safety measures, beautification and adornment, streetscape improvements, business and district marketing, district advocacy at the local level, and other economic devel-
opment activities. In general, the broad goals of the CBD are to bolster the economic viability of the retail corridor, create an entity that can leverage additional investment, and increase community participation, leadership, and political influence.

**Business Improvement District**

Similar to a CBD, The Mission Miracle Mile Business Improvement District (BID) is a focused effort that covers the block of Mission Street from 21st Street to 22nd Street, although there are currently plans for a small expansion. This BID provides the commercial establishments in its boundaries with additional cleaning, security, and beautification services. Funding is secured through a self-taxing mechanism of participating businesses.

**Merchant and Neighborhood Associations**

Motivated and concerned merchants and neighbors often come together in response to area problems or in anticipation of coming changes. Our Mission Street study identified two such groups: Central Mission Neighborhood Association and the Mission Bernal Merchant Association. A third group, Calle 24, is adjacent to the project area (lower 24ths Street between Mission and Potrero) and has been engaged in the process.

The Central Mission Neighborhood Association addresses neighborhood issues, such as the condition of local parks, homelessness, and parking and traffic issues. Their areas of concern are the blocks adjacent to Mission Street from 17th Street to 22nd Street. The Mission Bernal Merchant Association focuses on the portion of Mission Street from Cesar Chavez to Randall. Their goal is to promote and enhance the businesses in that area. They also engage local residents and neighbors through hosting community events.

Because these groups are rooted in the neighborhood, they are aptly positioned to advocate for and implement corridor improvements.
Programming Recommendations

RECOMMENDED PROGRAMS FOR MISSION STREET

Regular Sidewalk Cleaning
Key Agency: OEWD

Due to high pedestrian volumes (see Chapter 3) and the importance of Mission Street as a major commercial destination, maintenance has become one of the key working areas of the Mission Public Life Plan, both for existing and forthcoming spaces. Cleanliness is a primary concern for residents and merchants. A regular power washing program would be very welcomed as a way to integrate current cleaning efforts along the Street.

Corridor-wide Community Benefit District (CBD) or Business Improvement District (BID)
Key Agency: OEWD

Currently, the Mission Merchant Association covers the one block of Mission Street between 21st and 22nd. The blocks south of Cesar Chavez have been included in the newly-formed Mission-Bernal Merchant Association. A stronger Business Improvement District (BID) or Community Benefit District (CBD) could both fill the current gap in the project area north of Cesar Chavez and could unify the corridor as a strong commercial destination in the City.

Additional Traffic Enforcement
Key Agency: SFMTA

One of the main circulation issues noted on Mission Street is traffic congestion and double-parking. Commercial loading is needed for most businesses and should not be exacerbated by individual vehicles stalling in the parking lane. Many community members would like to see a traffic enforcement program.

Façade Improvement Program
Key Agency: OEWD

The historically significant architectural details and signage of many Mission Street storefronts could be restored to its original conditions by a corridor façade improvement program. Currently part of the Invest in Neighborhoods program just South of Cesar Chavez Street, a Façade Improvement Program could be established for the whole project area: new infill projects could integrate the restoration guidelines into the scope of their work, and individual owners could apply for the program and receive matching funds for the cost of the improvements. Façade improvements might include storefront restoration (windows, paving details on sidewalk, and store vestibule), storefront transparency, general façade upkeep.

Adopt-a-Streetscape Program
Key Agency: PW

Participating merchants could sponsor a proposed streetscape element (bench, moveable chair, trash cans, etc.) in front of their own business (or at another location) as a way to sponsor unified improvements along the corridor. Trash cans, for example, were voted as the most necessary streetscape element for Mission Street and could become design elements by incorporating art and color.

Festivals and Street Programs
Key Agency: Planning, SFMTA

The rich cultural history and art scene of Mission Street could be protagonists of additional festivals and street programs. Events are effective, relatively low cost, placemaking strategies that can celebrate neighborhood identity and foster interaction.

AGENCY KEY
OWED: Office of Economic and Workforce Development
SFMTA: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
PW: Public Works
SF Planning: San Francisco Planning Department
Ideas for Art on Mission Street

Mission Parade consists of 20 steel cut panels with 10 unique vignettes that repeat at entrances to the Mission Playground. Each panel features three fantastical characters. Some of the figures include a peg-legged pirate with a hook for a hand; a friendly one-eyed, one-toothed monster; an alligator with a top hat holding a flower; a fire-breathing dragon; a plant watering can following a smiling tree holding an umbrella and a gold miner complete with a pick ax and a pan. All of the figures in the panels are oriented in the same direction so that they appear to be walking in a procession. (Michael Bartalos, Mission Parade, 2012. Located at Valencia and 19th Streets.)

PUBLIC ART IN THE MISSION DISTRICT

Murals are an intrinsic part of the Mission District’s identity, just like projects done by community members and neighbors, like altars, fences, low rider cars, etc.). In the 1960s, with the Chicano Movement, the mural movement took off. San Francisco’s early murals focused on social struggle and activism. In the 1980s, with a massive immigration from Central America, murals mirrored political and cultural resistance. In the late 1990s, a local group of artists based in the Mission (some of them Latino), known as the “Mission School,” continued the tradition. Their work was heartfelt, handmade, and deeply observational, and its urban realism was filtered through interests in graffiti, comic books, green culture, and of course, murals.

In the 1990s public art (and murals), in the Mission and citywide, took a different form. This is due in part to the change in demographics as well as changes in the arts. A great number of artists and art students from a variety of backgrounds moved to the Mission neighborhood following the footsteps of the “Mission School” artists, expanding the cultural identity of the mural artist beyond the Latino connotation. A new form of public art, the “new genre public art,” departed from the traditional definition of public art as sculpture installation in parks and plazas. New genre public art brings artists into direct engagement with audiences to deal with the compelling issues of our time.

Today many artists have moved out of the Mission; however, they actively participate in exhibitions, workshops, and programs in the many arts organizations still present in the Mission neighborhood. Some of these existing arts organizations — the ones who mostly serve the Latino population — are losing their audience. Organizations whose audience is less specific are instead experiencing growth, a reflection of the changing demographics of the neighborhood.
ART ALONG THE MISSION STREET CORRIDOR TODAY

1. Brian Goggin, Substrata, 1999
   Mission Street bus bulbs, between Cortland and Precita
   Mission Street Bus Bulbs, NE and SW corner of Mission and 23rd Streets
   1240 Valencia Street
4. Various Murals on 24th St
   Twenty-Fourth Street between Potrero St. and Valencia St.
   Mission Street between 16th and 19th streets
   Valencia Street between 16th and 19th streets
   Mission Street between 16th and 19th streets
   Mission Street between 16th and 19th streets
9. Gary Dwyer, Seven Dancing Stars, 1994
   Mission Police Station, 630 Valencia Street (at 17th Street)
10. Clarion Alley Murals
    One block north of 17th St. between Valencia St. and Mission St
11. Amy Blackstone, Untitled, 2004
    Kidpower Park, Hoff Street between 16th and 17th Streets
12. Carolyn Mark (with Peter Carpou and Susan Kelk Cervantes), The Flower Inside Us Grows, 2002
    Mission Street Bus Bulbs, 150 Otis Street (at Otis Street)
**ART ORGANIZATIONS**

A. Secession Art & Design, 3235 Mission St
B. Mission Cultural Center, 2868 Mission St
C. Gray Area Foundation for the Arts, 2665 Mission St
D. Kiria Koula, 3148 22nd St
E. ATA Artist’s Television Access, 992 Valencia St
F. Community Music Center, 544 Capp St
G. The 500 Capp Street Foundation, 500 Capp St
H. Kadist Art Foundation, 3295 20th St
I. StoreFrontLab, 337 Shotwell St
J. ODC Theater, 3153 17th St
K. Kearny Street Workshop, 180 Capp St
L. The Lab, 2948 16th St

**Not mapped**

Galería de la Raza/Studio 24, 2857 24th Street
Precita Eyes Mural Arts and Visitors Center, 2981 24th Street
Brava! for Women in the Arts!, 2781 24th Street
Acción Latina, 2958 24th Street

**MISSION BASED ARTISTS (OR ONCE LIVED IN THE MISSION)**

Juana Alicia
Miranda Bergman
Edythe Boone
Jesus “Chuy” Campusano
Mona Carron
Susan Kelk Cervantes
Merra Desai
Susan Greene
Megan Wilson
Craig Baldwin
Margaret Kilgallen
John Jota Leaños
Guillermo Gomez-Peña
Yvonne Littleton
Los Cincas
Los Uberfozos
Al Lujan
Jet Martinez
Barry McGee
Julie Murray
Aaron Noble
Irene Perez Ride
Rigo
Artemio Rodriguez
Isis Rodriguez
Andrew Schoultz
Mats Stromberg
Swoon
Michael Bartalos
Mike Arcega
Stephanie Syjuco
Chris Johanson
Amy Ho
Brian Goggin, Substrata, 1999
Mission Street bus bulbs, between Cortland and Precita

Nine concrete inserts, sited in transit “bus bulbs,” each with a different Bernal Heights historical reference, using a sculptural imprint and text.

Artist, Cesar Chavez, Si Se Puede! Plaza, 2014
3047 Mission St., NE corner of Mission & Capp streets at Cesar Chavez Street

The Cesar Chavez Streetscape Improvement Project creates a safer corridor for pedestrians and cyclists. The slogan “Si Se Puede” alludes to Cesar Chavez political slogan as well as a local advocacy group (CC Puede) instrumental in advocating for and implementing the streetscape project.

Various Artists, The Free Speech Wall, 2002 – Present
1240 Valencia Street

A public gallery of outrage and passion on a former police station now housing an architecture firm (Bruce Tomb).
In conjunction with MUNI sidewalk enhancement, the artwork fills the widened sidewalks with the number 23 depicted in a variety of ways, including 23 dots, roman numerals, cross-hatching, binary code, etc. The smaller white tiles contain hand-painted text with statements about the number 23 in English and Spanish.

24th Street has several murals depicting relevant themes to the lives of artists and residents of the neighborhood.

Balmy Alley is located between 24th and 25th Streets in the Mission neighborhood. The block-long alley is the best place to see the most concentrated collection of murals in San Francisco. The mural production began in the mid-80’s as an expression of artists’ outrage over human rights and political abuses in Central America. Today the alley contains murals on a great variety of styles and subjects from human rights to local gentrification to Hurricane Katrina. A mural art tour is offered weekly by the Precita Eyes Mural Art Center, the oldest mural art organization in the Mission.
The installation features four 10-foot telephone poles outfitted with highly ornamental Victorian-inspired crowns. The unadorned posts are used as a community bulletin board. A decorative paving design based on Victorian wallpaper is sandblasted into the sidewalk surrounding the poles.

Susan Kelk Cervantes (designed and painted in collaboration with M. Bergman, J. Alicia, E. Boone, Y. Littleton, M. Desai, and I. Perez), Maestrapeace, 1994
Women’s Building, 3543 18th St

This spectacular mural is a culmination of a multicultural, multi-generation collaboration of seven women artists, and a colorful work of art that sings to our community.

The mural was painted in 1994 by Juana Alicia, Miranda Bergman, Edythe Boone, Susan Kelk Cervantes, Meera Desai, Yvonne Littleton and Irene Perez, and many helpers.

Covering two exterior walls, Maestrapeace is as educational as it is inspirational and serves as a visual testament to the courageous contributions of women through time and around the world.¹

¹ “The Women's Building Mural Maestrapeace” The Women's Building website: www.womensbuilding.org

In the lobby of the Mission Police Station, the artist created a sculptural installation based on a legend of the Ohlone Indian tribes which originally inhabited the area. The legend refers to the cluster of stars we call the Pleiades. Stone furniture in the lobby is arranged in the pattern of the Pleiades. Framed panels feature legends about the Pleiades as told by the area’s diverse residents.
Clarion Alley Mural Project (CAMP) is an artists’ collective formed in October 1992 by six North Mission residents: Aaron Noble, Michael O’Connor, Sebastiana Pastor, Rigo 92, Mary Gail Snyder, and Aracely Soriano. The project, similarly to Balmy Alley, creates murals along both sides of the alley. The initiative also facilitates the production of murals by other artists outside the collective: over time, a great variety of muralists, local and international, has created murals along the alley. The alley is remarkably well maintained and visited by locals and tourists at all times of day.

The artist designed and fabricated the fence and gate panels along with sculptural trellises that utilize imagery and patterns associated with the dominant cultural heritage of Mission District residents.

As part of MUNI sidewalk enhancements, the artists designed a 65-foot long ceramic tile mosaic depicting the tree of life in a highly stylized manner. Neighbors, both children and adults, and homeless youth fabricated the huge mosaic. Homeless youth painted individual tiles depicting their dreams and hopes, the backbone of the snake-like figure.
Handsignals refers to the formal qualities of the numerous theater signs prevalent in the Mission District, and repurposes that vocabulary to “advertise” a new public space. Made of familiar pedestrian traffic signals and lettered brightly to mark McCoppin Hub as a new public space, Handsignals plays at the edge between art and advertising.
ART STRATEGY

When this Plan was written, the neighborhood was in the midst of dramatic demographic change. As a result, we witnessed a reluctance to support permanent art works, reflecting the uncertain direction of the neighborhood’s identity. There is interest, however, in temporary artwork, especially if community-based and in media projects that include youth.

In addition to murals, new temporary public art could be installed in public plazas, gardens, sidewalks, police stations, public garages, abandoned buildings, and so on.

Site installation

In the 1950s, cities like Chicago and New York started to install permanent outdoor sculptures in public plazas. This trend quickly spread to cities like San Francisco and Los Angeles. Artists like Henry Moore and Isamu Noguchi were invited to install their work in San Francisco, mostly in outdoor settings. After several decades, this form of art evolved, and new public art has a more dynamic and engaging goal.

The following examples of site installation illustrate the variety we could see in the Mission.

Brian Goggin (with Dorka Kheen), Language of the Birds, 2008
Intersection of Columbus and Broadway Avenues

A sculpted, illuminated flock of 23 translucent, suspended open books with bindings positioned as if they were wings of birds in flight. Italian, English, and Chinese phrases from books about the neighborhood and by neighborhood authors are scattered and embedded across the plaza.
This project ingeniously brings the inside of the Moscone Center to the outside, making it a truly public building. A large LED screen moves along the façade of the building at 4th and Howard Streets. A camera placed on the rear of the sign broadcasts a live feed of the activities within the building. A series of playfully deceptive videos are alternately screened to suggest other activities going on within.

In response to the community’s request for more seating in the area, artist Primitivo Suarez-Wolfe created a permanent art installation. Domestic Seating is comprised of nine cast metal replicas of domestic chairs donated by local residents installed along the sidewalks adjacent to the busy intersection.
Lighting

Lighting can have a dramatic effect on the environment as well as increase safety in public space. Mission-based artist Amy Ho has done several projects using light.

Amy Ho, *Sky in Red and Blue*

*A light installation that transforms the viewer's experience of looking out the ProArts Gallery window onto Frank H. Ogawa Plaza. The work transforms the prosaic view from the window into a blazing red world on one side and a cool blue environment on the other side. Inside the gallery, the viewer is bathed in red and blue light as he or she looks outside.*
Storefront pop-up art

There are several vacant storefronts on Mission Street. Potential temporary art installations could revitalize the first floor of buildings and, as an extension, the sidewalk and the street.


Conflict Kitchen is a restaurant that only serves cuisine from countries with which the United States is in conflict. Each Conflict Kitchen iteration is augmented by events, performances, publications, and discussions that seek to engage the public with the culture, politics, and issues at stake within the focus region. The restaurant rotates identities every few months in relation to current geopolitical events.

SUPERFLEX, Copyshop
Copenhagen, Denmark and Knoxville, Tennessee, USA.

Copyshop is the name for a shop and an information forum investigating the phenomena of copying. Copyshop offers products that challenge intellectual property. It can be modified originals, improved copies, political anti-brands — or a Supercopy as the new original. Intellectual property in the form of copyright, licenses and patents has an increasing importance on society — for what we say, where we say it, and to whom we say it to. The right over ideas maintains the status quo within the current economic order. As an active player, the function of Copyshop will be as that of an ordinary shop. Copyshop was first installed in a storefront in Copenhagen from 2005-2007 and then moved to Knoxville, Tennessee. Copyshop works as a franchise and can be reopened again.
**Murals and other street print**

Galería de la Raza runs the Digital Mural Project, an ongoing public art program on 24th and Bryant streets. The billboard, traditionally painted with temporary murals, has more recently hosted computer-generated images. The billboard installation is replaced quarterly. This project exemplifies how street and building surfaces can become an art canvas.

Mike Mandel (with Larry Sultan), *Waiting, 1999*
San Francisco International Airport, International Terminal, Gate A7

This 25-foot-by-32-foot image is a photographic close-up of four central figures involved in the familiar yet deeply symbolic drama of waiting in an airport for the return of loved ones. The photograph, taken by the artists, was translated into a digital image with each pixel represented by a 1-inch mosaic tile.
Galería De La Raza

Digital Mural Project, ongoing

In the mid-nineties, artist and board member Amalia Mesa-Bains developed the ReGeneration Project, a program providing emerging artists with exhibition and professional development opportunities and to directly involve young Latino artists in the planning and management of Galería activities. Participants in this project created the Digital Mural Project, an ongoing public art program, which replaced the painted temporary murals on the Bryant Street billboard with computer-generated images. In recent years, performance and public event series have been developed to address the educational needs of diverse populations — seniors, adults, adolescents, and students.

Jessica Sabogal, Youth So Educated Are Dangerous, 2013
East facing wall on Bryant and 24th Streets

A collaboration of Galería De La Raza and CARECEN worked with 10 teens from the Mission community for two months on developing their message to their generation and the people around them. Above all, they valued education and achieving their dreams.
Maria Forde, *The Pickpockets*  
Market Street

Mollie Wisner, the sweet pigeon-faced woman known as the Lost Chicken, was last seen around here in 1880, when she skipped town after posting bail for grand larceny. She’s one of six fleet-fingered women portrayed in artist Maria Forde’s series: 24 posters made from paintings based on police mug shots of the proper-looking ladies who fleeced people from the Gilded Age through the early 1900s.

**ART ON TRANSIT**

Since 1992, the San Francisco Arts Commission runs the Art on Market Street program. Every year, the program features new temporary artwork by Bay Area artists. The program includes a bus shelter kiosk poster series with an installation rotating every three months. Similarly, Mission Street could host a bus shelter art program that would invite, engage, and celebrate the importance of transit on this high-density street.
**Mission Street Art on Muni Pilot Project**

**ART ON MUNI INITIATIVE**

In February 2014, the Planning Department, in collaboration with SFMTA, launched the *Art on Muni* Initiative. Artists were encouraged to respond specifically to Mission Street as a subject.

*Themes*

The initiative looked for art that could discuss the following themes.

*Buses and commuters*

The corridor has a strong transit character: thousands of commuters take the 14 and 49 buses every day. Many of their stories are waiting to be told.

*Mission Street yesterday and today*

This theme celebrates the rich cultural history of the Mission and its current identity.

*People on Mission Street*

The vitality of Mission Street is made by its people: this theme explores those who use the street every day.

**Installation**

The art would be installed on:

- MUNI exterior and interior banners ranging from 11” by 28” to 30” to 144”
- BART display panels on 16th Street Plaza approximately 5’ by 4’.

The Planning Department received 29 submission and selected six artists: four artists for the Muni poster series and two artists for the BART poster series.

CYCLE 1 - MAY - JULY 2015

LAURIE HALSEY BROWN

Artist Bio
senseofplace LAB emerges in the interdisciplinary space of art, architecture and social engagement. It was founded by Laurie Halsey Brown in San Francisco in 2008, based on research/art in New York and the Netherlands since 2000. She has a MFA from CalArts, and has shown nationally, including the New Museum, NYC, and internationally.

Portfolio Sample
… hay cultura y diversidad /... there is culture and diversity,
As part of the project: Markings (Dear Developer) 2014/15
C-Print - 16" x 20"

Proposal
The Markings (Dear Developer), 2015
Social engagement action, four C-prints

Markings is an on-going community-based project. In this version, SF residents ‘tag’ places that have special meaning for them with their memories. People were invited to share their memories of places in the Mission on tags that were written with “This is where...”. The tags were added to small flags and placed in front of each place connected to their memory, and photographed. The photographs are framed with found frames to reflect the intimate feelings that people have for places. The project reveals the value that places have beyond the monetary. The images are from a social engagement action as part of the Plaza 16 Coalition “No Monster in the Mission” March/Festival at the 16th Street BART on October 4, 2014.

Installation
16th Street BART Plaza
May–July 2015
RHONDA WEPPLER

Artist Bio

Rhonda Weppler (b. Winnipeg, Canada) is a San Francisco-based artist whose work has been exhibited internationally, including at the Fort Wayne Museum of Art (Indiana), Orange Coast College Photography Gallery (Costa Mesa), National Gallery of Canada (Ottawa), Dos de Mayo (Madrid), Tokyo Wonder Site, and loop-raum (Berlin). Her work is represented in public collections including the Fort Wayne Museum of Art, Vancouver Art Gallery, Musée d’art Contemporain de Montreal and the National Gallery of Canada. She holds an MFA from the University of British Columbia and a BA (Fine Art and Art History) from the University of Toronto.

Proposal

For my project I will be collecting objects throughout the Mission, gathered from off the ground—such as discarded materials and natural debris—or purchased from local stores. I will then assemble these objects to mimic satellite views of the Mission. These still life images will reflect an area through its overlooked details; the culture and flavor of a place seen through its objects. These images will also work as actual maps. A shift in scale will connect buildings and streets with the more intimate details of place.

Portfolio Sample

Punjabi market, 2012  Found objects, Dimensions vary

Installation

Muni Posters and Muni Cards
May–July 2015
NINA WRIGHT

Artist Bio

Nina Wright is a painter, printer, and muralist living in Oakland and working in San Francisco. She’s a transplant from Cincinnati, Ohio, and has been living in the San Francisco Bay Area for eight years. She is usually working on projects with LeQuiVive Gallery. Her solo show “The Future is Calling” at Naming Gallery ended February 2015 but her work is easy to find on the street. You can see her murals mostly in downtown Oakland and also in historic Clarion Alley, in the San Francisco Mission District.

Portfolio Sample

The future is calling, 2014  Spray paint, acrylic and brush on wall - 12’x 24”

Proposal

For this project I am painting a colorful adaptation reflecting individuals you would come across on a crowded San Francisco Muni bus or Muni train. I will be mirroring the experience of the people and the ride itself. I plan on demonstrating visually the uniqueness of San Francisco Bay Area residents, a trait that sets us apart from other cities.

Installation

Muni Posters and Muni Cards
May-July 2015
For the Mission Street Art on Muni Series, I will create two mixed media digital images that will record the trans-migratory nature of Mission Street and will culminate in visual arts campaign titled Sí. Existimos.

Artist Bio

For first generation Colombian-American graffiti artist Jessica Sabogal, art serves as a haven, a tribute, a creative outlet of adoration and exaltation for women with stories often untold. Using a spray can, she reinvents what it means to be a female graffiti artist in a male-dominated medium and colors her canvas by unraveling stories she once heard, lived, struggled, and loved. She pushes the boundaries as an artist by utilizing her medium for social change, action, and empowerment.

Portfolio Sample

Justice For All Indigenous Women!, 2014
Spray paint on concrete, 8’ x 25’

Mural created in Montréal, Canada for the 3,000 native and indigenous Canadian women that have been missing or murdered since 1980.

Proposal

For the Mission Street Art on Muni Series, I will create two mixed media digital images that will record the trans-migratory nature of Mission Street and will culminate in visual arts campaign titled Sí. Existimos.

Installation

Muni Posters and Muni Cards
August–October 2015
**Artist Bio**

Vic De La Rosa is an artist who explores the boundaries and intersection of technology, art, and design in the realm of textiles. His specialty and studio practice centers on computer interfaced weaving and printing technology utilizing jacquard power looms, digital fabric printers and laser cutters in combination with traditional textile techniques by hand.

**Portfolio Sample**

**Patricia, 2013**  Jacquard woven tapestry 81” x 57”

From a textile portrait series of Mission residents. The subjects ranged from new arrivals with only one month of residency to multi-generational families that have lived in the Mission for decades. Part of a 2013 solo exhibition “Mi Barrio Es Tu Barrio” at Galería de la Raza, “Patricia” is now part of the permanent collection.

**Proposal**

Through a combination of textiles and technology I explored issues of community, gentrification and identity on a neighborhood level. For this Mission Street Art on Muni, I will create portraits of the citizens and commuters that are connected by this thoroughfare. The compositions will incorporate my interpretations of the Latino motifs and history that have become signifiers and touchstones for the visual culture of the Mission. They will be produced in hand and machine textile techniques using the sarape riding blanket form as a nod to the Mission’s most recent cultural history. I want to freeze a moment at this busy neighborhood intersection and allow the viewer to consider the people they pass by daily. I encourage the viewer to not only reconsider these fleeting street encounters with the individuals that makeup the fabric of the community but to also ponder their own place in it. As the Latino population of the Mission morphs, and the entire city experiences continued change, the ideas of heritage, place and belonging are continually shifting and blurred. My goal with these textile pieces is to use images of everyday San Franciscans to give the viewer pause, and foster a moment for considering one’s values and beliefs towards fellow citizens and neighbors.
DAWN WELESKI

Artist Bio

Dawn Weleski’s practice administers a political stress test, antagonizing routine cultural behavior by re-purposing underground brawls, revolutionary protests, and political offices as transformative social stages. Recent projects include City Council Wrestling, a series of wrestling matches where citizens, pro-am wrestlers, and city council members personified their political passions into wrestling characters, and “I will not bomb Iran” (100 times), a curriculum designed and taught by Weleski to generate student-authored apologies on behalf of the United States. She co-directs Conflict Kitchen, a take out restaurant that serves cuisine from countries with which the U.S. government is in conflict, which has been covered by over 550 international media and news outlets worldwide and is a finalist for the Second Annual International Public Art Award.

Proposal

For the Mission Street Art on MUNI Series, I propose a series of intimate, extraordinary portraits of Mission Street residents’ domestic spaces and families. Depending on the space allotted for their installation, the portraits could take two forms: (1) for the portrait format of 5’ by 4’, portraits of Mission Street residents inside their homes; or (2) for the 11” by 28” to 30” to 144” format, portraits of an average shelf and the products that it holds in a domestic space along Mission Street (i.e.: a shelf in a bathroom, a refrigerator, a closet). The goal of the portraits is to present private, intimate moments in public space, humanizing the residents that we sit next to everyday riding the bus, as well as those potentially losing their homes and new folks just arriving to the neighborhood.

Conflict Kitchen, 2010 – ongoing
Public project; Pittsburgh, PA - (Collaboration with Jon Rubin)

Conflict Kitchen is a take-out restaurant that only serves cuisine from countries with which the U.S. government is in conflict. The food is served in a custom-designed wrapper upon which are printed interviews that we have conducted with folks from that country and those that have migrated to the U.S. The restaurant changed identities every six months to highlight a new culture and set of politics.

Installation

Muni Posters and Muni Cards
August–October 2015
Chapter 6
Implementation
Introduction

The Mission Street Public Life Plan is a long-term vision for the Mission Street corridor as bounded by South Van Ness Avenue and Randall Street. While no funding has currently been secured for implementation, priorities for streetscape elements have been identified by the community and serve as a guideline for future implementation.

A combination of Federal, State, or local sources, combined with impact fee revenue, in-kind development contributions, and community-led improvements are potential funding sources for implementation.
FUNDING SOURCES

Better Streets Plan

Per Planning Code Section 138.1, proposed development projects are required to make pedestrian and streetscape improvements to the public right-of-way shall conform with the principles and guidelines for those elements as set forth in the Better Streets Plan.

Muni Forward

The City and County of San Francisco’s 2014 Capital Plan and the San Francisco 2030 Transportation Task Force (T2030) both recommended General funding for design and construction of many Muni Forward projects. On November 4, 2014, San Francisco voters approved Proposition A, which includes $150 million in funding to design and build Muni Forward projects. Future funding is expected from other sources as well. Depending on funding availability for the 14 Mission corridor, it might be possible to implement select elements proposed in this Plan through the Muni Forward initiative. This plan prioritizes the elements based on community input through an extensive survey and through technical analysis by staff.

Federal, State, Local Sources

Public funding for capital improvements could come from Federal, State, or local sources. Examples of local funds includes the Road Repaving & Street Safety Bond (Prop B), which funded streetscape improvements in the Mission, including Bartlett Street between 22nd and 21st. Prop AA (vehicle license fee) and Prop K (sales tax) are other local funding sources for streetscape and transportation improvements that could fund many of the improvements in this Plan. These funds can also match funds for federal and state funding. Federal, state, and regional grant opportunities are available to City agencies and could fund elements of this plan.

Eastern Neighborhood Community Infrastructure Fees

The Mission Area Plan is part of the City’s General Plan that directs land use, design, infrastructure, and area-specific issues by providing guiding objectives and policies. As the Area Plan neighborhoods gain new residents and workers, there is an accompanying need for improved public infrastructure and amenities, such as parks, street improvements, transit, childcare centers, and libraries.

New development in the Plan area is required to pay impact fees per the Planning Code Sect.423. These fees partially support the necessary infrastructure for new future residents and employees.

Development Project Contributions

Improvements could also be constructed as part of new development projects. In some cases, new development is required to make improvements to the public right-of-way directly adjacent to their property. In addition, some private development projects could fulfill the requirements of applicable development fees through an in-kind agreement. In this scenario, the private developer would build the improvements rather than pay fees. Development projects can also provide improvements to the public space simply as benefits to the neighborhood in form of building better relationships with the existing community.

Community-led improvements

Community members and neighborhood groups can also make important contributions to improving the street environment. A number of public and private grants, permits, and programs exist to help neighborhoods enhance the livability of their streets, such as San Francisco’s Community Challenge Grants and the Sidewalk Landscape Permit issued by Public Works. Numerous community-led projects can be seen throughout the neighborhood, especially greening projects such as the Shotwell Street sidewalk landscaping project in the block between 17th Street and 18th Street.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Several proposed developments as well as parcels identified as opportunities for development are in the pipeline. As these softsite projects move forward, they can use this Plan as a guide for streetscape and public realm improvements.
Implementation Priorities & Costs

This section outlines the community priorities as identified by the streetscape design survey, the potential funding sources, and costs associated with each. Implementation costs will be refined as designs are developed and ready for implementation. Preliminary costs associated with each corridor-wide streetscape design typology has been developed to help ground these ideas in reality. Note that these are only estimates and will vary widely depending on time and scope of implementation.

**SIDEWALK ELEMENTS**

The table below summarizes the top priorities for corridor wide treatment per the streetscape design survey for corridor wide improvements (further described in Chapter 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN ELEMENT</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTING AGENCY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>APPROX. COST PER UNIT*</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Scale Lighting</td>
<td>Add pedestrian scale lighting</td>
<td>DPW, PUC</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$16,000 - $25,000 EA</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>Install new street trees</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$1,500 - $6,000 EA</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash/Recycling Cans</td>
<td>Install new trash/recycling cans along the corridor</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$1,500 - $3,000 EA</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Sidewalk Space</td>
<td>Provide additional sidewalk space at selected locations</td>
<td>DPW, MTA</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$100,000 - $500,000 EA</td>
<td>Local or State Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Install bicycle parking</td>
<td>DPW, MTA</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$1,000 - $3,000 EA</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Art Installation</td>
<td>Install and commission community art at select locations</td>
<td>DPW, Planning</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Planters</td>
<td>Install landscape planters at select locations</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$3,000 - $15,000 EA</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History Marker</td>
<td>Install cultural history marker</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$3,000 - $20,000 EA</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storefront Outdoor Vending Area</td>
<td>Install outdoor vending area in front of businesses</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moveable Seating</td>
<td>Add moveable seating in select locations</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Paving</td>
<td>Add decorative paving at select locations</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$12 - $60/SF</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs are preliminary and shown as reference only. Final costs will vary. Cost in 2015 dollars. Source: DPW Landscape Architecture.

AGENCY KEY
DPW: San Francisco Public Works
MTA: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
PUC: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Street tree recommendations

The Mission District is one of the warmest, sunniest neighborhoods in the city because it is located inside a valley. It is no wonder that visual interest and shade are important consideration when thinking about additional tree planting. Infill tree planting continues to be a top community priority and can greatly enhance the public realm.

Historically, Mission Street did not receive a complete tree planting until the mid 20th century when development and BART spurred tree planting. As part of this, Mexican Fan Palms were placed within Mission’s core area, with smaller evergreen and deciduous trees providing a lower canopy.

This Plan developed a tree planting palette to inform choices when thinking of infill planting. Acknowledging the varying character along Mission Street and also the varying climate along its length, street tree selection is unique to three segments; South Van Ness to Duboce, Duboce to Cesar Chavez, and Cesar Chavez to Randall.

The planting palette can visually unite the corridor while providing an appropriate mix of species of varying color, scale, and texture.
## INTERSECTION AND PLAZA ELEMENTS

The table below summarizes the top priorities for BART plaza and intersection design elements described in Chapter 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN ELEMENT</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTING AGENCY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>APPROX. COST PER UNIT*</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART Plaza Enhancements</td>
<td>Add design enhancements to BART Plazas, including seating, information/vending facilities, public art, shade canopies, transit information, decorative lighting, trash/recycling cans</td>
<td>BART</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Grants or Federal Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Waiting Improvements adjacent to BART Plazas</td>
<td>Add design enhancements to Muni transit waiting areas adjacent to Bart Plazas, including: leaning bars, seating, updated transit information boards, trash/recycling cans</td>
<td>DPW, MTA</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Local or State Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Crosswalks</td>
<td>Install decorative crosswalks at key intersections</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Federal, State or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Intersection Paving</td>
<td>Install decorative paving at key intersections</td>
<td>DPW, MTA</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$12 - $60/SF</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Sidewalk Space</td>
<td>Provide additional sidewalk space at select intersection corners</td>
<td>DPW, MTA</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>$100,000 - $500,000 EA</td>
<td>Local or State Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Priority Signal</td>
<td>Install leading pedestrian interval (LPI) signals at select intersections</td>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Federal, State, or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGENCY KEY**

BART: Bay Area Rapid Transit
DPW: San Francisco Public Works
MTA: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
PROGRAMES AND MAINTENANCE

The table below summarizes recommended programs and maintenance strategies for the corridor. They are ranked in order of priority as identified by the community. More information about programs and maintenance can be found in Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM ELEMENT</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTING AGENCY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Sidewalk Steam Cleaning</td>
<td>Initiate regular sidewalk steam cleaning</td>
<td>OEWD, DPW</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor-wide Business Improvement District</td>
<td>Initiate a merchant’s association</td>
<td>OEWD</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Traffic Enforcement</td>
<td>Provide additional traffic enforcement for double parking</td>
<td>MTA, SFPD</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade Improvement Program</td>
<td>Implement a façade improvement program for eligible businesses</td>
<td>OEWD</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>Grants, State or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt-a-Streetscape Program</td>
<td>Participating merchants can sponsor a streetscape element (benches, etc.) to contribute to the streetscape of the corridor.</td>
<td>Planning, DPW</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Festivals and Programs</td>
<td>Curate and implement special events and programs</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Grants or Local Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGENCY KEY
BART: Bay Area Rapid Transit
DPW: San Francisco Public Works
MTA: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
OEWD: Office of Economic and Workforce Development
SFPD: San Francisco Police Department

As part of the streetscape design survey, the community was polled to determine priorities. Participants selected their top two options. The results from over 580 respondents are below.

40% A NEW CORRIDOR-WIDE BUSINESS IMPROVEMENTS DISTRICT (BID) – A MERCHANT ASSOCIATION THAT CAN SPONSOR EVENTS, CLEANING EFFORTS AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS
57% REGULAR SIDEWALK STEAM CLEANING – REGULAR SIDEWALK STEAM CLEANING WOULD COMPLEMENT PUBLIC WORKS’ AND INDIVIDUAL MERCHANTS’ CURRENT CLEANING SERVICES
57% A FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – THIS PROGRAM WOULD MAINTAIN AND RESTORE THE UNIQUE CHARACTER OF THE BUSINESSES ON THE GROUND FLOOR ALONG THE STREET
35% ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT – TARGETED ENFORCEMENT WOULD HELP SOLVE THE CURRENT DOUBLE PARKING ISSUE THAT IS IMPACTING TRANSIT OPERATIONS AND CAR CIRCULATION ALONG THE CORRIDOR
18% COMFORTABLE BUS STOPS – THIS PROJECT COULD BE DEVELOPED IN COORDINATION WITH SFMTA’S UPCOMING TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS
13% ADDITIONAL FESTIVALS AND PROGRAMS – THESE COULD BE ORGANIZED BY MERCHANTS, SCHOOLS, OR CULTURAL CENTERS ALONG THE STREET
As this corridor diagram demonstrates, many parcels are developed below their capacity and many projects are coming down the pipeline, some of which will be implemented within the coming decade. Per the Planning Code, future development will, in many cases, be required to enhance the sidewalk space adjacent to the project site. It is the goal of this Plan to guide investment to preferred streetscape elements that have been vetted and prioritized by the community.
When new development projects are approved, the San Francisco Planning Code requires improvements to the fronting sidewalks. This category of streetscape element will build on these requirements. Developers must fund these improvements in order to comply with code regulations. However, anything beyond required, and or part of an in-kind agreement, may include a more intensive set of public space improvements. What is shown here is a high intensity public realm design, the cost of which can help quantify this benefit to the community. The opportunity site map on the opposite page shows sites for potential new development.

Goal: Improve sidewalks conditions along the street  
Sponsor: Project Developer  
Potential Locations: Opportunity sites  
Cost: $$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN ELEMENT</th>
<th>COST/UNIT</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Scale Lighting</td>
<td>$16,000 -$25,000 EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$32,000 - $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Connection for string lights or similar</td>
<td>$7,500 - $8,500 EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,000 - $17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>$1,500 - $6,000 EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,000 - $24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Grate (custom)</td>
<td>$3,000 - $4,400 EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$12,000 - $16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Guard (custom)</td>
<td>$1,500 - $3,000 EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,000 - $12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash/Recycling Cans</td>
<td>$1,500 - $3,000 EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000 - $6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Sidewalk Space</td>
<td>$300,000 - $500,000 EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300,000 - $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Paving</td>
<td>$12 - $60/SF</td>
<td>4,000SF</td>
<td>$48,000 - $240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Art Installation</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Planters</td>
<td>$3,000 - $15,000 EA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$18,000 - $90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History Marker</td>
<td>$3,000 - $20,000 EA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$9,000 - $60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info/Bulletin board</td>
<td>$3,000 - $5,000 EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,000 - $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench with planter</td>
<td>$3,000 - $15,000 EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$12,000 - $240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (3-year)</td>
<td>$900 - $1,200 EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,600 - $4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging Flower Basket</td>
<td>$1,000 - $1,500 EA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,000 - $6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Approximate Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$471,600 - $1,270,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Street’s rich character stems from the varied storefronts and businesses present along the corridor. Many of these façades are intricately detailed and include historic signage, paving patterns, and remnants of storefronts dating back to the mid 20th century and before. An in-depth historical survey was done from 16th to Cesar Chavez Streets, as well as a storefront transparency analysis for the entire corridor. Overlaying this information is a start to identify where storefront sidewalk space can enhance public space for people to stay and spend time. We polled the community on what types of streetscape elements are most important for these locations.
Existing merchants can provide improvements on their fronting sidewalk—which can benefit their patrons and all street users. The costs of these improvements are generally carried by the business owner. Businesses in historical/cultural buildings may be more suitable for storefront public space investment to preserve and showcase this history. Improvements could be small—like moveable seating—or large—like decorative vestibule paving. The example costs below reflect a more intensive investment.

**Goal:** Support businesses or other sponsors by providing amenities on the street for their customers

**Sponsor:** Fronting businesses, neighborhood organizations, institutions.

**Potential Locations:** Multiple locations along corridor

**Cost:** $
Mission Street has pockets of wider spaces both on the sidewalk and within several plazas. These public spaces are used in different ways and include the BART plazas, Capp Street Plaza, the soon to be constructed Mission-Valencia Green Gateway, deactivated bus stops, existing sidewalk extensions at transit stops, and other underutilized spaces where the sidewalk is wider than normal. This corridor map identifies where these spaces are and what they currently look like. The Planning Department presented the community with ideas on how these spaces might better cater to the neighborhood and asked the community to prioritize should funding become available.
Existing merchants can provide improvements on their fronting sidewalk—such improvements can serve their patrons and all street users at the same time. Costs associated with these improvements are generally carried by the business owner. Scale of implementation can be one element or a multitude of elements. The costs below reflect a more intensive investment.

**Goal:** Provide additional sidewalk space for the community to gather  
**Sponsor:** City of San Francisco  
**Potential Locations:** Corners, mid-block extensions, alleys  
**Cost:** $$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN ELEMENT</th>
<th>COST/UNIT</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>$2,000 - $5,000 EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,000 - $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info/Bulletin board</td>
<td>$3,000 - $5,000 EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,000 - $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash/Recycling Cans</td>
<td>$1,500 - $3,000 EA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,500 - $9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Paving</td>
<td>$12 - $60/SF</td>
<td>600SF</td>
<td>$7,200 - $36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Planters</td>
<td>$3,000 - $15,000 EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$6,000 - $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History Marker</td>
<td>$3,000 - $20,000 EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$6,000 - $40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench with planter</td>
<td>$3,000 - $15,000 EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$6,000 - $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moveable seating</td>
<td>$50 - $5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$5,000 - $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging Flower Basket</td>
<td>$1,000 - $1,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,000 - $1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Approximate Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$43,000 - $211,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upcoming Projects

MISSION - VALENCIA GREEN GATEWAY PLAZA

The Green Gateway Plaza, funded by the San Francisco Public Utility Commission (PUC), will be located at the SW corner of the Mission-Valencia intersection.

By narrowing Valencia Street at this location, currently too wide for the low volume of traffic, the project will increase pedestrian safety by shortening the pedestrian crossing and will improve the experience of waiting for the bus by providing new seating.

Construction will start in Spring 2015 in coordination with the repaving of Mission Street south of Cesar Chavez.

The plaza has the opportunity to become a true neighborhood gateway, a community open space that can serve many different purposes.

Images: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
MUNI FORWARD TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

The Muni Forward transit plan improvements will have implications for what the public realm of Mission Street will look like in the future. In order to approach the design challenges of Mission Street in a holistic way, the Planning Department worked closely with SFMTA to identify designs that complement the Muni Forward improvements. This includes ideas for making bus stops more pleasant and functional, complementing transit at intersections and BART plazas, and ways to use bus stops that will be deactivated (no longer used as transit stops) as part of Muni Forward initiative.

The following images are draft summaries of Muni Forward improvements that were presented at the open house on February 18th, 2015. For updated information, please visit the project website: www.sfmta.com/14Rapid/.

Proposal Summary: Van Ness to C. Chávez

Summary of Proposals

- Existing Stop

Segment Location

- S. Van Ness
- Otis St
- Mission St

Summary of Proposals

- New Pedestrian Bulbs
- Lane Reduction (4 lanes to 3 lanes)
- New Transit Bulbs
- Transit-Only Lane (southbound only)
- Stop Removal
- New Turn Pockets
- Right Turn Only (northbound)
- No Left Turn (southbound)
- Convert Bulb to Bus Zone

DRAFT summaries of potential Muni Forward improvements Van Ness to Cesar Chavez Street
Proposal Summary: Van Ness to C. Chávez MUNI FORWARD

Alternative 2

Summary of Proposals
- Parking Removal
- Convert Bulb to Bus Zone
- New Transit Bulbs
- Left Turn Restrictions
- Stop Removal
- Transit-Only Lanes (both directions)

Segment Location
- Existing Stop

DRAFT summaries of potential Muni Forward improvements Van Ness to Cesar Chavez Street
Proposal Summary: South of C. Chávez  

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS**

- Extend Transit Bulbs
- Stop Removal
- Turn Restrictions
- New Turn Pockets
- Extend Transit Bulbs
- Relocate Stop
- New Stop
- New Traffic Signal
- New Transit-Only Lanes

**SEGMENT LOCATION**

- Existing Stop

**MUNI FORWARD**

DRAFT summaries of potential Muni Forward improvements Cesar Chavez to Randall Street
Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condensed Use Categories</th>
<th>Business Use Survey - Use Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eating and Drinking Place</td>
<td>Bakery w/ Retail, Bar, Café, Fast Food / Limited Restaurant, Restaurant, Full Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Service</td>
<td>Medical Cannabis Dispensary, Medical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>Fitness / Gym, Personal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Administrative Offices, Business or Professional Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Services</td>
<td>Drug Store / Pharmacy, Dry Cleaners, Laundry, Grocery Store / Small Market, Supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks/Financial Service</td>
<td>Bank / Financial Service, Check Cashing / Fringe Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools &amp; Instructional Service</td>
<td>Child Care, Instructional Services, School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Appliance, Home Furnishings, Books, Records, Clothing, Accessories, Florist, Gifts, Gunsmith, Hardware, Building Supply, Jewelry, Pawn Shop, Pet Supply Store, Photo Studio, Shopping Mall, Trade Shop (with Retail Component), Variety, Discount, Electronics Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor &amp; Tobacco</td>
<td>Liquor Store, Tobacco Paraphernalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Animal Hospital / Kennel, Auto Parts Store, Auto Rental, Auto Repair, Garden, Gas Station / Service Station, Light Manufacturing/ Wholesaling, Massage Establishment, Non-Retail Services, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Storefronts</td>
<td>Vacant, Vacant Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Entertainment</td>
<td>Adult Entertainment, Arcade Video / Amusement Game, Assembly / Private Club, Entertainment, Movie Theatre, Performance Theatre, Adult Entertainment, Entertainment, Galleries, Framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
<td>Motel, SRO Residential Hotel, Tourist Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Parking Garage, Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INSTRUCTIONS:

Conduct the following tasks for each BART Plaza. Conduct each exercise once per hour at both Plazas. Do one Plaza at a time:

**ACTIVITY MAPPING** of BART plaza and sidewalks.

- Do not map persons in the immediate vicinity of bus shelters (grayed out zone).
- Do not map people in the stairwells or escalators (grayed out zone).
- If necessary, use both sides of the Mapping sheet.
- Mapping is not a timed exercise. Proceed slowly enough to ensure accuracy of data.
- Complete mapping of the entire plaza and adjacent sidewalks before conducting Transit Activity Scans.

### ACTIVITY MAPPING
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![Diagram of BART Plaza]

### PERSON OR OBJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON OR OBJECT</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>20 YEARS OLD</th>
<th>21-5 YEARS OLD</th>
<th>65+ YEARS OLD</th>
<th>STANDING</th>
<th>SITTING</th>
<th>LYING</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE/CULTURAL</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC DEVICE</th>
<th>TALKING WITH EACH OTHER</th>
<th>EATING/DIRECTING</th>
<th>SLEEPING</th>
<th>INTOXICATION</th>
<th>SMOKING</th>
<th>WAITING FOR TRANSIT</th>
<th>URINE/DEFECATION</th>
<th>LUGGAGE/BELONGING</th>
<th>STROLLER</th>
<th>PUSHCART</th>
<th>STROLLER ON BIKE RACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>POSTURE</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>OTHER ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>OBJECTS</td>
<td>BIKES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NOTES**

MISSION ST PLAZA
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INSTRUCTIONS:

Conduct the following tasks for each BART Plaza. Conduct each exercise once per hour at both Plazas. Do one Plaza at a time:

ACTIVITY MAPPING of BART plaza and sidewalks.
- Do not map persons in the immediate vicinity of bus shelters (grayed out zone).
- Do not map people in the stairwells or escalators (grayed out zone).
- If necessary, use both sides of the Mapping sheet.
- Mapping is not a timed exercise. Proceed slowly enough to ensure accuracy of data.
- Complete mapping of the entire plaza and adjacent sidewalks before conducting Transit Activity Scans.
## Mission St Plaza Activity Mapping

**24th St Bart, NE**

### Data Collection Form

- **Date:**
  - Weekday
  - Weekend

- **Name:**

- **Weather Condition:**
  - ☀️ Clear
  - ☁️ Cloudy
  - ☔️ Rainy

- **Temperature:**

- **Time In:**
- **Time Out:**

### Enter Data @: tinyurl.com/sf-mission-bart-act-map

### Mission St Plaza Map

### 24th St Bart, NE

### Table: Person/Object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Posture</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Other Activities</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Bikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Francisco Planning Department

**Notes:**
### INSTRUCTIONS:

Conduct the following tasks for each BART Plaza. Conduct each exercise once per hour at both Plazas. Do one Plaza at a time:

**ACTIVITY MAPPING** of BART plaza and sidewalks.
- Do not map persons in the immediate vicinity of bus shelters (grayed out zone).
- Do not map people in the stairwells or escalators (grayed out zone).
- If necessary, use both sides of the Mapping sheet.
- Mapping is not a timed exercise. Proceed slowly enough to ensure accuracy of data.
- Complete mapping of the entire plaza and adjacent sidewalks before conducting Transit Activity Scans.

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON OR OBJECT</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>POSTURE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OTHER ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OBJECTS</th>
<th>BIKES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>STANDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

**MISSION ST PLAZA**

**ACTIVITY MAPPING**

**24TH ST BART, NE, p2**

**SAN FRANCISCO**

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**
MISSION ST PLAZA
ACTIVITY MAPPING
24TH ST BART, SW, p2

INSTRUCTIONS:
Conduct the following tasks for each BART Plaza. Conduct each exercise once per hour at both Plazas. Do one Plaza at a time:

- ACTIVITY MAPPING of BART plaza and sidewalks.
  - Do not map persons in the immediate vicinity of bus shelters (grayed out zone).
  - Do not map people in the stairwells or escalators (grayed out zone).
  - If necessary, use both sides of the Mapping sheet.
  - Mapping is not a timed exercise. Proceed slowly enough to ensure accuracy of data.
  - Complete mapping of the entire plaza and adjacent sidewalks before conducting Transit Activity Scans.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON OR OBJECT</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>POSTURE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OTHER ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OBJECTS</th>
<th>BIKES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

NOTES
### Instructions:
Conduct the following tasks for each BART Plaza. Conduct each exercise once per hour at both Plazas. Do one Plaza at a time:

**Transit Activity Scan** of bus shelter zones.
- Scan persons in the vicinity of each bus shelter.
- Begin scanning just after a bus disembarks and loads passengers.
- Stop scanning just after the next bus disembarks and loads passengers.
- Scanning is not a timed exercise. Proceed slowly enough to ensure accuracy of data.

### Notes
Enter data at: TINYURL.COM/SF-MISSION-BART-ACT-MAP

### Mission St Plaza Transit Activity Scan
16th St BART, NE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☀️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time In</th>
<th>Time Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission St Plaza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th St BART, NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person or Object**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Posture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mission St Plaza**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person or Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS:**
Conduct the following tasks for each BART Plaza. Conduct each exercise once per hour at both Plazas. Do one Plaza at a time:

**Transit Activity Scan** of bus shelter zones.
- Scan persons in the vicinity of each bus shelter.
- Begin scanning just after a bus disembarks and loads passengers.
- Stop scanning just after the next bus disembarks and loads passengers.
- Scanning is not a timed exercise. Proceed slowly enough to ensure accuracy of data.

**Notes**

**Mission St Plaza Transit Activity Scan**
16th St BART, NE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☀️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time In</th>
<th>Time Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mission St Plaza**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16th St BART, NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Person or Object**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Posture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSION ST PLAZA
TRANSIT ACTIVITY SCAN
24TH ST BART, SW

INSTRUCTIONS:

Conduct the following tasks for each BART Plaza. Conduct each exercise once per hour at both Plazas. Do one Plaza at a time:

TRANSIT ACTIVITY SCAN of bus shelter zones.

• Scan persons in the vicinity of each bus shelter.

• Begin scanning just after a bus disembarks and loads passengers.

• Stop scanning just after the next bus disembarks and loads passengers.

• Scanning is not a timed exercise. Proceed slowly enough to ensure accuracy of data.

NAME

DATE ☐ WEEKDAY ☐ WEEKEND

WEATHER CONDITION

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

TEMPERATURE

TIME IN ◯ TIME OUT ◯ ◯ ◯

PERSON OR OBJECT

GENDER AGE POSTURE

MALE FEMALE

65+ YEARS OLD 10-15 YEARS OLD

STANDING INFORMAL STANDING FORMAL SITTING INFORMAL SITTING FORMAL

LEANING LAYING

TOTAL

TOTAL

ENTER DATA @: TINYURL.COM/SF-MISSION-BART-ACT-MAP

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

NOTES
### PEDESTRIANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DIRECTION OF TRAVEL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HARBOR</th>
<th>HARBOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 15 YEARS OLD AND UNDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>≤15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### OVER 65 YEARS OLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### RUNNING/JOGGING

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### SKATEBOARDS, ROLLERBLADES, ETC.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### WHEELCHAIR/SPECIAL NEEDS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### CYCLISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DIRECTION OF TRAVEL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HARBOR</th>
<th>HARBOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 15 YEARS OLD AND UNDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>≤15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### OVER 65 YEARS OLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### COUNTERTRAFFIC

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### ON SIDEWALK

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### NO HELMET

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* MUST ADD UP TO 100% OF SAMPLE

---

### NOTES

---

* TINYURL.COM/SF-MISSION-ST-PED-COUNT

---

**Mission Street Screenline Count**

**Block(s)**

- Northern Cross Street
- Southern Cross Street

**Date**

- Weekday
- Weekend

**Name**

**Weather Condition**

**Temperature**

**Time In**

**Time Out**

**Sample Street Block**

- Screenline: Count pedestrians and bikes crossing this line
- Stand for 15 minutes at each spot, somewhere in the middle of the block

---

**San Francisco Planning Department**
### Mission Street Activity Scan

**West Sidewalk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Years Old and Under</td>
<td>≤15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 Years Old</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posture</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting on Ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiting Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to Cross Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating/Drinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuisances</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intoxication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating/Defecating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parked Formally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parked Improvised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Sidewalk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Years Old and Under</td>
<td>≤15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 Years Old</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posture</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting on Ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiting Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiting for Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to Cross Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating/Drinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuisances</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intoxication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhandling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating/Defecating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parked Formally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parked Improvised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

*Must add up to 100% of sample*

**San Francisco Planning Department**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STANDING</td>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✌️</td>
<td>SITTING FORMAL</td>
<td>Sitting on an object designed for humans to sit upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✌️</td>
<td>SITTING INFORMAL</td>
<td>Sitting on another object or surface not designed for sitting: steps, newspaper stand, planters; or on their own devices such as boxes, skateboards, large bags, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✌️</td>
<td>SITTING ON GROUND</td>
<td>Sitting in contact with the ground, on a cardboard box, blanket, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✋️</td>
<td>LAYING</td>
<td>People laying down on objects or the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⏳️</td>
<td>WAITING FOR TRANSIT</td>
<td>Waiting for a bus, train, or other public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⏳️</td>
<td>WAITING TO CROSS STREET</td>
<td>Waiting to cross the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🎨</td>
<td>CULTURAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>Looking at Art, or engaged in making Art (Graffitti, Murals, etc). Guided tours, music performances, preaching, parades, protests, demonstrations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🛒</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>Anyone interacting with or performing work associated with businesses located on the street, including customers and employees providing services or soliciting services/products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🍼</td>
<td>EATING/DRINKING</td>
<td>Anyone eating/drinking on the street including sidewalk dining operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>📥️</td>
<td>ELECTRONIC DEVICE</td>
<td>Anyone interfacing with a personal electronic device such as cell phones, tablets, laptops etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🏬</td>
<td>SMOKING</td>
<td>Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🔴</td>
<td>INTOXIFICATION</td>
<td>Individuals who are not sober or who are observed intoxifying themselves in the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🔄</td>
<td>SLEEPING</td>
<td>Individuals who appear to be sleeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🇲️</td>
<td>PANHANDLING</td>
<td>Individuals soliciting money or other items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚿</td>
<td>URINATING/DEFICATING</td>
<td>Individuals observed in the act of urinating/defecating in public; Instances or evidence of urination or defection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🐶</td>
<td>PET WASTE</td>
<td>Pets observed in the act of urinating / defecating in public; instances of pet waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚴️</td>
<td>BIKE PARKED FORMALY</td>
<td>Bicycles secured to a bike rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚴️</td>
<td>BIKE PARKED IMPROVISED</td>
<td>Bicycles secured to any other fixture that is not a bike rack.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MISSION + VAN NESS PED INTERSECTION COUNT: POSITION 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYCLE</th>
<th>A → B</th>
<th>A ↔ B</th>
<th>C ↔ B</th>
<th>C → B</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>CYCLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In May 2014, the Planning Department engaged in a significant effort of conducting a Public Life Survey on 16th street and 24th Street BART plazas. As part of this survey, volunteers observed and documented activities on both plazas between 8 am to 8 pm. The series of maps above indicate where people were observed on these plazas at each hour. The goal of these observations is to inform any programming or design ideas that the community would like to pursue on the plazas and the surrounding areas.
This series of maps illustrates some of the detailed information that our volunteers observed and documented on the 16th Street BART plazas.

“People-watching” is defined when an individual is stationary but looking around, relaxing, or simply “watching his/her surroundings”, and he/she may or may not stay at that location for a long time. People-watching indicates that such individual feels comfortable enough in that plaza to pause and look around. If such behavior had to extend for a long time it could seem as idling to other users.

“Sitting informally” is defined when an individual is observed sitting on a location other than a bench or any other furniture specifically designed for sitting. These observations can help us analyze how different elements on these plazas are being informally used as seating, and point out to the high demand for seating furniture that is flexible and adaptable.
In May 2014, the Planning Department engaged in a significant effort of conducting a Public Life Survey on 16th Street and 24th Street BART plazas. As part of this survey, volunteers observed and documented activities on both plazas between 8 am to 8 pm. The series of maps below indicate where people were observed on these plazas at each hour. (Please note that for today’s presentation we are only showing information until 4 pm).

The goal of these observations is to inform any programming or design ideas that the community would like to pursue on the plazas and the surrounding areas. The Mission Public Life team has held multiple community focus groups specifically on the 16th Street BART plazas to help spur a community driven effort to introduce new programming and new potential design elements. Please read about this effort on the 16th Street Plazas Focus Group Summary flyer.
This series of maps illustrates some of the detailed information that our volunteers observed and documented on the 24th Street BART plazas. A “people watching” activity is defined when an individual is stationary but looking around, relaxing, or simply “watching his/her surroundings”, and he/she may or may not stay at that location for a long time. People watching indicates that such individual feels comfortable enough in that plaza to pause and look around- if such behavior had to extend for a long time it could seem as idling to other users. “Sitting informally” is defined when an individual is observed sitting on a location other than a bench or any other furniture specifically designed for sitting. These observations can help us analyze how different elements on these plazas are being informally used as seating, and point out to the high demand for seating furniture that is flexible and adaptable.
In May 2014, the Planning Department engaged in a significant effort of conducting a Public Life Survey on 16th street and 24th Street BART plazas. As part of this survey, volunteers observed and documented activities on both plazas between 8 am to 8 pm. The series of maps above indicate where people were observed on these plazas at each hour. The goal of these observations is to inform any programming or design ideas that the community would like to pursue on the plazas and the surrounding areas.
This series of maps illustrates some of the detailed information that our volunteers observed and documented on the 16th Street BART plazas.

“People-watching” is defined when an individual is stationary but looking around, relaxing, or simply “watching his/her surroundings”, and he/she may or may not stay at that location for a long time. People-watching indicates that such individual feels comfortable enough in that plaza to pause and look around. If such behavior had to extend for a long time it could seem as idling to other users.

“Sitting informally” is defined when an individual is observed sitting on a location other than a bench or any other furniture specifically designed for sitting. These observations can help us analyze how different elements on these plazas are being informally used as seating, and point out to the high demand for seating furniture that is flexible and adaptable.