

Response ID	Public Comment/Questions about the project:
1	Please reopen Lake Street. The option you proposed is unacceptable to SF tax-paying residents. It's unfair, inequitable, and add stress to nearby streets. Stop your abuse of authority by taking our streets away.
2	Please no Traffic diverters, as they still impede people who live on or need to visit Lake St from efficient accessibility. Why should cars drive extra blocks, wasting gas and emitting more pollution, to turn to their street?
3	The current traffic blockers at Lake and 24th are in bad shape. The sandbags were replaced a month ago, but the bags are already broken, and there is sand all over the place. In addition, the bases of the blockers have very sharp edges which is concerning to have right next to a crosswalk - hoping we can get these temporary fixtures in better shape!
4	I am 100% opposed to this project! I don't want Lake St shut down. Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary : it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.
5	Do not close Lake Street. More than 3000 people are against it but you have ignored them. It has increased traffic and accidents on California, Clement and Geary yet you don't care and have ignored that
6	I would support this plan if local access only signs, no barriers, we're maintained at all intersections and additional do not enters were added at 8th Avenue and 17th Ave
7	We rely on Slow Lake Street for taking our kids to school safely on cargo bikes, it covers the majority of our route (12th Ave to 2nd Ave on Lake) and without it we would be driving much more often. Thank you for this thoughtful proposal! It will make Slow Lake Street even safer, and it gives us confidence that we can continue commuting by bike for the 9-10 years that our kids will be going to the same school.
8	I am a Lake St resident vehemently opposed to ANY form of Slow Lake St. It has significantly impacted my experience of living in this neighborhood, chiefly because of the impact on the traffic of neighboring streets and the amount of time it takes for me to drive to this route as far as Arguello. At the afternoon rush hour, I often go as far as Anza for an easy drive, as Geary backs up too. Crossing Park Presidio during this time can take a very long time. Furthermore, I walk my dog from our house at the end of Lake St to Mountain Lake Park several times a week and the street is unused and empty most of the time. People continue to use the sidewalks, which remain as safe & uncrowded as before. It is mainly used by bicycles (which drive pedestrians onto the sidewalk) and we have a bike lane already.
9	I live on California Street btw 5th & 6th Aves and often park on Lake Street, since my building does not have a garage. Will accommodations be made for residents who need to do that?
10	The slow street had it's time during Covid. It needs to be opened back up for those of us who actually live on the street and the surrounding neighborhood. Traffic on California Street is ridiculous and with businesses opening back up downtown, more traffic is to come. This was not thought out - to close Lake, and alter California's lanes. See the picture on the SFMTA site, and you will see how many people are walking down the street. https://www.sfmta.com/calendar/june-13-2022-engineering-public-hearing-lake-street-design - that should speak for itself. It is not used, like you think it is. Maybe you should just make it a gated community and gate off Lake to non-residence. This does not feel like the city I have lived in for 40 years.
11	I am opposed to the plan. Open Lake Street to what it was in February 2020.
12	I am OPPOSED to this final proposal because: 1. Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. 2. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary : it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. 3. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. 4. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. 5. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. 6. Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.
13	We need speed cushions between 15th & 24th Ave. Cars frequently run the stop signs, as do electric bikes. Kids on street are not safe if only speed reducing measure is Stop signs. Best if speed cushions at every other block to reduce risk
14	I do not understand how you are able to take away streets for my use in which I pay taxes to maintain/clean and repair? Seems that my rights as a SF resident are being ignored. If these are going to be made private street, then residents on Lake Strwet should take over the costs to maintain/manage. Not to mention that the amount of traffic and congestion now on California and Geary Blvd. are outrageous. Why is so much time being spent on this- Covid quarantine and mask wearing is over, people are back to work, children are back to school, we have several large parks in the Lake Street area and the street is super wide with both two sidewalks and two bike lanes- what more do you want! Open the darn street up!

15	Strongly oppose. Why are we using public funds to enhance the value of a small number of owners on Lake Street to the disbenefit of all other residents in the surrounding area? Please think about the entire city, not just a chosen few and the recommendations of city planners who are disconnected from the neighborhood.
16	This is a dangerous and outrageous proposal for a public street in San Francisco. California street has become very congested as a result of this closure. How are trucks, vans, emergency vehicles supposed to navigate this? And what about the many people who live next to the street? In addition, who benefits from this? Is this more graft and corruption at City Hall? This must stop now. Open Lake street for the benefit of all San Franciscans.
17	Existing Slow Street barricades, or even better more permanent variations like on Clay and Pacific, should be kept in place to discourage through-traffic. Lake Street is being used by drivers as a short-cut, often at high speeds, which is incredibly dangerous for pedestrians. There needs to be more physical "impediments" on Lake Street to discourage cars from using this as a through-street. The cars driving on there now aren't stopping at the existing Stop signs, so adding more Stop signs doesn't discourage them.
18	Thank you for making traffic diverters a part of your design. Please add more traffic diverters. They are the gold standard in making a route nonviable for through-traffic. They are the most important element of your design and there are not enough of them.
19	NO NO NO..... how can you waste money exploring this issue , when there are so many other issues facing SFMTA. This exercise in changing a public street to a private street , but a publicly funded street is unconscionable. This action just perpetuates the citizen divide we see all over the country, and San Francisco is better than this. Lake Street is right next to one the nicest parks in the city, Mountain Lake Park and the Presidio. Why does Lake Street get this special provision? Just because it was enjoyed during COVID does not mean it should be made permanent. Satisfying a few at the expense of the many is not what San Francisco needs right now. Please be reasonable and look at this from all sides. I live in the Richmond District and see this as a very big mistake. 1Hey, I want my street too, 14th Ave to be a slow street. I have just as many reasons to want this, why Lake Street, why now, why a permanent change to the traffic patterns of the Richmond District!? In my opinion you are wasting precious time and money trying to find a solution where no problem exists. NO NO NO TO SLOW LAKE STREET!!!!
20	Like the design. Let's do it.
21	I love the idea of traffic diverters...Why are there only four of them? It seems like there should be a few more here and there to discourage long drives through the street. Also, why are raised sidewalks being used on lake street itself rather than on the numbered streets entering Lake? It seems like a raised crosswalk on the south side of all Lake Street intersections would provide a very clear sign to motorists entering the area that it was a place to slow down and drive with caution.
22	Thank you to SFMTA for your work on this project. What has made Slow Lake Street so successful as a space to build community, get to local businesses, improve health, and shift trips to sustainable modes is the reduction in cut-through traffic. Cut-through traffic represents 95%+ of speeding / reckless driving and is the biggest deterrent for people to use Slow Lake, especially kids, families, seniors, and people with disabilities. I am encouraged to see traffic diversion in the design. Unfortunately, the traffic diversion is only partial, meaning cut-through traffic will legally use Lake as a cut-through from 2nd Avenue and 24th Avenue to Park Presidio, and car drivers will drive around the traffic diverters at 2nd, Funston, 14th, and 24th to drive on Lake Street. In order to eliminate cut-through traffic and make Slow Lake safe enough for kids, seniors, and people with disabilities, we need full traffic diverters in the locations where partial diverters are currently proposed. Anything less will result in the destruction of the positive community space that Slow Lake has become. Why are there only partial traffic diverters in the proposed, and what needs to be done to make those full diverters? The proposed design also lacks any traffic diversion for two 10-block sections—between 2nd and 12th Avenues and 14th and 24th Avenues. Having zero traffic diversion in these two 10-block sections will result in car drivers using Lake Street as a cut-through, increasing speeding and reckless driving, and endangering the lives of kids, seniors, and people with disabilities. In fact, cut-through traffic, speeding, and reckless driving are already common now between 14th and 24th Avenues due to the lack of effective traffic diversion there. In order to eliminate cut-through traffic, speeding, and reckless driving, we need traffic diversion at every intersection on Slow Lake Street. Specifically, we want to see diagonal diverters or block-end closures, as these are the only effective tools for eliminating cut-through traffic. We've also heard our neighbors who express concern about accessing California Street at intersections with no traffic control, and therefore suggest traffic diversion at 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 17th, 19th, 22nd, and 27th—at a minimum—to allow them safer access to California Street from Lake Street. Why is there only traffic diversion at four intersections, and where can additional diagonal diverters or block-end closures be added on Slow Lake Street to eliminate cut-through traffic? Also, what metrics will determine when additional traffic diversion will be added to Lake Street and how quickly will diversion be added when those metrics determine it is needed? In addition, the design eliminates four blocks of Slow Lake Street—between 24th and 28th Avenues—unnecessarily shortening this safe corridor for people using the Slow Street at the west end and eliminating a safe connection to the west end of Lake Street, El Camino Del Mar, China Beach, Baker Beach, and schools—including Presidio Middle School, Washington High School, and Burke's—where the Slow Lake Bike Bus has been helping kids and families get to school using sustainable modes. The full length of Slow Lake Street must be preserved. Why was the section of Slow Lake Street between 24th and 28th Avenues removed from the design, and how can it be restored so as to continue this safe connection for families and people of all ages who are regularly using Slow Lake Street west of 24th Avenue? Finally, the design excludes the sections of Lake Street between Arguello Street and 2nd Avenue and 28th and 30th Avenues, which leaves people going further on Lake Street vulnerable, including kids and families going to Presidio Middle School and people of all ages connecting to Slow Clay Street or using Arguello Street to travel to other parts of our city. Why doesn't the design include the sections between Arguello Street and 2nd Avenue and 28th and 30th Avenues, and how can those be added to the design? Thanks again for your work on this project, and please take care.
23	Open up Lake street. No traffic diversions if any type.
24	I love the traffic diverters! Especially planters which also help improve the street environment. Diverters are the best way to keep through traffic off the street and have an added bonus of slowing bike traffic through pinch-points. Small improvements: Consider a bioswale instead of a planter, where water can run back into the soil instead of as run-off. Also more permanent, less subject to vandalism. Consider more diverters where you have proposed 4-way stops. Diverters both move through traffic away AND slow bikes more effectively than stop signs. These could be cheaper -- bollards or posts.

25	your plan seems hostile to bicycle riders. i don't live on lake street, but i bicycle through there frequently. the space for bicyclists, the smallest space is unreasonable, and provides in one direction no possibility of passing another cyclist safely, and in the other direction having to pass in the road for cars. i calculate, 32.5% of road to aesthetics, 30% of road to pedestrians, 22.5% of road to cars, and 15% to bicyclists. maybe you haven't noticed, but the use of bicycles, particularly electric bicycles is exploding across our city. they are a very real part of transportation. lake street is an important safe bicycle route. you need to be more realistic about the needs of bicyclist. you need to be more appreciative of how much bicycling impacts the city in a very positive way. this plan needs to be more favorable in the amount of the travel lanes devoted to cyclist. about how they are going to pass a slow moving cyclist, possibly one carrying children and how they are going to pass pedestrians that are usurping the cyclist spaces, which always occurs, everywhere there is bicycle designation. please stop marginalizing bicycles and treat them as the growing segment of green transportation they are providing for our city that is healthy for all.
26	YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE BROWN ACT BECAUSE YOU HAVE NOT GIVEN PUBLIC NOITICE OF YOUR JUNE 13 "HEARING" AT LEAST 72 HOURS IN ADVANCE, AND YOU HAVE NOT MADE AVAILABLE YOUR ALLEGED "EXEMPTION" FROM CEQA.
27	I am very concerned about the Slow Lake St. proposal. I am opposed because it continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets, Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day, Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians and very important for me is that the Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.
28	Driving north on 15th Avenue with a right turn onto eastbound Lake, as residents of that intersection we strongly believe there should be a no entry sign in addition to the raised crossing due to aggressive and unsafe nature of drivers cutting through on 15th which an elevated crosswalk is unlikely to curb adequately.
29	I would like to see one more diverter section or some type of traffic calming between 6th-9th streets.
30	The Lake St. project is redundant. It provides unnecessary open space adjacent to real abundant open space in a far more attractive configuration. The project is unsafe, it forces traffic onto adjacent streets less able to handle the added traffic. This discriminates against the neighboring communities. It also takes away the life of the street, thus providing a more fertile environment for crime (see Jane Jacobs " The Life of Great American Cities." If one wants to live in a community of private streets let them move to Irvine where everyone lives on a lifeless cup-de-sac and super-blocks are the norm.
31	Of all the elitist proposals this city has conjured up, this takes the cake! Keep the nice single family dwellers safe from through-traffic, while the majority apartment dwellers on California street suffer the consequences of more congestion, upset/unsafe drivers, and all the soot and exhaust as a result of the additional cars. It was bad enough that you made California a one lane street for cars, but then diverting all the cars that would otherwise take Lake street into California street really takes the cake. I am all for more stop signs and speed bumps (please not those useless ones that have a cutout (what's the point even of having a speed bump?!)). But PLEASE DO NOT ADD SPEED BARRICADES along 2nd 14th and 24th! This is public street turned private for al the fancy single homes! A now private street that the public has to pay to maintain!
32	Please put a four way stop at California and 15th Avenue. This is a dangerous and heavily traveled intersection. It has gotten much worse since Lake Street became slow.
33	Why Lake Street? Why not make California or Clement Street the slow streets and divert traffic to Lake. The survey questions is basically selection bias at its worst. I mean who doesn't want a private street. Did we ask California St or Clement St residents if they favor their street being a slow street or if they had a preference which street would they make a slow street? This proposal is an injustice to everyone else who lives in this corridor and is affected by the increase traffic on their streets.
34	Please kill this project. Your survey is significantly flawed - who would not want to live on a private street? Of course, 70%+ of the residents of Lake street are in favor of it. But all past residents of the city paid for it through their tax dollars and closing Lake street is a significant inconvenience for other members of the community. Very few people are walking in the middle of the street during sunny days (week days or weekends) and virtually no one is using it at night. While this made sense during the first few days of the pandemic when everyone was ordered to stay at home, that is no longer the case and this street in particular should remain open for all taxpayers and citizens to enjoy. I have been biking on Lake street for over 35 years and it is more dangerous now than before it was closed as the few people who should be on the sidewalk are walking randomly without paying attention on the street, creating hazards where none existed before. Again, sidewalks are for walking, bike lanes are for riding, and streets are for motor vehicles. That design has worked well for over 100 years and there is no compelling case to change it, particularly on a significant pathway like Lake Street.
35	This project seems to be very "selfish" for those who live on lake street and disadvantages those who live nearby but not on lake street. Too bad the surveys are not conducted independently- very disappointing
36	I'm a Lake Street resident and I support these design proposals.
37	This was taken to a vote and Lake Street was approved as a permanent slow street. What you are presenting is not congruent with other permanent slow streets. Lake should look the same as Clay. Period.

38	<p>First let me say how surprised we are that Lake Street is remaining slow given the latest SFMTA survey results from this past winter: "Winter 2021/2022: A survey of residents to gauge design preferences for the future of Lake Street. Over 5,700 responses were received; 83.5% of Lake Street residents expressed their support for at least one of the three options that maintained the Slow Street. Of residents who live adjacent to Lake Street, 53.9% supported one of the slow street proposals over the "No Build" proposal." Of course the people who LIVE on Lake Street want it to remain closed off and private. For everyone else who lives on the side streets connecting to Lake and California Street the results from this winters survey were resoundingly clear that people DID NOT want Lake to remain slow. Lake Street ALREADY has dedicated bike lanes. There is no need for traffic diverters. We are supportive of the installation of more 4 way stops, speed humps and raised crosswalks. DO NOT INSTALL CONCRETE TRAFFIC DIVERTERS!!! PLEASE OPEN UP LAKE STREET again to car traffic with the additional stop signs, speed humps and raised crosswalks. That will ensure car traffic remains slow and the road is accessible to all. Again, based on the more recent and thorough SFMTA survey done this past winter....only the residents on Lake want to slow street, not the surrounding neighbors who have to deal with the additional traffic. It seems very elitist and unfair to eliminate car traffic on a road that already has bike lanes. NO TRAFFIC DIVERTERS PLEASE</p>
39	<p>I am adamantly OPPOSED to this proposal for three main reasons. I live at Cherry and Clay and Lake has been my primary E-W transport route for over 31 years. 1. Limits access of those with mobility issues. I have dupytrens, carpal tunnel and arthritis in both hands and had a spinal fusion in 2018 making it virtually impossible to ride a bike. However, while I am over 70, I am physically active when I can get to the site. I have an active 25 lb dog which I can no longer walk in the Presidio due to coyotes. I would sometimes drive to the dog park at 8th. Now it's impossible to park once I drive there. I also used to regularly play tennis at Mt. Lake Park, now I have the same difficulty getting and parking there. You are blocking access to the park to people with mobility issues. Seriously, increasing wheelchair access? If that's a problem then fix the sidewalks. 2. It is divisive, exclusive and inequitable and usage is not high enough to justify permanent slow street status. Lake Street residents have been told by certain real estate agents that their property values will go up if it is designated a permanent slow street. That means a corresponding drop in value to those who live on ancillary streets, including increased car, delivery and truck traffic. You expect me to pay tax on the maintenance and upkeep of a PUBLIC street where I have little access? Where you have now established an essentially gated community in one of the most expensive neighborhoods in the City? I voted no on A primarily because of this issue and will continue to resist funding Muni's non essential pet projects. 3, Prioritizing SF Bike over safe, affordable and dependable public transit. You are once again caving to the desires of SF Bike to control a street that was successfully used and well loved by pedestrians, bikes and cars for years. I never received a survey yet we live within a block of two slow streets. The supervisor declared that this wouldn't be a win-lose solution, that everyone would compromise. That is not what you are presenting today. It's a total win, for SF Bike. You, SFMTA, are trying to make the City so miserable for those of us dependent on our cars that you are hoping we'll just move. That's not an option for us. Reduced free parking near GGP, increased use of red zones, clogging traffic by reducing lanes on California and Geary, horrific traffic on Stanyan seem to be your priority. This is no longer a City that works for everyone and I will make sure that our voices are, heard.</p>
40	<p>Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary : it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement traffic diversions will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. (not ok at all) Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.</p>
41	<p>I don't see any reason to make Lake St. not accessible to cars. I lived off lake street for 40 years. I walked up and down the entire st. Rode bikes in the bike lanes, and there was always room for everyone. Monday - Friday the street is virtually empty since it was closed. Only on the weekends have I seen anyone in the street. This also causes more traffic on California st. Which had its lanes reduced. I am opposed to closing Lake st.</p>
42	<p>Overall, not a bad design. I think the biggest problem is the traffic diverters and the fact that westbound traffic will be forced onto 3rd and eastbound onto Funston making those streets much busier. I think these type of diversions are inappropriate for a street like Lake (from Arguello to 19th) where the blocks north of Lake dead end. This has people driving for several extra blocks in a circle to reach their homes north of Lake. I do like the added stop signs and would prefer that every block have a stop sign to slow cars and bikes. To me, this is a better option than the diversions which will send people speeding down 3rd and Funston.</p>
43	<p>I think this is a good proposal because it opens the street back up to local traffic. The added stop signs and speed humps discourages motorists from speeding through intersections. It's only fair to residents that both Lake and California are open to motor vehicles. Don't cave in to the wealthy bike interest groups!</p>
44	<p>Please open lake street. Traffic on California street is very congested due to the closure of Lake Street'</p>
45	<p>Hi, I am very confused by this page and proposal. It is unclear and hard to understand what is being proposed. Is Lake Street remaining a "Slow Street"? Will cars be returned to Lake Street? I still fundamentally do not understand why the street should remain closed to vehicles when there are large sidewalks, bike lanes, and a huge park directly adjacent to much of the Lake Street corridor. Please provide clarification on what the street would actually look like.</p>
46	<p>I'm opposed to the proposed changes. Lake Street has never need a dangerous street. It should be re-opened,</p>
47	<p>Remove all slow streets blockages because: 1. They just divert traffic and make it worse. 2. Lake (and Kirkham and Ortega) Streets are wide with sidewalks and bike lanes. 3. Slow streets remain empty most of the day. 4. Traffic diverters make situation more dangerous for pedestrians, drivers, bicyclists. 5. Slow streets become publicly funded private streets. 6. Blockages cause worse access for emergency vehicles.</p>
48	<p>Many cars turning left from Lake on to 14th travel very quickly, creating hazards for users of Lake Street and 14th Ave. I'm concerned that a diverter will increase the number of cars making this left and potentiating Please include a speed cushion, raised crosswalk, or other speed-reducing element into the 14th Ave traffic diverter. Thanks!</p>

49	I, along with my neighbors who live on or adjacent Lake St., oppose the continued closure of Lake St., including the most recent proposal. Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic onto neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary: it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.
50	I would request that slow street barricades be added back to the design for Lake Street. The current design effectively ends slow lake street.
51	Please just stop all of this nonsense and open Lake Street to what it was before the pandemic. There is NO NEED for Lake to a be a slow street given all of the other options we all have to enjoy the outdoors. I have 3 children and live in the neighborhood and Slow Lake has made living in the City a nightmare. I am an SF native who grew up in the Richmond District and live here now. Please SFMTA, stop pushing your own agenda and let us residents be.
52	Closing Lake Street when we were under lockdown made sense; it no longer does. One of the joys in living on 24th Ave. north of Lake Street is the close proximity of abundant hiking trails and bike lanes. Currently, if I need to drive somewhere, I have to cross Lake Street. It does not feel safe doing so. Bikes rarely stop at stop signs and can be difficult to see. Traffic has increased on California Street. I am concerned about public safety vehicles having access to the neighborhood. I am strongly opposed to the permanent closing of Lake Street to motor vehicles.
53	Lake Street used to be a major thoroughfare, a busy street. I am against closing Lake Street because traffic is just diverted to other now crowded streets. It should not turn into a private street, for the lucky "few". How are emergency vehicles going to get to the emergencies in that area without delay?! The cement diverters sound like an absolute driving hazard. Thank you for doing the right thing and opening Lake Street.
54	What's the purpose of the raised crosswalk on the north side of 17th? Why not add it to the south side of a street where a lot more cars cross that crosswalk and so it'd be more effective. Also, why not continental crosswalks on every intersection?
55	Shockingly inequitable project. As a tax paying citizen of SF I am being denied access to a public street and subsidize recreational use for a few. The recall of school board and Boudin should be a clarion call to you: we want sensible, logical governance by the people whose salaries we pay, not pie in the sky ideas of hired consultants, OPEN LAKE STREET, fully.
56	I am supportive of all of the proposed changes to Lake Street. We need more speed cushions, more traffic diverters, and less car/pedestrian interactions.
57	I'm writing to oppose the concrete barriers at 2nd/Lake, Funston/Lake, 14th/Lake, and 24th/Lake. I'm opposed to these concrete barriers because they are unsafe and prevent fire, safety, paramedic vehicles from entering Lake Street. This new proposal is ultimately creating a publicly funded gated community on Lake Street. This is NOT what residents want.
58	I understood and supported the Slow Streets program during the pandemic. I don't see how closing a public street to the rest of us makes any sense now. How does this benefit anyone except the residents of Lake Street? Please Open Lake Street.
59	I strongly oppose these changes to Lake Street. I live off Lake, and I have seen that the street is usually empty. There is plenty of room to walk on the sidewalk and ride in the bike lane. In addition, the traffic backups on California have caused congestion and additional drive time, which wastes more gas and is bad for the environment. Please reopen Lake Street!
60	The new traffic diverters are great, and raised crosswalks are also a great idea. All-way stops should have been standard where they weren't already in use, so that's also wonderful. The problem is they're not being used nearly enough. But it seems to me that you're removing: 23 barricades, at least one at nearly every intersection, and replacing them with 4 diverters and 7 speed cushions. More importantly, they're concentrated in two or three short stretches of the street and leaves long stretches of Lake without any Slow Street features. e.g., 25th to 15th; or 12th to 4th with nothing but a single raised crosswalk? Without clearly engineered and visible features consistently and frequently on the route, how will drivers, pedestrians, or cyclists even know they are on a Slow Street? It will simply be an ordinary street primarily for car use. This seem to revert all but a handful of blocks of Lake to ordinary non-Slow Street status. It seems like this will result in Lake effectively not being a Slow Street that is friendly for children on bikes, but rather primarily a car thoroughfare for much of its route. Yes, there are some appreciate slowdowns of traffic at the ends, but this is *not* making the street into a place for pedestrians, cyclists, and children. Please consider increasing the density and frequency of the diverters and raised crosswalks throughout the route.
61	Slow Lake creates a private street on a public access road that is critical for people accessing the Presidio National Recreation areas, Mountain Lake Park, and the Golden Gate Bridge. It places unfair burdens on other key access roads, putting all the busses and cars onto fewer streets, slowing down commutes and making crossing these streets more dangerous for cars and pedestrians. This was NOT mandated by the surveys and Lake St. provides ample space for bikers and pedestrians, who also can feel free to use the adjacent park for recreation. As our city NEEDS to get back to business and many people have left the city because they feel the SFMTA, SFUSD and city government have blithely ignored their needs to conduct their lives in the city--I urge you to return Lake street to the lovely, tree lined corridor for vehicles of all kinds along our national treasures. If you would like to co-opt the golf course again, that would be much more popular for families!
62	Will automobile traffic on 15th Avenue be able to turn east onto Lake Street and proceed to Park Presidio?
63	If I'm understanding the design, there is a flaw in that there is no barrier/diverter from 4th Avenue to Park Presidio to keep through traffic away. Someone coming up West on California street could turn right at 4th, then left on Lake and could then proceed unencumbered to Park Presidio. I think you need another diverter -- perhaps at 7th to force the driver back to California Street to discourage this practice. Otherwise, the design looks great.
64	I think Lake street as a slow street does not work. Cars still go on the street, but speed to not get caught. Without covid risks, there is no reason to have it slow.
65	I am AGAINST Lake Street remaining closed. With plenty of wide sidewalks along the street and in the neighborhood (including the Presidio), there is no reason to keep the street closed. Furthermore, traffic on California Street has become unmanageable and even dangerous as drivers try to speed around backups on the street. PLEASE RE-OPEN LAKE STREET!

66	Why?? Is the City doing this?? It makes no sense. I live north of Lake on 17th Avenue. I ride my bike to Union Square for work. The commute down Lake on my bike is perfect using the bike lanes on the street the way it exists today. Traffic on California St is a nightmare. I feel horrible for the residents on California St. All that congestion and exhaust. There are so few people walking on Lake Street. And really so few bikers. People are back at work. Children are back in school and generally families are away for the summer. The street is empty. It was only used fully during the pandemic. Now it's an absolute waste of money and resources to close the street entirely to cars. I'm a biker!!! Bike lanes are sufficient. Please put design and build efforts toward housing. Makes me crazy to think this has been funded by people that don't even leave near the Lake St corridor. Listen to the voices of the neighborhood. We are deeply divided on this issue. Why is the City "ram-riding" this through? Stop the nonsense.
67	Unnecessary, inconvenient, unpopular and illogical. Your so-called "survey" is an insultingly contrived way to justify forcing this madness on the citizenry. Of course most homeowners given a private drive at no expense like the idea! How about asking the rest of us?
68	Why is it necessary for every taxpayer in SF to pay to make a private street for the benefit of the few hundred people who live on Lake St.? It is not necessary. This is a solution for which there is no problem.
69	With the Slow Street signs/barricades removed, how will non Lake St-residents know that Lake is a Slow Street and through-traffic is prohibited? Otherwise, the plan looks great!
70	This is an unfair project for all taxpayers in SF. You are making the street complicated and confusing when there are already designated bike lanes and sidewalks for pedestrians. Why can't you just impose a lower speed limit and add the stop signs? Why do you have to completely block traffic from entering Lake Street? Please, reconsider installing permanent diverters and allowing cars to safely and slowly use Lake Street. It's a STREET.
71	It is not fair that Lake Street gets a private play space and others do not. Why? Do they pay more taxes for this? why does the rest of the City pay for this? And push Lake traffic to other streets to deal with?
72	I oppose the proposed plan: 1.The PREVIOUS SURVEYS WERE INADEQUATE: PREVIOUS SURVEYS DID NOT OFFER A LESS DRASTIC OPTION of more stop signs and speed bumps but without restricted access. The Survey asked about options, all of which assumed the street would be closed. 2.There is no need for restrict traffic to create a place for walking since about 100 yards north of Lake Street, THERE IS AN EXISTING PAVED SIDEWALK in the Presidio that runs parallel to Lake Street, west to within one block of Park Presidio. 3.Closing Lake Street to through traffic COMPLICATES GETTING AROUND The City. 4.We'd all love to have our personal street where we live be closed to everyone but us, but we live together and WE NEED TO SHARE The City, not create personal enclaves that server only a few. 5.Closing Lake Street MAKES LIFE MORE DIFFICULT FOR SENIORS since it was - and should return to being - an option to access the Golden Gate Bridge. 6.I have biked Lake Street more times than I can count, but for health reasons (I'm on blood thinners for life) I can no longer bike. So,I know from experience THERE WAS NO PROBLEM BIKING ON LAKE STREET BEFORE THE SLOW STREET TRIAL. So there is no reason to eliminate traffic all together.
73	I like this design and support the proposed changes. I bike and run on lake street frequently and I think the interventions bordering Park Presidió in particular would greatly enhance my feelings of safety.
74	How do unelected government employees get to make traffic control decisions without a city-wide referendum?
75	I hope that the use of traffic diverters is carefully reviewed. I am personally finding that these are becoming more and more dangerous as cars back up trying to get in out of a particular block. Sadly, it won't be long before a pedestrian or driver is severely injured via an accident.
76	It looks like the plastic bollards are being removed, and permanent traffic diverters are only being placed at 4 locations along Lake St. If that's correct, I think this is terrible. The bollards are *the* fundamental feature that keeps Slow Lake safe for bike and pedestrian traffic. A few speed cushions are wildly insufficient to prevent dangerous driving. The plastic barriers should be kept or replaced by permanent barriers at all current locations.
77	Closing Lake Street to make it a private entity for residents is wrong, unfair to other Richmond District residents, and serves no purpose other than to fit with an agenda by SFMTA and the Bicycle Coalition. Closing Lake Street has caused an uptick in traffic on California Street, making it more unsafe, crowded, and too busy for local residents. Playing favorites does not seem like it's a fair way to residents of other side streets and avenues. Why close Lake Street? This was part of a pandemic-related Slow Street Project. Now it serves no purpose, other than to create an unfair, private, and uber-selective closure for residents of Lake Street. This issue has created bad, negative feelings among residents of the Richmond District. There is no justifiable reason to create a new "special class" of street closures. This was put forth in an undemocratic way, with no actual input by residents the most affected by it's closure. SFMTA and others need to be aware of the negative environment they have created among neighbors, residents, and caused hard feelings where no need existed for a permanent street closure. There is plenty of room to accommodate bicycles, strollers, pedestrians and cars on Lake Street. This is a very bad idea and the agenda promoted by SFMTA was not supported by actual research of those MOST affected by the closure. In short, it's not a good idea, the permanent closure is not justified, and creating a "special class" of uber-wealthy and special-needs where none existed before needs to be changed and streets need to go back to their original purpose, to serve all residents equally, Please reconsider your biased decision to close Lake Street. Your agenda is unfair to the majority of nearby residents, and the unsafe traffic conditions on California Street alone serves as the main reason NOT to proceed with your agenda as planned. This is an unfair, undemocratic and divisive plan which serves only the agenda of SFMTA, and creates a special class of citizens. This is a very bad idea, and residents of side avenues and California Street can attest to the validity of increased traffic, stress, and bumper to bumper traffic at peak hours of use. There is no justification for this change to become permanent. Creating a special class of neighborhoods on Lake Street has led to negative feelings among many residents. Why does Lake Street get to be a private "For Residents Only" street?
78	Don't close Lake St. If you want to close it, put it on the ballot and let the people decide.

79	a Do Not Enter sign is proposed at Lake and Fulton but what kind of advisory will be posted at Lake and Presidio? Clearly there will be no where for cars turning off of Presidio to go except to wrap back around on Funston. This can only result in a terrible crush at Funston and California, which I believe is an uncontrolled intersection. California going East at this point is already a mess much of the day., A previous suggestion to me from an SFMTA employee that drivers should depend on their smart devices is inadequate. Requirement of use of a smart device to navigate should not be a condition of being able to drive in SF. Signage should be clear and routes should be able to be easily followed
80	I think you are taking the right steps and using the right process to move forward with this.
81	Why are we now closing off a street that was created as additional pedestrian walking space during covid?? Why is this a publicly funded private street? Why are we discriminating against anyone who can't afford to live on that street, who is handicapped, or who has children and needs to drive and wants to access playground or presidio (which by the way offers the amenities right next to the "needed" slow street. That street functioned fine for drivers, bikers and walkers the 25 years prior to slow street i have used it in all these manners. I have also used it these same ways during slow street and never had to use the middle of the road. There is very little use of that street as slow street intended other than weekend mornings, Why should the other neighborhood streets put up with massive increased traffic for the benefit of few. If there is an issue with speeding, or safety, put up speed bumps. Has the SFMTA staff visited this street, spent hours examining use as compared to other streets? I no longer can drop my kids at Baker beach or the south side of the Presidio without a 20 minute detour, We no longer go. I am OPPOSED to this final proposal because: Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary : it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies. I have a masters in city planning from UNC chapel hill and i understand that planning is making decisions for the larger good. This is the most idiotic, discriminatory, biased, special interest caving decision you can make, If you want the city to bike more, put your efforts in other places. This bike lane works fine to serve that purpose without needed a street closure,. The street sits next to a park and national forest. There is ample outdoor safe walking one block over. The pre-slow street Lake worked fine for all three users to co-exist safely. Spend your money and efforts in other areas.
82	So no surprise: the people who live on Lake Street like the idea of making it basically a private street, paid for by the city. These are privileged people who don't need more privilege. All the resources could be used for much better purposes. I'm outraged.
83	Thank you for creating these detailed designs. Given the number of intersections I don't think there are enough diverters to make Lake street truly safe and welcoming to pedestrians and people on bikes ages 8 to 80. The design is a good start but additional diverters are needed. We also know that public opinion about road treatments before they are implemented is generally quite different from public opinion after they are implemented. In general once people experience the treatments for a few months the level of opposition reduces. So I don't think opposition that may be received during this hearing is an accurate reflection of what the public's actual views will be when the treatments are implemented.
84	Comments I am OPPOSED to this final proposal because: - Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets which becomes both a nuisance and a danger to those driving and living on those streets. -Closing Lake St. is completely unnecessary: it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. This is an urban street - not a suburban cul de sac. If people want to let their kids play in the street, they can move to the suburbs. Alternatively they can take advantage of the many parks and all the walking areas of the presidio. -Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. This was a great idea during lockdowns when folks were trapped indoors but it has completely outlived its use. Now that people are back at work and school there is no need to turn Lake street into a communal backyard. -Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. This is not a standard layout and will likely cause many dangerous situations to arise and both drivers, pedestrians and bikers make mistakes from not knowing the proper way to navigate these streets. -Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. Only a small portion of individuals who live on Lake Street POTENTIALLY benefit from these changes. You are allowing the few to benefit at expense of the many. -Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies. This is terribly concerning. -the fact that this is what elected officials are dedicating their time and energy and taxpayer money towards is an embarrassment and abhorrent given all the other systemic more important issues facing the city like homelessness, drug addiction, financially unsound school systems. Truly shameful. Questions -how much would the proposed design cost? -where is the budget for this coming from? -have there been analyses done that show that this project is the best use of taxpayer dollars? What sorts of benefits or returns does this project drive? Has it been proven that the money going to this project has no other use in the community?
85	Why are you making lake st private!!! I have been cycling on Lake st. since the late '80's and never had any problems, Only now that its closed for cars, it is a major problem. You are not representing the Richmond community as a whole!! only for the few entitled lake street homeowners and the bicycle collation members who probably use it once /year!!
86	More sensible vehicular traffic in San Francisco makes sense. The Lake Street proposal doesn't. I walk across or along Lake from my home on 15th Avenue 2-3 daily. Yes, people walk, run and bike on Lake, but the sidewalks and bike lanes are underused by a wide margin. Space for everyone abounds. Stop signs and speed bumps certainly make sense to slow traffic. But turning vehicles off Lake? If I want to go north towards the Golden Gate Bridge, it appears I must make a left onto California Street. The intersection has no east-west stop signs and is dangerous. Also, more traffic will be diverted to California. This is frightening. Do Lake Street residents like having a semi-private street? I'm sure they do. But what entitles them to this at the expense of their neighbors. Honestly, have you observed Lake Street? The "need" may be theoretical but hardly practical. I'd love an explanation as to why Lake should be a slow street because I detect none.
87	This design does not provide for greater lane space dedicated to bike/pedestrian use. It maintains the two lanes for car traffic. This is an unfortunate design and will not create enough safety for children and residents who are using the street for exercise/recreation. The design should further reduce space given to cars.

88	I guess my first question is why all the construction and MONEY being directed towards LAKE Street. This is a wide street with bike lanes and stop signs. When did Lake become some "unsafe street"? If anything it is the cyclist that have created an unsafe environment by not stopping at Stop signs and causing motorists to swerve, to stop suddenly, etc...while the cyclist mosey on. Secondly, what happens to California, Clement and Geary? Traffic is getting worse on all the above streets not to mention more time and gas as one has to zig zag through the streets to get down the Richmond. Traffic engineering can be used elsewhere in this city. Not on a street that doesn't get any traffic to begin with unless this is a push from the cycling community.
89	I would like to see more traffic diverters and speed bumps not just at the main intersections, but also throughout Lake Street. For example, most cut-through drivers simply ignore the the Stop sign on 6th Ave and drive through full speed, because they know there is no enforcement.
90	The traffic diverters make the road more dangerous. Cyclists and motorized scooters are not stopping at stop signs and in several instances cars had to swerve to avoid hitting them. While your summer 2020 survey showed great support for a slow street, this was during a time when most people were not commuting to/from work. Now that people are going into the office and children are back in school the need to have this big of a close street no longer exist.
91	Lake Slow Street has become an amazing place for walking and biking. The proposed changes will substantially reduce the impact of the slow street by removing the current barricades at many intersections. While I like the new diverters, replacing 20+ barricades with 4 diverters is clearly insufficient. Every intersection with a barricade now should have a diverter under the proposed plans.
92	Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary : it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.
93	I strongly oppose this project and I live on Lake Street near 28th Avenue. California Street is a near parking lot from 8am-9am and 4pm-6pm during workdays. California Street was shrunk to one lane in each direction right before COVID and now it must support the traffic that used to run on Lake Street. Lake is an important street for east/west traffic in the western part of San Francisco. I have spoken to several Lake Street property owners who've admitted to me they primarily like "Slow Lake Street" as they think it will increase their property value. I personally think closing Lake Street is very regressive to those who live on California and Clement who must deal with additional traffic and noise on their streets. It benefits the relatively richer Lake Street property owners pretty clearly. COVID has entered the endemic phase now thankfully and it's time to open up Lake Street. Thank you.
94	Believe this is disruptive and overly expensive. Believe it will cause more traffic accidents on Lake Street and will also add to pollution. Need environmental impact study.
95	This feels like an enormous waste of taxpayer dollars and an intrusion for residents and non residents alike. Lake Street must remain open to automobile traffic to ensure safe and fair transit for all. There is more than enough space for recreation with the Presidio and Mountain Lake Park adjacent. You should consider closing the roads one weekend per month to see if there is enough use to continue.
96	The proposed slow street design is flawed in that it relies largely on new four way stops on Lake St to slow traffic. Problem is that too often cars, electric bikes, regular bikes & skateboards ignore stop signs and travel well in excess of 25 ,ph. With small kids, dogs, older adults on the street speeding traffic that ignores stop signs creates great risk of bad accidents. Thus more speed cushions, on every other block is badly needed to make Slow Lake St a safe street
97	Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians- BEYOND UNSAFE!!!! SUCH A BAD IDEA - WHY IS CEMENT NECESSARY?
98	Traffic diverters blocking one side of the street will work as well as the no through traffic signs that blocked one side of the street AKA they don't. Why can't SFMTA learn from other cities and use solid barricade traffic diverters like Berkeley and Portland do on their bike boulevards? Image linked https://pbs.twimg.com/media/FR9uN11VgAAkllL?format=jpg&name=medium
99	As someone who participated in the surveys and town halls I am surprised to see the very minimal interventions proposed here. Speeding is a problem for the length of Lake Street, yet there are only two speed cushions for the length of the street. There are only two traffic diverters. There is almost no change to the layout of the street. It is hard to believe this is the final proposal - it seems to only be oriented towards drivers who want to see their shortcut restored. It is also hard to understand how this can be seen as a "slow street". It seems this will be a return to the pre-pandemic thoroughfare of speeding drivers recklessly disregarding pedestrians.
100	I'm shocked by this design - why are almost all of the diverters getting removed? Years of outreach and polling have reaffirmed the public's support of Slow Lake, yet SFMTA has decided it makes sense to encourage more cars to drive on it now? SFMTA has completely failed Vision Zero goals if this plan goes forward and Slow Lake is dismantled.
101	I'm really disappointed that this proposed build is dramatically watered down. I'd like to really eliminate all through traffic with barriers and diverters (like we see in Berkeley).
102	Under this design, the street is no longer a safe walking, biking, or learning to ride a bike. I am writing to advocate for a safe plan that would present mixed car and person use. Cars shouldn't drive more than a block on the street, speed limit should be 10 mph for cars, and there should be clear notification at each intersection that thru traffic is not permitted. If possible local tech company maps should not use this is a route.
103	I would like to see more traffic diverters. They are the most effective tool to prevent through traffic, and cars routinely roll through stop signs.
104	Why don't we just leave the roads as they were before.
105	LAKE STREET FREE OF CARS IS MARVELOUS. THE ENTIRE STRETCH FROM 2ND AVENUE TO 28TH AVENUE SHOULD BE KEPT PERMANENTLY CAR FREE. AND, MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE TO DISSUADE AND CITE MOTORISTS WHO VIOLATE LOW LAKE STREET. AS LARGE A FINE AS PERMITTED UNDER CALIFORNIA LAW AND SAN FRANCISC ORDINANCE SHOULD BE ASSESSED

106	There is absolutely no reason to close Lake street. There's a super wide sidewalk and a dedicated bike lane. Closing this street only benefits the people living on this street. Why are these property owners entitled to a free front yard? Are they more important than the rest of us who need to drive on this street to get to work, to pick up our kids from school , to take our elderly parents to the doctors? The increase in the traffic on all adjacent streets and California street is huge and have made these streets so much more dangerous. Does someone have to die for SFMTA to see that closing Lake street is dangerous! SFMTA is a public entity who's supposed to serve the needs of all not just the property owners whose houses front Lake street!
107	Slow Lake Street is dramatically underused (especially during the week) while parallel streets like California and Geary bear the brunt of the diverted traffic. It's time to reopen Lake Street to all, not just the privileged few who live on this elite corridor.
108	I am just completely taken aback by this. We made comments and filled out a survey for a slow street, but this is far from one. I understand there were a minority of people who wanted a no-build option, which you have done here. Because you have proceeded with a no-build, and Slow Lake will cease to exist, at the VERY least, there should be 4-way stop signs on every block, raised crosswalks at every intersection, and speed humps on every block. Motorcycles are going to continue to have their fun speeding down Lake with their ultra loud, smelly, polluting gas engines if this continues as is. Large and small vehicles of all types are going to continue to race down most of Lake from 3rd to Park Presidio Blvd, and from 11th to Arguello, and similarly out west, if this continues as is. Please help us at least stay safe if we are once again forced to use bike lanes right next to traffic, walk on the sidewalks and cross Lake St at crosswalks. That is the LEAST you all could do.
109	I am opposed to Slow Lake Street.
110	I think this is a horrible idea. We live on nearby streets and the amount of traffic and speeding that this is causing is horrible. Open the damn street.
111	The Lake Street Slow Street is a horrendous idea. Lake Street should revert back to its prior status, with none of these design features implemented. 1. The project impairs the free access of tax-paying handicapped people and senior citizens to a public street. 2. This divisive slow street designation inappropriately favors a small minority of people over the larger majority. The usage by bicyclists, pedestrians and wheelchair bound people on their now- personal Lake Street is way too small to justify this closure, and the closure results in inordinate and unnecessary heavier traffic on other streets. 3. Many "progressive" San Franciscans rant and rage about the wealth of the rich residents surrounding Lake Street, yet by supporting this project they are essentially giving those wealthy residents a private street with non-local access limited to bikers and pedestrians. Yet the rest of us, who won't be able to use the street, still have to pay taxes to maintain that street. 4. Residents of Marin County must utilize 19th Avenue and Park Presidio to get home. Its a reality that isn't going to change any time soon. Recently the SFMTA installed carpooling and public vehicle-related limitations on the street which forces even more local traffic onto surrounding streets. Blocking Lake Street just creating another choke point /bottleneck which creates even more traffic on the surrounding streets. 5. A reversion of Lake Street back to its original status still allows pedestrians, bikers and wheelchair users to access the street, but without prejudicing the rest of the tax paying San Franciscans. Its the most fair result. 6. The project inappropriately promotes (and spends money on) bicycle use over safe, affordable and reliable public transit. Bottom line - the SFMTA is incompetent and corrupt. Unless and until the SFMTA submits to a full audit of its management practices, I will not support any additional funding to the SFMTA and will oppose the SFMTA agenda.
112	Is Lake St still a Slow Street, as approved by the SFMTA board? There appears no mention of Slow Streets in this design. Why are there not traffic diverters at all intersections? Why are there not clear signs designating Lake as a Slow Street? This proposed design pleases nobody and sets up Lake St for inevitable conflicts between speeding motorists and vulnerable road users.
113	As a resident of Lake Street, I am extremely disappointed by the detailed design for the Lake Slow Street. Despite the survey feedback showing support for the Slow Street and the SFMTA board decision in favor, your design has essentially made Lake street no longer a slow street. My concrete feedback is to return the design to an actual slow street design, with diverters at most or all intersections (instead of only a small subset) and to do more robust diversion. The design should also emphasize the street as a shared street (like the initial design proposals that *your agency* presented to the public), instead of a primarily automobile-centric street. I do like the raised crosswalks and speed bumps in the current proposal, but they do not go remotely far enough in creating a people-first space.
114	I am totally opposed to the Permanent Closure of Lake Street. I have lived on 29th Avenue off Lake Street for 40 years and feel this closure has increased traffic horribly on California Street. VERY few people are using Lake for recreational purposes especially during the week. The number of cars making U turns, driving a block at a time and delivery vehicles being unexpected creates real hazards as well as confusion and actual danger
115	I see that plans for a permanent slow Lake street are proceeding despite the public stated (by Tumlin) threshold for a permanent slow street is 75% support in the neighborhood. Lake street failed that threshold. I have now read the proposed plan in detail and my major objection (after any plan being proposed after the failure to reach 75% support) is the creation of the traffic diverters. These diverters essentially make Lake no longer a public street with full access and instead a private street. No one objects to traffic calming but seriously, you think bicyclists are going to honor four way stops? Right now pedestrians are complaining of bicyclists ignoring stop signs. Are you going to make it totally clear that pedestrians are to walk on SIDEWALKS and not in the middle of the street?
116	Please completely reopen Lake Street as it existed before the pandemic. The street is necessary for travel within the city especially for those who need to get to Park Presidio, then onto the the bridge. After the closing of lanes on California street to allow for more space for buses I have been stuck in serious traffic multiple times. Removing Lake Street as a driveable street and reducing California St and reducing California St capacity by half from Arguello to Park Presidio isn't a long-term workable solution. Lake Street needs to reopen as it long existed before the pandemic.

117	<p>I live near the intersection of Lake and 15th and for the past ten years have used Lake for ingress and egress to my home. While I somewhat understand the modification made during the COVID lockdown I strongly oppose any continued or further modification. There are so few people who use the street for recreation and those who do could so easily use the existing generous sidewalks or bike lanes or the hundreds of acres of public green-space contiguous to Lake Street. It has been my observation that bikers and pedestrians have become uncourteous (intentionally walk down the middle of the street so a car cannot pass) and aggressive (yelling at their neighbors in cars) and lawless (bikes flying through stop signs without even looking) on Lake and have made it a miserable experience to travel by car for a mere block or two to get to a traffic light (where it is safe turn) on California. Retaining or adding any additional barriers, medians, directionals etc to Lake will only make it more dangerous than during the pandemic. Please open Lake Street to normal traffic: cars, bikes, people which it is very capable of handling per its original pre-pandemic design!!! I stand with my community as follows: We are OPPOSED to this final proposal because: Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary : it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.</p>
118	<p>Traffic diverters do not "prevent vehicles from entering a block from one direction". They simply funnel two lanes of traffic into one, and surely no one will argue that that will improve safety. It doesn't take an engineer to point out that after you have reduced the traffic on Lake Street to almost zero, you should realistically change the timing of the traffic light at Lake/Park Presidio to be solid green for Park Presidio until a sensor or button causes the light to change. Cars are backed up past Geary during rush hour with cars trying to leave the city. Isn't there a clean air mandate that the SFMTA is giving lip-service to? No one can argue that an idling car will produce less air pollution than one which has already left the city. There is a lack of coordination between the part of SFMTA in charge of signs and the part creating slow streets. An example using Kirkum, another slow street, would be the removal of the time restriction on the no-left on Juda and 18th Ave. Cars leaving Inner Sunset are left with the choice of a blind left on Lincoln, using Lawton/16th Ave (a narrow, twisting, hill with buses), or adding 33% distance to their trip to make a safe left at a light on Funston/Lincoln. Did anyone ever ask the Muni drivers on route 66 what they thought of increased car traffic on that hill?</p>
119	<p>This design is completely unacceptable and utterly against what was expressed as the desires of residents and road users in two different polls. While additional stop signs are welcome, this design doesn't include any of the significant traffic calming and street sharing features that were proposed in the design poll. Why were those offered as the designs if SFMTA was just going to overrule and return the street to one dominated by cars and easily used as a thoroughfare? This is not a Slow Street design and shouldn't be allowed to be presented as one.</p>
120	<p>I live in the neighborhood and I'm very happy with the plan! I strongly support the suggested changes, especially the new planned traffic diverters, which I think will make a big difference for safety on Lake Street.</p>
121	<p>Traffic diverters and raised crosswalks on Lake street are unnecessary and should be eliminated from the design. Additional four way stops and speed cushions are sufficient to both calm traffic and divert drivers who feel the need for speed. Thank you.</p>
122	<p>As someone who is concerned about drivers using Lake St. as a through street, I love that this design incorporates the traffic diverters at key intersections. Thank you SFMTA!</p>
123	<p>Questions: 1. This project, as approved unanimously by the SFMTA Board after a lengthy public process, was for a Slow Street. This design, however, is not for a Slow Street: you've started calling it the "Lake Street Project" instead of "Slow Lake Street." Why was the nature of the project changed? 2. Who authorized this change, and what authority do they have to change a Slow Street project into a traffic calming project after the MTA Board authorized a Slow Street? 3. Why does the design call for "existing Slow Streets barricades to be removed throughout the corridor?" Why will these barricades not be replaced with signs similar to those used on Page or Sanchez? 4. What are the design goals for this design? What do you consider acceptable car traffic volumes and speeds on Lake Street after this design is implemented? How do you expect car traffic volumes and speeds on Lake Street to change under this proposed design as compared to present conditions? 5. What NACTO All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility category (https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/designing-ages-abilities-new/choosing-ages-abilities-bicycle-facility/) are you targeting for this design? 6. What Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) category are you targeting for this design? 7. Will you commit to regular evaluations of traffic volumes, speeds, and criteria that will prompt immediate design revisions if these targets are not met or a particular LTS is not achieved? If so, what are these targets? 8. What uses of the street will or won't be allowed after this design is implemented? 9. Will this design be safe for an 8-year-old child riding a scooter or two 10-year-olds playing catch? 10. Many pedestrians are currently walking and jogging in the roadway on Lake Street. How will this design keep them safe? 11. The standard for most other Slow Streets throughout the city is a delineator at every intersection. Why is that not included in this design? 12. Why do the proposed diverters only cover one side of the street at a time? Will drivers simply be able to drive around them, as they are already used to doing with delineators and Slow Streets barricades now? Were full diverters/modal filters (such as those used on Tiffany St) considered, and why weren't they used? 13. The proposed design at Lake and 2nd Ave appears to direct vehicles directly into bicycles (EB Lake just west of 2nd: the double yellow line striping angles abruptly toward the path of bicycles proceeding straight, pushing vehicles toward any cyclists who happen to be in this area). How do I not die here? 14. Under the proposed design, if a child is using the bike lane on Lake Street and a Dodge Ram pickup truck (103.5" wide with mirrors) passes in the adjacent lane, approximately how much distance will there be between the child's bike and the truck? How many continuous blocks will this truck be able to travel on Lake St under the proposed design, and how many blocks is the truck allowed to travel on Lake St under the existing design (assuming it is through traffic)? I'll submit comments at a later time. Thank you for all your work and help on this important project!</p>
124	<p>I'm the former Planning Director of the SFMTA and worked with the Slow Streets team through the first 18+ months of the program. I also use Lake Street frequently to get to various destinations in the Richmond and Presidio by bike. I don't believe that the proposed design will maintain Lake Street as a comfortable bike route that people feel they can use for travel by bike. Specifically, this design doesn't discourage through traffic on Lake Street and will increase the number of cars using the street, making it more stressful to navigate by bike. Please add diverters so there's a diverter every 1-2 blocks. Lake Street in the temporary configuration gave people access by car to the entire street, just not as a through route. There is no reason that needs to change. The SFMTA Board appropriately designated Lake as a street where non-auto transportation would be prioritized and that is not what this design would accomplish.</p>

125	I live adjacent to Lake Street and I am vehemently opposed to this proposal. SFMTA has not listened to neighbor concerns about increase traffic on adjacent streets when making this decision. I live on one such Street. I urge you to re-open Lake Street FULLY, and to acknowledge Lake Street as a vital east west corridor for those of us living south of the Presidio. Lake Street provides important access to the Golden Gate Bridge and also important access to Mountain Lake Park for residents of San Francisco. As a neighbor, I feel completely unheard on this issue. Please reconsider this horrible mistake. You screwed up Euclid, and now you're going to screw up Lake Street. This is an outrage.
126	I am adamantly opposed to closing Lake Street! Enough is enough. This concept is for the entitled, select group of people only. There are no people using the streets on a regular basis. In the meantime, the rest of the neighborhood streets suffer with clogged traffic, inciting bad and reckless driving by frustrated drivers.
127	I oppose this plan for several reasons. 1. It still diverts traffic to other streets 2. Lake street has wide sidewalks and abuts a public park. There is no need to keep this street closed 3. Cement dividers are a danger for both drivers and pedestrians 4, As a current designated slow street it's barely used 5. As the saying goes - if it isn't broke don't fix it - just let it go back as to how it was pre-pandemic
128	I would rather the city does not move ahead with the current proposal for further limits on car access. Instead, I would appreciate returning the street to allowing regular traffic. The nearby Presidio park, bike lanes and sidewalk allow for plenty of pedestrian access on Lake St without closing off the whole street. Diverting auto traffic to California Street increases congestion and makes commuting to my house two blocks off Lake St more difficult. Thank you for your consideration.
129	Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies
130	Why some people are more important than others? Would you close Tenderloin streets?
131	Slow streets are unjust and unfair. Every taxpayer is contributing to maintaining a path here they are not allowed to use, and is exclusive to the wealthy.
132	Thank you for your commitment to active travel! Lake St is valuable to me as an east-west biking corridor where I feel safe and relaxed. I love the traffic diverters and speed cushions. And please keep building them!
133	slow Lake St continues to divert and increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake Street is unnecessary. it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes and adjacent parks. Slow lake street remains unused and sits empty all day. Cement drinkers will make for an more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake Street has become a publicly funded private street. Fire, Police and Ambulance can not quickly access lake street, making it more dangerous for all neighbors in emergency,
134	Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary : it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street.
135	Will there be more greenery and trees planted along the sidewalks?
136	I'd love to see more diverters instead of stop signs: stop signs are not bike-friendly, while diverters are great for cyclists. Additionally, we know from current Slow Street signage that drivers are very willing to drive around diverters if the diverters only divert across a part of the intersection. We should have full-width diverters that prevent cars from traveling through intersections rather than diverters that just suggest to cars that they should not go through. We know that reducing through car traffic reduces vehicle speeds, and lower vehicle speeds improve Slow Street usage. We also know that half-diverters deflect only some through vehicle traffic, and we know that stop signs create traps for SFPD to ticket cyclists. So let's use the above knowledge and actually build bike-friendly modal filters rather than adding stop signs and partial diverters.
137	Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets - Closing Lake St. is unnecessary: it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks -Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day
138	Lake Street should not be a slow street. I live off of lake street at 26th. By eliminating lake street you are destroying traffic flow down California street especially during rush hours. It's especially an issue at California and presidio park ways and after eliminating two lanes east of presidio on California you are creating additional traffic and unsafe environment.
139	Lake would no longer be a slow street without delineators at every intersection. There are already drivers ignoring the delineators and cutting through on lake, putting everyone's safety at risk. Leaving only four diverters is asking for trouble and would no longer make this a comfortable street for active transportation. We need diverters at every intersection. I live on Lake Street and bike, walk and drive on it daily. There is no need to remove diverters. That will only encourage drivers to go more quickly and stay on Lake longer. SF has 2,612 streets, and nearly 100% of them prioritize car traffic over every other potential user of that space. Lake Street was approved by the MTA Board. This proposal waters down that designation to the point of meaninglessness. This watered-down proposal is the worst of both worlds. It will not appease the drivers who want to use Lake Street as a highway and it will discourage active transportation and community. Whoever inevitably ends up maimed or killed by this design will suffer the most. I just hope it is not my six-year-old son who rides his bike or plays t-ball on Lake Street.
140	Rather than create road blocks and diverters, why don't we narrow down Lake Street, widen the sidewalks, and consider weekend only closures os sections of Lake Street.
141	Keep streets open for vehicles. Every time I walk or drive by these streets NO ONE IS USING THEM. I understand why this was necessary during Covid, but Covid has been long over.
142	I think the extra stop signs are a great idea along Lake street. The traffic diversion barriers are unnecessary and extraordinarily punitive to the residents of West clay Park. By the design, we are not allowed to turn left or right at 24th Ave onto lake street, a street I've driven all my life without hitting anyone with my car. Forcing us up to a left turn at California Street to go east is unreasonable. As a resident of the neighborhood, we should be allowed to drive at least to a numbers avenue that has a stop sign at California. Take the traffic diversion barriers out of the plan!!!, all the other modifications are reasonable enough.!
143	Slow streets gives a false sense of security. Your guard is down, kids can run into the street,etc.

144	No to the traffic diverters, which DECREASE safety by encourage cars to drive the wrong way down streets.
145	This quiet street movement is unnecessary and disruptive to neighborhoods and traffic on the neighboring streets. It has the appearance of being classist and puts a stain on an otherwise beautiful part of town. Those streets were paid for by the taxes of the people you now exclude from using them. Open up Lake Street and all other streets. Open San Francisco!
146	Closing Lake Street during the pandemic was beneficial to the local community however that benefit no longer exists. I live in the neighborhood and am retired. I walk on Lake Street weekly during the day and have been for many years. Since school has resumed over a year ago Lake Street has been virtually empty during the weekday. As there is a dedicated bike lane and very few walkers or families using Lake Street I do not see any need for closing Lake Street. If your plans as stated goes forth Lake Street becomes a private street for those residents supported by City tax payers like myself.
147	Supportive of proposed ideas EXCEPT The traffic diverters. Please remove from the final plan
148	I would prefer that the roadway remain open for pedestrian use, and that all current barricades be replaced with permanent and/or quick-build diverted (rather than a small subset as proposed). Please keep the street primarily for all active transportation modes as a slow street, rather than just a (hopefully) slower car traffic street.
149	In your discussions with the Open Lake Street group last week you said these were to be concrete permanent barriers. This language on your website is misleading as it doesn't communicate that at all. And there are no visuals as to what these concrete barricades will look like. I don't believe this is giving the public the information needed for an honest public comment or to make a real analysis and determination of this project. Please change your language to be more forthright and add visuals of these barriers so the public can understand the magnitude of this new idea. The slow streets team has unilaterally decided to push forward with a totally new option, previously undiscussed or publicly vetted. Our community has had no advance discussions, nor was this option in the last survey. Given that this is a completely new unvetted proposal for our community and people have just left for summer and schools are now all out, I think you should allow at least 3 months to reach out to families plus this community of largely Chinese and Russians as well as many elderly who need a more extensive outreach then just an email. I think 6 months would be even better since that is the amount of time that you last engaged with the community with your last survey and ideas. We private citizens took hundreds of hours canvassing the streets in December 2021 to make sure all our voices could be heard during your last survey and proposals. It is the only way to really understand the whole community's feeling and opinions and not just the activated pro slow group and the bike coalition. No where in the last two years of discussions, public surveys or emails, were concrete barricades discussed. This new idea is from left field. And to give the community only two weeks to form a developed opinion while so many have just taken off for the summer is just not right. You have offered up something completely new here. It is somewhat misleading to imply that you have "incorporated our desires" into this new plan. We advocated for stop signs and speed bumps at each intersection IN PLACE of bollards and closed streets, not as an addition too a permanently closed with concrete barricades. The 2,500 people who want Lake Street open (restored to its the pre pandemic state), did in fact ask for stop signs and speed bumps at all intersections. The community has been asking for them for 15 years plus. But we asked for stop signs and speed bumps IN PLACE OF bollards not in addition too then let alone these solid concrete barriers no one has ever heard about or vetted. Lake street was always a safe and vital road for our community. Moving 5000 to 8000 cars a day with negligible accidents, nearly none. We had 10' side walks and wide bike lanes. Those 8000 to 5000 cars a day are now forced onto california and geary. Those of us who drive them daily know how dangerous it has become. Putting permanent concrete barriers is forcing residence to enter into california at intersections with no stop light. It is also forcing the community to needlessly circle. All this while Lake street sits empty and unused. All this bc someone identified Lake street as an ideal causeway for the tiny percentage of bikers. I am strongly opposed to these completely new plans. Please identify the barriers in your plans as permanent concrete blockades. As it is now it is unclear and misleading.
150	Please add the barricades or plastic diverted to every block like on every slow street. Anything less is endangering all uses of the street. SMFTA approved a permanent Slow Street, not what has been presented.
151	Lake Street should be out back the way it was before the Pandemic and Slow Streets. It's duplicative and unnecessary and barely used as a Slow Street.

152	<p>Thank you to SFMTA for your work on this project. Ultimately, I'm confused. Didn't the SFMTA Board vote to make Lake a permanent Slow Street? Why is it now just a traffic calming project? This makes it unsafe for my family. Please take heed of this message and the others sending it. I urge SFMTA to do the following before approving the design for Slow Lake Street: 1) Upgrade the four partial traffic diverters to full traffic diverters to eliminate cut-through traffic. 2) Add diagonal diverters or block-end closures at all intersections to ensure cut-through traffic on Lake Street is eliminated. 3) Extend Slow Lake Street to Arguello Street and 30th Avenue to allow for more connections. What has made Slow Lake Street so successful as a space to build community, get to local businesses, improve health, and shift trips to sustainable modes is the reduction in cut-through traffic. Cut-through traffic represents 95%+ of speeding / reckless driving and is the biggest deterrent for people to use Slow Lake, especially kids, families, seniors, and people with disabilities. I am encouraged to see traffic diversion in the design. Unfortunately, the traffic diversion is only partial, meaning cut-through traffic will legally use Lake as a cut-through from 2nd Avenue and 24th Avenue to Park Presidio, and car drivers will drive around the traffic diverters at 2nd, Funston, 14th, and 24th to drive on Lake Street. In order to eliminate cut-through traffic and make Slow Lake safe enough for kids, seniors, and people with disabilities, we need full traffic diverters in the locations where partial diverters are currently proposed. Anything less will result in the destruction of the positive community space that Slow Lake has become. Why are there only partial traffic diverters in the proposed, and what needs to be done to make those full diverters? The proposed design also lacks any traffic diversion for two 10-block sections—between 2nd and 12th Avenues and 14th and 24th Avenues. Having zero traffic diversion in these two 10-block sections will result in car drivers using Lake Street as a cut-through, increasing speeding and reckless driving, and endangering the lives of kids, seniors, and people with disabilities. In fact, cut-through traffic, speeding, and reckless driving are already common now between 14th and 24th Avenues due to the lack of effective traffic diversion there. In order to eliminate cut-through traffic, speeding, and reckless driving, we need traffic diversion at every intersection on Slow Lake Street. Specifically, we want to see diagonal diverters or block-end closures, as these are the only effective tools for eliminating cut-through traffic. We've also heard our neighbors who express concern about accessing California Street at intersections with no traffic control, and therefore suggest traffic diversion at 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 17th, 19th, 22nd, and 27th—at a minimum—to allow them safer access to California Street from Lake Street. Why is there only traffic diversion at four intersections, and where can additional diagonal diverters or block-end closures be added on Slow Lake Street to eliminate cut-through traffic? Also, what metrics will determine when additional traffic diversion will be added to Lake Street and how quickly will diversion be added when those metrics determine it is needed? Finally, the design excludes the sections of Lake Street between Arguello Street and 2nd Avenue and 28th and 30th Avenues, which leaves people going further on Lake Street vulnerable, including kids and families going to Presidio Middle School and people of all ages connecting to Slow Clay Street or using Arguello Street to travel to other parts of our city. Why doesn't the design include the sections between Arguello Street and 2nd Avenue and 28th and 30th Avenues, and how can those be added to the design? Thanks again for your work on this project, and please take care.</p>
153	Open Lake Street! It was closed as a temporary matter when people were home during COVID. We are back to work and 1) no one is using it and 2) traffic is terrible on California Street
154	Lake street have wide sidewalks and parks around it, city don't need another golden gate park. i think its creates unnecessary troubles for emergency services as well as any contractors or utility workers
155	Overall I'm impressed with the draft designs. There are a few stretches where it's more than two blocks before a stop sign is reached. I'm interested in effectiveness of the traffic diverters, and signage throughout Lake Street. My main concern is in regards to safety and that automobiles will weave around (going against traffic) to get beyond the traffic diverter. I'm also concerned that removing the current signage will make drivers think the street is open to through traffic. I think there should be some signage to recognize Lake as a slow street. What is the official speed limit of Lake Street as a slow street? My thoughts are that if the speed limit is like 15 mph, then there should be speed limit signs posted throughout. I'm also interested to learn how much Public Works can contribute in making community oriented infrastructure celebrating Slow Lake.
156	I live on 10th Ave and am 100 percent opposed to the proposal. None of the concerns which I raised in earlier comment have been addressed by the FAQ. First and most notably, ALMOST NO ONE IS USING THE STREET TO WALK OR. BIKE!! Second, the existing bike lanes and sidewalks are big enough to accommodate the. Bike and pedestrians traffic. Third, THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS SPLIT on this issue, and the MTA proposal is tearing the neigh neighborhood apart, not bringing it together. Fourth, we feel bullied by the Bike Coalition and its staffers - they are fully funded, have paid for signs and consultants, drowning out the voice of the neigh boyhood. Finally, MTA staff has not acknowledged the number of people who OPPOSE closing the street permanently.
157	There should be more diverters. Diverters should extend across the whole road to prevent scofflaw drivers from going around them in the wrong lane.
158	Closing it is unnecessary. There's not much traffic and the sidewalks are large enough for usage.
159	This is terrible for traffic, open up Lake Street again
160	Open Lake Street for normal traffic!
161	Implore you to install a traffic diverter at 15th Ave and eastbound Lake Street. This is by far the most dangerously trafficked intersection on the corridor. Missing a diverter here would be a grave late stage error.
162	Please open up the slow streets.
163	Please allow slow streets and bike lanes
164	Please no concrete divertors,
165	I am in favor of maintaining Lake Street as a slow street.
166	Block Lake means people have farther to drive, create more traffic and more pollution. It makes no sense at all to keep it pedestrian-only, for the good of people or the environment.

167	Lake street was a safe street before the pandemic closure. It has always had wide bike lanes and frequent stop signs. Virtually every avenue that crosses it ends in a cul de sac and it borders a national park. There is absolutely no need to close it to traffic. What this proposal amounts to is the privatization of a public street benefitting only the property values of those who live in what is already one of the city's wealthiest neighborhoods. This is an example of elitist exclusion at its worst.
168	Idling cars elsewhere are very bad for the environment. NO SLOW STREETS!
169	Please keep Lake Street a slow street. We've overwhelmingly asked for this. The proposal is not a slow street, and will not provide the safety of the current implementation nor of other slow street designs proposed as options earlier in the process.
170	Why can't everyone share lake street? What is the basis to close the street beside cyclists decided only they have rights.
171	Why do rich home owners get to have private streets ?
172	It is absolutely outrageous that public streets are being taken away so that some private individuals in a neighborhood can have a recreational area even though there is a big park nearby with wide sidewalks up and down lake Street. The dim lights at night provided by the crappy city street lights are setting up an accident situation for sure. There is no reason to take away Lake Street and transform it into a private enclave for a few hundred people while thousands of people are forced on the side streets and into endless traffic jams on the newly constricted California Street. Stop trying to greenwash a really stupid ideas..
173	I am OPPOSED to this final proposal because: 1. Slow Lake Street continues to divert/increase traffic to neighboring streets; 2. Closing Lake Street is unnecessary it has wide sidewalks bike lanes and adjacent parks; 3. Slow Lake Street remains are used and empty all day, almost every day; 4. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians; 5. Slow Lake Street has become a publicly funded private street; 6. Fire police and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake Street Creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in an emergency. Please reopen Lake Street and share it with everyone.
174	As a 23 year resident of 18th Avenue at Lake Street, I find this proposal outrageous, offensive and unnecessary. I would like to think the public comments would make some impact, but it is abundantly clear that the SFMTA's Slow Streets Group, a self serving opportunistic group serving a vocal minority, was never going to consider anything less than making material changes to Lake Street. This entire process has been a charade. But more importantly, instituting these changes, creates a multitude of problems. I come and go from my house several times a day and I can say from personal experience, Slow Lake Street continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Slow Lake Street remains barely used and sits virtually empty all day, almost every day. Walkers who could be easily on the sidewalk, feel compelled to saunter down the middle of the street. Bikers, who already have a bike lane, also feel it is necessary to ride in the middle of the street. Some parents, think the street is a playground as evidenced by the father-son football game in the middle of the street as I was trying to make my way home last week. Lake Street, as it existed before Covid, addressed everyone's needs, bikers, walkers and drivers. There are wide sidewalks, bike lanes, disabled access on every corner and adjacent parks. The cement diverters which seem to be an entirely new concept (not presented at the public meetings I 'attended') will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. I am concerned that fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake Street, creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies. Seems response times will be negatively impacted due to the the diverters, raised sidewalks and speed cushions. Pushing cars off Lake Street continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. California Street and the adjacent streets are clogged during peak hours. The survey that concluded there is not increased traffic on these streets is bogus. The data was collected during the pandemic when those who could, worked from home. As people continue to go back to work, school, etc, the traffic is getting worse. The proposed design elements will make Lake Street, what is now a lovely, bucolic street (minus the crappy, temporary signs) permanently ugly with concrete barriers, a few flowers that will eventually die be damned, hastily poured speed bumps (evidenced by all the others the SFMTA has created in the city) and hideous speed cushions.
175	What this draft design hasn't clearly stated anywhere is that Lake will no longer be a "slow street" that deprioritizes cars, despite the overwhelming popularity of it. This attempt at a "compromise" caters to a vocal few who still won't be happy with the traffic diverters. The draft design primarily returns Lake to it's original status quo, and once again favors car drivers over all modes of active transportation. I'm disappointed.
176	I support this project. I hope SFMTA can implement everything it would like to present this as an example for all slow streets throughout the city. To show what it can be if we use some mixed-mode and not car-centric forward thinking. I would offer that we should look at installing traffic circles at key intersections, similar to what has been done recently in the Presidio.
177	We are strongly opposed to this project. There are ample opportunities to access parks within steps of Lake Street.
178	Open to cars. Bikes can go through parks or use the large bike lanes.
179	This is a disaster for those that need to travel downtown every day. It forces us to use clogged, potholed, and dangerous California and Clement St. Slow Lake St solves a problem that does not exist. SF needs to focus on solving real problems. Please reconsider.
180	Lake Street is for all modes of transportation - including cars. NO SLOW STREET on LAKE.
181	Please put up as many barriers as possible. Drivers are ignoring and removing the temporary barriers. My 4 yr old rides her bike on Lake st 4x/ week and we are constantly buzzed by cars moving too fast. she learned to ride a regular bike on her 3rd bday on Lake st. Slow Lake street has been a Godsend
182	Please do not water down the safety improvements for Slow Lake Street. Residents of Lake Street and Richmond District neighbors overwhelmingly support Slow Lake Street. Lake Street needs MORE safety improvements, not less.

183	The proposed permanent closure of Lake Street to vehicles is unnecessary and unfair to neighboring residents living on neighboring streets. Why should any of San Francisco's residents request that their street not be made available to "TAX" paying citizens of San Francisco. We all pay taxes and should be treated on a level playing field. One neighborhood or street should not have the right to request that their street be made effectively pedestrians. It is my understanding that residents of Lake Street will still have cars in their garages and will be able to use them as they see fit. So basically they can drive on their street, but no one else can? If everyone starting doing this, how would we get around in the city of San Francisco. Let's get real, this is a wealthy neighborhood who already benefits from wide sidewalks and an extra wide street with bike lanes. A permanent pedestrian slow street is neither needed nor does it make sense. It causes increased traffic for California street and Clement and simply isn't right. We've got to have better things to do with our public funds than this. All these slow streets were suppose to be temporary during the worst of the pandemic, not permanent. The city and the mayor should keep their word and return the SF city streets back to the way they were pre covid. Thank you.
184	This whole Slow Lake Street project is STUPID & Unnecessary. Stop this project IMMEDIATELY. We have been very patient up until now. You CRAZY Socialist Bureaucrats have gone too far. Return to Lake Street to "as before" The Pandemic. We want NO BUILD
185	For those needing to get to Park Presidio Northbound, Lake Street used to be the most efficient route.
186	Why not spend all this extra money and just leave Lake Street alone. It worked fine before all of this started. I drove on it yesterday and there were no walkers, cyclists, scooters, no people except cars on the street. This is all so unnecessary.
187	Very disappointed with this new plan that does not do nearly enough to keep Lake Street as a Slow Street. Plan should do more to encourage walking and cycling in the street. Plan should retain Slow Street Barricades and have four-way STOP signs at every intersection, and these must be enforced. More Raised Crossings, more Speed Cushions and more traffic diverters.
188	1. Have your engineers' California Street traffic count numbers that you are basing your conclusions on been grossed-up (i.e., increased) by 40% to account for the increased traffic that will occur once our 40%-vacant Downtown fully reopens? 2. As I look down Lake Street now on this brilliantly sunny week day I see only six people walking down it - half on the sidewalk (this is the case basically all week days that I have observed). California Street clogs will only intensify as the 40% Downtown office vacancies refill. Question: Why is it equitable to punish parents taking kids to / from school and Downtown workers trying to earn a living to give Lake Street property owners a city-funded private drive?
189	We NEED to remove the diverters. Lake street should be returned to it's original pre-pandemic state. However, since you are looking for a compromise, the stop signs are fine and the raised crosswalks are okay. The huge issue are the diverters. Making left turns onto California street is dangerous and difficult. You will be forcing people to make dangerous turns with the diverters which is not okay. Alternatively they can go make multiple rights or try to cross California and then make a right right and right, but I thought you wanted to help the environment by reducing emissions. You are only making it worse. The cars sitting idle on California is not helping while Lake sits empty. Open Lake and let the cars drive with traffic calming measures (stop signs and the raised cushions) but do NOT use diverters. Cyclists can use the existing bike lanes like they have since 1971 and the sidewalks which are nice and wide. Please stop making the neighborhood so divisive and allowing people who do not live in the neighborhood to dictate what happens.
190	We don't need slow streets! They cause traffic jams on surrounding streets.
191	I appreciate the good intent, but I think all of this is overkill. None of the proposed features are necessary, Lake St. was accessible and shared by many before the pandemic, I think we should go back to that design. I hate to say it, but I think support for 'slow' Lake St. is mostly from a small number of wealthy property owners on Lake and nearby, whose property values will rise if Lake turns into a private playground, irrespective of the effect that 'slow' Lake has on other SF residents, workers, MUNI, etc.
192	Open Lake Street! It was great before the closure. No need for closure.
193	I'm 72yo, live near Lake St., and now use it instead of driving my car as a safe bike route when going to stores and events in the vicinity and further destinations using Clay Slow Street. I feel safe riding a bike only on Slow Streets. I won't bicycle too far off Slow Streets, dedicated bikeways, and separated bike lanes. In general, the proposed design seems adequate to keep Lake St. safe for bicycling as well as allowing equitable access for Lake resident car drivers. However, I think speed humps are more effective than speed cushions. Speed cushions were installed near me on 27th ave. and are often subverted. There's no justifiable reason emergency vehicles need to speed along Lake St. Their designated routes shouldn't require them to be on Lake for more than two blocks. In particular, the proposed traffic diverters are absolutely essential. Without them, safely bicycling in the middle of Lake to avoid hazards won't be possible due to drivers swerving around to drive faster. I also think prominent signage to remind bicyclists to observe stop signs would go a long way to improving harmony.
194	Reopen lake street. Reopen all of the streets. We do not want the streets closed, there are parks right next to lake street that are fine to use.
195	This is total bullshit. You gave us 1 day notice for a meeting! I was out of town yesterday. Stop this project! I want to use Lake Street and so do most of my neighbors. I'm sick of small special interest groups like the Bike Coalition, non profits, funded by the City, highjacking policy. Put in some more stop signs but leave up the street i've used to get across town for 30 years. California is a mess since you closed down Lake. Stop this nonsense about closing Lake
196	Please reopen the street to normal traffic.
197	No. This plan is not acceptable and unnecessary. Stop kowtowing to the Bike Coalition. We the taxpayers support you and the BC and we pay your salaries. Do this at your peril.
198	My wife and I both strongly support keeping Lake Street closed to through traffic. Car-free streets encourage physical activity, provide a space for community gatherings, and Free Lake Street has been a welcome, wonderful addition to the neighborhood.

199	<p>Hey there! To actually make a safe space for those outside of vehicles, there should be traffic diverters on <i>every</i> <i>single</i> block. What is proposed will be even less safe than the temporary measures right now. I also think that every intersection should have 4 way stops - the only possible reason to maintain any 2 way stops is to maintain traffic through flow over all other considerations. If this street is to be safe for people outside of cars, then cars need to be deprioritized. And rather than speed cushions, I'd like to see the space for driving cars to literally be made narrower. We should have a road that is designed for cars to move at a consistent, slow speed, rather than one where they can drive at whatever speed, abruptly slow down to go over a speed bump, and then speed back up again. Narrower streets are safer streets!</p> <p>https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2019/1/8/new-20-mph-street Finally - can we just give input on a city wide plan? It is exhausting to fill out surveys one at a time, and to watch the proposals get consistently and significantly watered down with each passing step.</p>
200	<p>I fully support the addition of the raised crosswalks and additional four way stops. However, the traffic diverters and barricades will materially reduce traffic safety. By closing Lake, California St has become massively more congested, making turning from the avenues onto California much more dangerous. It reduces safety and quality of life. How can the city just close a street that we rely on as neighbors?!?!?</p>
201	<p>If the Lake Slow Street plan proceeds, I would like to state my disapproval of the Traffic Diverters and "No Vehicle Entry" signs. Because of the heavy vehicle congestion on California St. and cross streets that have been created by the Lake Slow Street as well as the danger for vehicles/pedestrians/bikers to cross California St., there is no rational reason for diverting & forcing more traffic to those intersections, especially from 14th Avenue & Funston St.</p>
202	<p>Lake Street MUST be reopened. It is a public asset, a good that exists for the use of ALL of the citizens and taxpayers of this City, not just as a playground for the privileged few, and certainly not one that exists at the expense of everyone else who is paying for the street in their time, traffic and treasure. The taking of a public asset for private use in this fashion is anathema to everything San Francisco and America stand for. When did de facto gated communities suddenly become a policy goal?? Frankly it is stunning, nay appalling, that this is even a discussion. Especially here. Shame on you.</p>
203	<p>Please don't prevent streets from being streets and parks from being parks. We are lucky in SF to be surrounded by numerous parks with trails that provide a safe environment for walkers, joggers, families, bikers, etc. Please allow streets to be streets for the flow of cars and bikes. SF is already overcrowded and street closures has caused traffic congestion at every open main thoroughfare. From the Great Highway to Lake Street. It's a nightmare taking Park Presidio to 19th Avenue, Chain of Lakes to get to the Sunset. All streets should be available to reduce traffic throughout. The intent of streets should be honored as designed, for traffic smooth movement. Parks are designed for precisely the what people who live on Lake Street want....they all live close to Mountain Lake Park and the Presidio which offers numerous trails in a majestic setting.</p>
204	<p>OPEN LAKE STREET! There should be no closures and no traffic diverters. Stop signs are good, and so are raised crosswalks. This is a public street and it needs to be fully open to the public, not closed off for the lucky few who live there. If I want to turn off Park Presidio onto Lake Street to avoid being stopped in traffic all the way to Fulton, that's one less car sitting & idling for 15 minutes. I'm home in 5 minutes. This is even more serious now that Park Presidio has a lane removed for buses, it's going to be even more of a parking lot. Locals should be able to bypass that mess on city streets, and Lake Street is part of the local street network.</p>
205	<p>I like the addition of the calming slowing measures like speed bumps, 4 ways stops etc but why have the traffic diverters? That is confusing if the street is indeed open for all- pedestrians, cars and bikers.</p>
206	<p>Having driven on Lake Street for decades, I do not understand why there is a need to permanently close much of it to automobile traffic, especially as Mountain Lake Park and the Presidio are directly north of it if space for walking or having off-street areas are needed. I am not surprised that the majority of the street residents want it closed. It will not impact them much at all except for reducing traffic (other than their cars) on their street. It also smacks of elitism as one of the more affluent streets in SF is being targeted for being shut down. With as much return to "normal" that has happened in the city already, these pandemic protocols need to be rolled back to pre-March 2020 levels. This will not reduce traffic...it will just increase traffic on other streets and make a lot of wealth Lake Street residents happy.</p>
207	<p>While I am generally for an open Lake Street, my main concern is that the decisions are made subsequent to a planning process. The slow streets seemed to be very ad hoc implemented with unspecific goals. This new plan looks good, especially if the goal is, "keeping traffic volumes and vehicle speeds low along Lake Street to ensure it remains a safe and useful street for all." If the slow street idea is to become a priority in the future, I hope it is because it seems to meet specified, widely approved goals and is part of an assessable master plan. Thank you.</p>
208	<p>These are horrible changes that have reversed all of intention of the Slow Street that residents and neighbors want to have. The "traffic diverters" you propose are far too few, and if they are anything like the ones we see on Page st., completely ineffective at deterring or discouraging through traffic. I don't know if you've noticed, but drivers do not care about signs and painted crosswalks. They will proceed to abuse this street as they did before and do all over the city. You are baiting a trap for people that expect safety while walking and biking. Use real infrastructure - actual bollards and concrete barriers to prevent - not just discourage - through traffic; narrow the street and provide physical obstacles to fast driving. Anything less is simply giving the street space back to a state of auto-dominance. Please come back with a real effort instead of shirking your responsibility. I look forward to reaming your "Neighborways" plan for the Sunset as well.</p>
209	<p>Add all the stop signs and raised crosswalks and bumps in the road that you want. PLEASE just make it a street that cars can travel down from 28th Ave to Arguello!</p>
210	<p>The Richmond District is surrounded by ample public recreational green spaces: the Presidio to the north, Baker Beach, the GGNR with the Coastal Trail circling around the west to the vast expanse of Ocean Beach, the Golden Gate Park to the south, plus several playgrounds scattered throughout the city, and get to are determined to cater to an elitist neighborhood and turn their front yard into a special little park just for them. I don't wonder that 83% of these residents approve your plan. I, too, wish the city would cater to my personal whims, but unfortunately I live in the less desirable area of the neighborhood.</p>

211	The Lake St design that you are implementing was NOT on the survey. This is not what residents signed up for or what was proposed to them. You are not giving us safe reliable public transportation and flow of traffic. Instead you are pushing traffic onto other neighboring streets. Lake was a safe place to walk, bike and drive. Your lies regarding implementation and your pandering, according to your own survey to 5.5% of SF residents who want/need bike infrastructure will sink your bond even further in November. Lake is next to a public and National Park that is already closed to cars. That is a community space. You are creating a publicly funded gated street in one of the richest and whitest zip codes in the City. SFMTA does not stand for Equity. It does not stand for multigenerational families with school age children and seniors in their homes.
212	Reopen Lake St. Reopen all streets closed since 2020.
213	Why are you getting rid of the slow street barricades? I think we should keep Lake Street a slow street. I mean, are we serious about climate change and vision zero or not? Because proclaiming climate change an emergency and *opening* streets up to cars that were previously closed seems incredibly dissonant. I love the traffic diverters though, we should put those up all across the city. And you guys should probably waste less time soliciting the opinions of the online mobs and just build things https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2022/04/local-government-community-input-housing-public-transportation/629625/ Thank you for your service!
214	I was surprised to see how few streets have effective deterrents in the proposed design. Four-way stops are wildly insufficient deterrent for cars when there is no traffic control to enforce the rules -- please put physical deterrents like speed cushions on EVERY block to deter cars. The rules for Slow Street are not commonly known and therefore, drivers often enter Lake and are unsure of what the expectation is. A friend from out of town thought Slow Streets merely meant driving slowly. Signs indicate no thru traffic, but cars commonly travel more than one block, and the bikes are definitely not stopping at signage, so all signs are ignored. Given the unclear change of traffic rules once one enters Lake, drivers are wholly ignoring the stop signs on Slow Lake. Under the proposed design, cars have an _unobstructed_ path from 25th to 15th and will be highly enticing for drivers wanting to reach Park Presidio. I fear this would make it MORE dangerous than opening Lake Street to cars and drivers assuming normal traffic laws. 4-way stops are not an effective deterrent for cars, please put speed cushions on EVERY block to deter cars.
215	This design does not preserve slow lake street. Will it slow traffic down? Sure. Does it retain what made slow lake street special? No. You guys did a traffic diet on California, and if you really believe in that project, that traffic won't divert onto Lake Street, then stick to your guns and keep Lake Street completely closed. I have friends that live on Shotwell and Page, both slow streets, and I would hate to lose what we have here in the Inner Richmond. In short: Keep the barriers up. Because of the road diet on California, the minute you open up Lake Street, you're going to get a huge increase in traffic, speeding, and risk of pedestrian and biking injuries.
216	I support a Slow Lake Street. Could you please point me in the direction of the actual proposal? The design posted for public comment is an absolute joke. Over 70% of respondents want a SLOW LAKE STREET. And this design team doesn't even have the courage to put stop signs on every block? Next to No Slow street signage? Physical impediments like speed bumps 1+ time per block to actually slow vehicles? Throw in the basic solutions at a minimum. Good grief. What happened to the vision for actual 21st century solutions that might actually save lives and help pedestrians, cyclists, and even vehicle drivers co-exist in a more constructive manner? This proposal is a slap in the face to the significant majority that want a SLOW STREET.
217	The design removes all Slow Street signage from Lake Street and allows cars to drive 10+ blocks in both directions. It's dangerous! You are going to get a pedestrian or cyclist killed!!! There need to be delineators at every intersection; it needs to be absolutely clear to drivers at every intersection that this is a slow street.
218	What you're proposing is to remove the slow street, not make it permanent. This design is disgraceful. Please leave it as is rather than destroy it, as you are currently proposing to do.
219	In my opinion Slow Lake Street is a joke loved by Lake Street residents and a few people who walk down the middle of the street and hated by everyone else. More and more motorists are paying no attention to the restrictions. It was a great idea during the dark days of the pandemic but your department seems to be trying to reinvent this city. Nonsense all around! Everyone who enjoys the Slow Lake Street can get the same wonderful benefits using the bike lane on Lake Street, Mountain Lake Park, The Presidio and Lobos Creek area.
220	Thanks for your hard work on this project. As a resident of 11th Ave (half a block down from Lake St, towards California) who spends a lot of time walking/jogging on Lake St, and crossing Lake St to get into the Presidio, I wish there were more block-end traffic diverters, and a few *full* traffic diverters, to reduce cut-through traffic and increase public safety. The design as it stands seems like it would encourage more traffic flow than would be safe or compatible with a true multi-use slow street. Having 10-block sections without any traffic diverters seems inadequate given our community's goals. I'd love to see more traffic diversion to make this a true slow, safe, multi-use street. Thanks!
221	Four partial traffic diverters are not enough. Having 10 blocks in either direction between diverters will hardly slow down the cars that continue to speed through the neighborhood. There should be additional partial or diagonal diverters every few blocks, or a few traffic circles. This is not enough and will lead to fewer bikers and pedestrians using lake street as it becomes flooded with cars that are trying to circumnavigate California Street. Slow lake has been a blessing for our community, fostering non-car transit, and allowing children, families, and disabled individuals a safe and flat street to use each and every day. Please help preserve Lake street. Thank you.
222	Hi there, thank you for your work on this. As someone who walks my dog and bikes regularly on Lake Street (and has been threatened by cars on Lake Street) I wanted to share the following feedback: I urge SFMTA to do the following before approving the design for Slow Lake Street: 1) Upgrade the four partial traffic diverters to full traffic diverters to eliminate cut-through traffic. This is so important to do since a lot of the traffic on Lake Street are cars trying to get to or from Park Presidio. If we put a full diverter there, it would eliminate a lot of the aggressive driving. 2) Add diagonal diverters or block-end closures at all intersections to ensure cut-through traffic on Lake Street is eliminated. 3) Extend Slow Lake Street to Arguello Street and 30th Avenue to allow for more connections. Thank you for your time and consideration!
223	Biking on slow street with my children has been a true blessing. The current design flips Lake to being yet another car dominated street - 2 lanes of traffic and 2 lanes of parked cars with a small bike lanes sandwiched in between. Very disappointed with the fact that cars can drive a full 10 blocks on Lake. I'd rather that the SFMTA would adjust the California/Park Presidio lights and keep Lake as a Slow Street.

224	In my experience, these types of changes do nothing but piss off cars who rage against the pedestrians and cyclists using the streets. Pedestrians and cyclists need to be protected from these tons of steel and plastic barreling through our cities. This design does not do that. Please design this for the next ten years and not to pacify people who want to keep it like the last ten years. We should be a progressive city leading the world, not a city stuck in the past.
225	Our family loves the improvements proposed and would support additional speed cushions on Lake Street, additional redesign elements to beautify or naturalize the pavement, additional traffic diverters, etc. Thank you for the work to improve our neighborhood and safety!
226	I have lived at 28th and Lake since 1997 and am 100% opposed to any closure of Lake Street and in particular of this plan which essentially creates a private "gated" community on Lake Street on what has been and should continue to be a public thoroughfare. In closing Lake Street with this draft plan, and putting in concrete dividers, you are 1) affecting the lives of all of us who live in this area and didn't agree to this when we moved here and 2) overloading neighboring streets with ridiculous traffic. Furthermore, as a daily walker on Lake Street, I have photos to show that VERY FEW are currently using the closed street for recreational reasons...which is the reason it was supposedly closed in the first place. Lastly, the only way to make this fair is to physically get votes from those in the neighborhood as opposed to coalitions who aren't residents and don't understand the traffic patterns here. PLEASE DO NOT MOVE AHEAD WITH THESE PLANS. IT IS UNJUST AND NOT A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS.
227	It should be well-understood that this proposal is NOT making Lake Street a Slow Street. Pedestrians are limited to the sidewalks as they were before the pandemic. The newly proposed stop signs promote safety while the proposed DIVERTERS REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet street of West Clay. Under this proposal, pedestrians would enjoy a street with fewer cars due to traffic calming elements such as newly proposed stop signs but the proposed DIVERTERS are UNSAFE. The diverter at 24th and Lake St, for example, will divert considerable traffic onto West Clay. As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. WEST CLAY IS NOT WIDE ENOUGH to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, with the large population of elderly residents in West Clay, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
228	I'm not sure why we're using my tax dollars to benefit one of the richest zip codes in SF. Lake is already a quiet residential street. If the home owners want more privacy, they should move to the suburbs. I oppose this project 100%. Pedestrians should simply walk on the sidewalk, this is how streets are intended. Please do not waste our tax \$ that benefits only a handful of residents. Perhaps its should be better spent cleaning the many streets in SF that is desperately needed.
229	The lake street proposed designs are a step in the correct direction for the long term best interests of SF residents but fall short in meaningful ways by not including full and more frequent diversions to prevent cut through car traffic. Please design the street so that it forms a core slower safer link of the SF greenway bike and walking network. As a bipoc senior resident in inner Richmond I believe the time for meaningful street redesigns on the westside to reallocate street spaces to pedestrians and cyclists is here. Follow Paris.
230	Slow streets is absurd and cyclist are too aggressive.
231	This is a horrible and unneeded plan. This is a needed public right of way with wide sidewalks and bike lanes. It's called a public street for a reason. Traffic on California street is now a mess as a result of your actions. Open our Streets.
232	The proposed design is really bad, and kills The Lake slow street. The design allows through traffic at most intersections and gives drivers no indication that this is a slow street. The lack of diverters at most intersections leaves children, pedestrians and the elderly vulnerable to inattentive drivers. Stop signs do not work. Most SF drivers run stop signs, and they are a poor substitute for diverters and bollards at every intersection. Yes, you should add speed bumps and raised crosswalks, but do not remove the slow street signage.
233	These proposed designs are an enormous disappointment and must be modified. They ignore the amazing gift Lake Street has been to residents — a safe place to walk, bike, and take spend time with family and friends. The proposed modifications surrender this space back to cars. As a resident one block from Lake Street, I already see how cars speed through and terrorize residents at night on weekends when given the chance. We need much stricter enforcement — bollards, cameras, eventual total shutdown of the road to vehicles — NOT a few new stop signs! Cars dominate the vast majority of roads in this city. I don't own a car, and Lake Street is one of the few safe corridors I use to bike downtown for work and for other appointments, like the doctor, haircuts, and groceries. The proposed modifications in this plan threaten the lives of many residents to do not have cars and use the road similarly.
234	Open the street and provide access to Lake Street to ALL not just bicyclists and people who live on Lake Street. This is a PUBLIC street.
235	Thank you to SFMTA for your work on this project. Unfortunately, the design will not succeed in keeping Lake a Slow Street. I urge SFMTA to do the following before approving the design for Slow Lake Street: 1) Upgrade the four partial traffic diverters to full traffic diverters to eliminate cut-through traffic. 2) Add diagonal diverters or block-end closures at all intersections to ensure cut-through traffic on Lake Street is eliminated. 3) Extend Slow Lake Street to Arguello Street and 30th Avenue to allow for more connections. There should be traffic diverters on every even avenue. This allows for local access, but eliminates cut through traffic. It has been wonderful to see children learning to bike and playing in the street on Lake St the past 2 years. Anything less than full diverters/bollards on every other street will end up with car drivers using Lake St to cut through, and Lake Street will not be a slow street. There will be too much car traffic, and all the other goals of the slow street will fail.

236	<p>What happened here?! The permanent status of Slow Lake Street was decided over a year ago. I can only deduce that a handful of grumpy, loud, wealthy motorist donors have intervened. The 20th century is over. It is time for bold and creative reimagining of our cities and streets. I know the SFMTA staff understands this. Lead and most of the people will follow! A permanent and legitimate slow street network is a necessary component of our transportation network. This proposed design dismantles Slow Lake Street. Go in the other direction please! Remember: it is city policy and therefore your responsibility to do so (Vision Zero, transit first, 80% mode shift by 2030). Just do it! Come on, it'll be awesome! At the very least, please do not remove the slow street signage and add several more significant concrete barriers. Every two blocks? Local access needs will NOT be impacted. People will figure out which half block to turn and go down to access their \$5,000,000 (conservative estimate) driveway. They'll figure it out! Oh man this is so disappointing. Come on please please please. This is a unique opportunity. Please do not go backward.</p>
237	<p>The title picture for your presentation demonstrates the minimal usage of Lake Street by pedestrians. While it was a popular alternative during the first few weeks of the pandemic, it is now largely unused. The "improvements" made to Lake Street several years ago in the form of the concrete islands have actually made it a less safe street, no longer allowing autos to pass bicyclists and walkers by crossing the center line. The bicycle lanes are pinched at the island intersections without clear guidance by street signage. The result is in fact a less safe street. One improvement that would be helpful would be to disallow parking by tall vehicles within 20 feet of the intersections. Often, pedestrians including children step into the street from behind currently legally parked vehicles. Speaking of illegally parked vehicles, perhaps this "slow street" should no longer allow access to delivery vans. Along this vein, perhaps access to garages should be restricted to certain hours. I am against this project as it seems to be primarily an effort by entitled (and PR savvy) persons living along Lake Street to privatize a public right of way. Already this street has wider than typical sidewalks and bike lanes along both sides of the street. With almost ;unlimited recreational opportunities available within the Presidio, one block distant, it seems unjustified. What has been the effect on those who live along California Street in terms of far increased traffic? What has been the effect on those living in the neighborhoods that use this as an east west alternative? All this money is being spent, while roads throughout the city need basic paving, that will makes street safer for pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers.</p>
238	<p>I find it so odd that the slow street signage is being removed- what is the drawback of maintaining soft hit posts? The no entry signs would benefit from physical cul-de-sac infrastructure.</p>
239	<p>I live on 5th where it intersects with Lake St have DEEPLY oppose this whole project. Lake street is already wide, with safe bike lanes and wide sidewalks and a huge Presidio park only one block away. This was meant to be a temporary closure for COVID only and most Inner Richmond residents DO NOT favor this permanent closure-- your survey was skewed to those who live ON Lake St. who of course want a private street for themselves. This is a crazy inequity in a city that is all about equity so it makes NO sense. The funds and time and energy being used for this should be used in a million other ways than this. My comments about the project are that it simple should NOT be happening!!!!</p>
240	<p>New stop signs and diverters are good but please DO NOT remove the existing Slow Streets barricades! Doing so would dramatically water down the traffic calming that currently exists on Lake Street. We need to be doing more, not less, to eliminate dangerous cut-through traffic and build a network of low-stress streets for walking and biking. Put in modal filters every other block, like Berkeley has!</p>
241	<p>I am not in favor of closing Lake Street. Questions- 1. Will this project take away from the number of street parking spots currently on Lake Street? Yes or NO? If it will reduce street parking spots, parking will be pushed to the surrounding streets which are already impacted. 2. Will emergency vehicles, specifically ambulances and SFFD ladder trucks, be able to respond code 3 the length of Lake Street without changing response times? If it will reduce response times, this possibly will effect every home owner's insurance premiums along all sides of the Lake Street corridor. Comment- I have been the silent majority watching this project move at lighting speed, comparable to any city project. I thought it was a joke and would fade away in time. After reading this proposal, it reads like it is being rammed through. It is being pushed by an outside minority to replace cars with bikes, taking advantage of the Covid pandemic. Ask yourself, if Covid did not happen, this project would never be considered! I will state this clearly, this project does not need to proceed. Lake Street is already a slow street with stop signs and bicycle lanes already established, still the only street in the Richmond with dedicated bicycle lanes (east/west). There is an entire national park adjacent to Lake Street. Most of us walk, bike, and scoot on already closed streets in the Presidio, all within walking distance. Speaking with the local residents, most do not want this. I propose mailing every home owner within a block of Lake Street a formal ballot to get a real account of whether the majority really want this change. Please reconsider.</p>
242	<p>Lake Street already has bike lanes for that are used for walkers and joggers. Isn't that enough? Leave Lake Street open to vehicular traffic so local residents can conveniently go from one end of the Avenues to the other end of the Avenues as it was originally intended. How about making driving apps not use Lake Street as an alternative driving route unless they put in an address specifically on Lake Street?</p>
243	<p>The diverters are ridiculous. They don't promote traffic calming - just traffic prevention. Clay Street seems a fine example of how the slow streets should work.</p>
244	<p>Thanks for your work on the future of a safe lake street. The four proposed diverters are a great start, although I would like to see more added to reduce cut through traffic.</p>
245	<p>To the Lake Street Team: I am deeply, incredibly disappointed that Lake Street will not be a permanent Slow Street. What a loss for safety for people of all ages, for the health of our community, for the enjoyment of all. I am beyond disappointed that this proposal continues to foster a car culture. The pandemic presented a golden opportunity to make a small, simple change for the public good now and in the future. Shame on all of you.</p>
246	<p>I don't like this proposal. It does not discourage cars from driving down Lake Street strongly enough. More barriers should be in place along the route to make it clear to cars that they should not be driving down Lake Street. Additionally, the added 4-way stops will discourage bicycle use of Lake Street as they will now have to stop and start more frequently, rather than being able to roll through many intersections. Overall, this does not feel like a good plan for keeping vehicle traffic volumes low and keeping Lake Street a safe and hospitable place for pedestrians and bicyclists.</p>

247	Based on all of the design changes being proposed, it appears the Lake Street Slow Street designation is being eliminated. Yes, a number of design changes, including traffic diverters, 4-way stop signs and other changes will make it more onerous for non-resident cars to pass through Lake Street, but allowing cars to come back to Lake Street will go against the desire of residents to KEEP the Slow Street designation. Unless there is a City or State requirement that the street be re-opened to regular car traffic, please DO NOT ENCOURAGE non-resident cars to drive on Lake Street. Bicyclists and pedestrians will be pushed off of the street that has been transformed over the past 2 years. People will no longer feel comfortable using the middle of the street if feeling endangered by cars roaring down the empty street. It will become far less safe. Being on the edge of the Presidio with very few crossover streets, Lake Street is the ideal Slow Street. Having cars use California Street instead of Lake seems of little inconvenience. Once the Slow Street designation has been taken away, it will be almost impossible to get it back. The benefit to the neighborhood of keeping Lake Street a Slow Street can't possibly be outweighed by inconvenience to car drivers of having to use California St. KEEP LAKE STREET SLOW.
248	I like many of the design elements of this plan, and thank you for your efforts in trying to balance so many competing viewpoints. My primary concern with the proposed design is that there is a large number of blocks between Arguello and Funston, and between 15th & 25th with only stop signs and no traffic diversion or more effective traffic calming elements. As a resident of the neighborhood for over 20 years, cut-through drivers on Lake are notorious for rolling/running right through stop signs. To make matters worse, there is no enforcement of this moving violation. Motorists cutting through the neighborhood usually slow down enough to see if another car is there or approaching with the intention of stopping only if they see another car. If no car is there, they often roll through the stop signs without noticing pedestrians. For example, there has been a 4 way stop at 22nd Avenue for years and on several occasions I (or one of my children) have almost been hit by a car rolling right through it. I would like to see either: (1) more traffic diverters to discourage cut through traffic. Perhaps another one between Arguello and Funston, and another one between 15th Ave and 25th Ave, or (2) Significantly more raised crosswalks to force cars come to a complete stop at each stop sign. While the current Slow Lake Street situation has some flaws, it has been so much safer, not to mention pleasant, to run and commute via bike without the speeding cut through traffic. I am looking forward to a completed Lake Street design that prioritizes safe active transportation via bike, foot, scooter. Thanks again for your efforts.
249	I do not like the diverters. First, there are quite a few people who live directly on Lake St, near Park Presidio, who like the slow street because it is quieter for THEM but they use Park Presidio. If they find out about the diverters, they will turn their yes vote to a no vote. You will have problems. Second, it is very dangerous for young children to be on this road. You cannot make it safe. If you think you are making it safe and a motorist backs out of their driveway, running over a young child, YOU will be responsible. It is best to send young children to a park to ride their bike. Expect a massive lawsuit for killing a child. It is just a matter of time. My neighbor almost ran over a young child backing out of his driveway. Another neighbor witnessed a two year old almost get hit by a slow moving car trying to reach her driveway. Another neighbor had to quickly break for two kids running after a ball. I have heard more stories too. You need to focus on an older group of cyclists. This road had more people using it than the people who live on it because it has cul de sacs and streets crossing it that have no 4-way stop signs at California St. So, people need to use the road because California St is now very dangerous. Even adult cyclists are riding on the sidewalks on California St because it has gotten very bad. California St is the road that has had pedestrian injuries so you need to treat it well. Lake has never had a pedestrian casualty but it will if young children are allowed to run around it. There are parks nearby. the diverters are a BAD idea! If there is an emergency and the neighborhood needs to evacuate, this is dangerous.
250	The proposed changes are beyond woefully inadequate to establish this corridor as a safe place for walking and active mobility, verging on maliciously endangering. Traffic diverters must be added on EVERY block to PREVENT the use of this road as a cut-through route for cars. No other option will prevent car drivers claiming the space at whatever speed they want, endangering and inevitably injuring or killing people. Nothing proposed here shows any indication that this is a roadway with bike and pedestrian priority. Every block needs modal filters and bold signage. Is SFMTA incompetent at street design or abandoning the slow streets concept?
251	This design continues to reflect the racist and classist views of a group of wealthy residents and city officials that have no regard for the lives of workers that live and commute from the North Bay. Some of the most expensive homes in the City sit adjacent to Lake St - that have the Presidio in their backyard and do not need to privatize a public resource with tax payer funds. This is literally taking time and money from poor Bay Area residents and giving it to the wealthy. Open Lake St now and stop with this public embarrassment.

252	<p>REALLY trying to understand why the city has been SO deceptive about temp closing streets to allow folks to have some safe spaces during covid, then in the dark of night decide to make them permanet. What is the need driving closures on active streets that were designed for cars in SF. Have you seen Sanchez street lately? Most people are walking back on the sidewalks as the streets are still active, cars need to drive to get to parking or garages. Drivers need to enter to drop off packages, uber etc. I believe all street of SF belong to everyone, that SFMTA should not be just making up BS that people have asked and want a "private street" (which isn't fair, why not mine?) We need to fully reopen the city including the JFK drive (expect for weekends). Park and Rec has done an amazing job of giving SF's AMPLY open spaces to hike and bike. We DO NOT NEED any of this and feels like the city is just trying to meet some new goals potentially driving by grants to do this. The Streets of SF are a CLUSTER. Signage all around Humps EVERYWHERE that really aren't justified.. Bikers and scooters moving faster than cars where helmets, lic / with testing, insurance are not required. If you put more on the streets we are simply going to have more accidents. Where you have closed streets, perhaps except on the east side of the city, there are ample open space, The Presidio, the Panhandel and GGP, The Great Highway for all the silliness in the Sunset/ Lake Merced, Glen Canyon for folks on Chenery. Dolores park for Sanchez.. there is NOT REASON why I can understand why this is at all needed! I think you should focus on what this city needs, improving Muni, safe & clean streets from homeless and people on drugs.. and fix the roads and sidewalks in SF.. let's just focus on the basics not these bright shinny objects that some are hoping to give them a career boost and future job opportunities. I'm over the renters having more say than natives or those who actually have to deal with the craziness of why any of this is needed. Then move out of SF and leaving the rest of us to paying and dealing with the the mess. SF's are fed up. We pay the highest for water, gas, property taxes and very little to show for it. Focus on what matters not this BS! Reopen all slow streets NOW - to think just those in these neighborhoods have a say isn't fair to those of us who drive in those areas. It's short sided, but I understand it's easier for you to get your approvals to move your agenda. This city is built on neighborhoods and we all go to and enjoy them, these streets are not just theirs, as my taxes pay for all. You have not been honest with the people of SF and you need to simply reopen or face getting recalled or out of office.</p>
253	<p>I live where the entrance is too Presidio at 14& Lake are. I rely on safely crossing presidio to get to 12th Ave or avoiding 15th/California due to the lack of a traffic light. Please do not have Funston east bound or 14th westbound "replaced with traffic diverters consisting of concrete and planted areas in late fall."</p>
254	<p>I do not support the Lake Street Slow Street! I do not support the barricades and traffic barricades or blockers at Lake and Presidio. I found that incredibly dangerous for traffic and surrounding Richmond Seacliff neighborhoods that the corridor serves especially coming off the Golden Gate Bridge or from the Marina and Presidio Park.</p>
255	<p>How does this protect people using Lake Street? I see cars running stop signs out there now, and multiple cars drive the length of Lake Street for blocks at a time. More permanent protective infrastructure is needed, this proposal is a joke.</p>
256	<p>As a lifetime resident of the Richmond/Sea Cliff neighborhoods, with four generations of family living in Districts 1 and 2, I support the measures for adding the all way stops and the traffic calming elements and strongly oppose the permanent traffic diverters. The traffic diverters put all citizens living in the corridor and in certain areas along it at risk if emergency response or police take even 30 seconds longer to reach a home (e.g., residents in need of help for cardiac arrest, other medical conditions, or home invasions). The permanent barriers also disenfranchise residents who have a need to drive and who are not able to walk or ride bicycles (elderly, disabled, those recovering from injury, infants and families with infants and young children). Those residents are not able to use or enjoy the public road the same way other residents would. The permanent barriers would also continue to create a false sense of security to pedestrians who think that these measures mean they can let their dogs roam the road without a leash and let children play catch, soccer, football and basketball ball in the middle of the street. This creates very dangerous driving situations.</p>
257	<p>Question: Will the speed limit on the street remain the same? Comments: There aren't enough elements to reduce vehicle speeds in the ten-avenue stretch between 25th Ave & 15th Ave. The only method to slow a car in this stretch is a stop sign. In my experience, as someone who walks Lake Street 4-5 times per week, cars pick up a high speed between stop signs and often do not come to a complete stop at stop signs. The same issue exists on the other side of Park Presidio. There are only stop signs, with no other vehicle reduction methods, in the eight-avenue stretch between 2nd Ave & 10th Ave. I recommend the addition of a diverter on 8th Ave and the addition of a diverter on 20th Ave. I recommend all the cross walks be raised. Lastly, I recommend speed cushions at four locations: 22nd Ave, 17th Ave, 10th Ave, and 4th Ave. If there are 8 to 10 block stretches with only stop signs, I don't believe cars will go slow enough to prevent harm in the event of a collision between a person/bike and a car.</p>
258	<p>The traffic monster you have created is untenable!!! You(planners) have not recognized the how bad it is. OPEN LAKE ST!!!!!!</p>
259	<p>This design is incredibly disappointing and woefully short of the designs that were supported by the majority of San Francisco citizens. This proposed design is NOT a pedestrian-first space in the sprit and functionality of a Slow Street. This design is a return to an open car-first street that - while it will likely lead to slower vehicular speeds - will assuredly destroy the essence of a what a Slow Street should be: a place for pedestrians, families, bikers, neighbors and others to recreate, commute, and socialize safely without the fear or intrusion of vehicular traffic. Given TWO community votes supporting the Lake Street Slow Street designation as well as SFMTA's PROMISE of creating a permanent Slow Street designation along Lake, this is nothing short than a bait-and-switch. This design is shameful and unacceptable. SFMTA needs to make this right.</p>
260	<p>I live at Lake St and 5th Avenue. Although initially in favor of Slow Lake Street, I have changed my mind and would prefer the street to be returned to full service. But since that is apparently not an option, I will say that the proposed redesign seems excessive. Having speed bumps as well as raised crosswalks seems like overkill. Can't it be one or the other? Also if there is to be a traffic diverter at 5th Avenue, it should be designed so that cars headed South from 5th onto Lake, can turn left at Lake so as to continue south on 4th Avenue. Waiting at 5th and California, facing south, to make a Left Turn onto California Street can take a very long time due to the increased volume of traffic there now which is one result of Slow Lake Street. And for the love of God, whatever the "diverters" look like, please don't make them look like the big ugly yellow traffic-circle eyesores on Euclid!! Lake is currently a lovely residential boulevard. Don't make it look like an industrial obstacle course.</p>

261	In general the proposal guts Lake street as a slow street, disadvantaging vulnerable road users and non-motorized community usage. This is a capitulation, not a design that advances safety and community. Not surprised, SFMTA has managed to advance Vision Zero as if it were Zero Vision, because of the perceived need to bend over for those injuring and killing our citizens, our city and our planet.
262	There should be diverters similar to Outer Cabrillo at EVERY intersection other than Park Presidio, including Funston and 14th. I have already been run off the road by an irresponsible driver while on my bicycle. If someone needs to go more than one block on Lake, they don't need to do it at full speed.
263	I am a resident of the sunset district, but frequently bike up to the Presidio including sometimes on Lake street. I think the proposed changes are a good step forward for walkability and cycling infrastructure in the city. I'd like to see some diverters on the eastern half of the project (between 29th and 15th Ave) because of the proximity to Mountain Lake park. With both California St and Geary so close by, I think drivers have ample alternative routes and the addition of these diverters will help reduce cars on Lake st and the overall likelihood of pedestrian vehicle collisions.
264	Love the proposed design. Will serve as a test for implementing sustainable safety measures across the city.
265	Proposed changes look good. Please keep Lake Street a slow street (no through car access) to promote public health. Thanks.
266	While I live in the Richmond District, I do not drive on Lake Street, so my opinions are not self-serving. I support traffic calming measures and efforts to make streets safer for pedestrians, bicyclists, and yes, even other vehicles. So I support all the suggestions for the Lake Street Project that would slow down traffic. I do object to the traffic diverter proposals. I think they will cause confusion for drivers, especially those who do not live in the neighborhood or are driving in from out of town. Of particular concern is the one proposed at 14th Avenue blocking card turning right from Veterans Blvd / Park Presidio onto Lake Street. It is a very short distance to where the diverter would be placed and to find one's path blocked will lead to potentially dangerous confusion for drivers. It may also cause conflicts for drivers traveling east on Lake Street approaching 14th Avenue, having more cars in front of them, trying to figure out what they need to do because of the diverter. It also doesn't make sense that residents who already live on Lake Street or close by on any of the Avenues should not be able to use the full length of their own street to get to Park Presidio Blvd (living west of 25th Ave), or even as far as Arguello (living west of Park Presidio) to get into the Presidio there. My understanding (though I don't use GPS for navigation) is most programs already divert traffic onto California or Geary, so I really wonder how much these diverters would reduce traffic on Lake Street. But regardless, I think the potential confusion for drivers caught unawares outweigh any benefit.
267	This will result in tons of commuter traffic! Why are there so few diverters? Why not diverters every two blocks, which would leave Lake Street open to residents, but not cars speeding through! Bad "compromise"!!
268	Slow Lake Street has been an important connection for safer streets for people on foot and on wheels. Please do all you can to maintain this space as a safe space for people who are not in vehicles.
269	Please no diverters.... these will continue to forward the idea that Lake Street is a private road. It is a public road and in these days of equity, making a road in an above average neighborhood (financially) semi-private with a park alongside it makes no sense.... and is extremely unfair to the overall population of San Francisco. I conclude SF is no long a progressive city.
270	I'd like to express my support for the proposed diverters and other traffic calming measures, and also would like to encourage to consider more traffic diverters to limit traffic.
271	We need more signage designating this a Slow Street, and ideally bollards or physical barriers to prevent thru traffic.
272	If I interpret this proposal correctly, it would reopen Lake Street to through traffic, and end its status as a recreational resource. A street is either restricted to people - the norm - or it is somewhat restricted to vehicles, freeing it up for people to use for recreation. If this proposal is implemented, the street will revert to a car-only zone. Pedestrians and runners will be restricted to sidewalks, which are crowded and narrow. Bicycles will be restricted to existing bike lanes, which are narrow and compete with cars. Apparently the proposal is designed to slow down pre-pandemic traffic. Maybe. That is a good goal. But without further restrictions on through traffic by cars, without mandates on pedestrian right of way in the street, the recreational use of Lake Street looks to be essentially eliminated. Lake as a Slow Street has been a godsend during the pandemic. Which is not over, and the infectiousness of COVID is only growing worse. Please keep Lake Street, and all the Slow Streets, as they are. They have been working for years now. Please don't take them away.
273	I love slow Lake Street! It's a very elegant street and this only adds to the lovely atmosphere
274	You need to continue finding ways to eliminate cars. The damage cars have done is immense. They've been killing people every month, and damaging people by impact every single day! The negative impact on climate has been immense. The amount of city space dedicated to driving cars is obscene. You need to continue your work of eliminating the damage, forget about the favoritism you're showing for cars, and really help all the people in immense damage by the presence of cars. Stop being part of a destructive favoritism for preserving cars. Instead help everyone (including the people who drive, who can do everything in life without their personal damaging selfish cars).
275	I like the draft proposal but think there should be more traffic diverters to ensure the corridor is actually maintained as a slow street. I live adjacent to Lake and often see through traffic speed down 2-3 blocks and then turn away. If we had more diverters cars wouldn't be able to do that. Plus more greenery and rainwater collection!
276	I am opposed to this removal of an important thoroughfare. It is wrong to virtually close a street off to vehicles when there is abundant car free open space for all persons and pets just a block away for this proposal. It looks more like a 'special interest land grab' than good Planning.
277	Lake Street is lined with mansions. It is not equitable to make this a slow street unlike normal residential streets in San Francisco. Please return Lake Street to a normal street!

278	Hello, I live on Fifth Avenue between Lake and the Presidio Wall. My only objection to your proposed changes is the addition of traffic diverters. I should not be blocked from accessing Lake either off of Arguello or Funston. Diverters would force me to make a loop onto California Street just to get home. It's a real waste of time and taxpayer dollars. Add as many 4-way stops and humps as you like. That is enough to slow traffic down and make Lake safer for local residents. Nothing more is necessary. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.
279	This is a huge disappointment after all the community input was given! This design will encourage the opponents to slow Lake to blow through all the stop signs as they do now. This is exactly the opposite of a Vision Zero design!! This design needs, 1) More Lane diverters to discourage and reduce through traffic, closed street signs on the lane diverters. 2) Speed cushions every block. 3) Raised cross walks at every 4 way stop. 4) Must remain a close street so the apps like Waze and Google can not divert traffic onto Lake Street.
280	I agree with a friend who says: The one part I do not like are the diverters (cement) which will not let people enter Lake at 4 locations. sending traffic back around the block, impacting California. The rest: more stop signs, raised crosswalks, etc. I am OK with. I think diverters make this a semi-private road for residents of a well off street with the Presidio park alongside it. If SF is about equity, this move puzzles me.
281	I can see how this will slow down traffic, which seems like the primary goal. However, it doesn't encourage bike riding - if anything all those new stop signs will discourage bike riding. Perhaps the team can explore whether smarter road-markings, roundabouts/traffic circulars, or other measures might both slow down vehicular traffic whilst encouraging other forms of road use.
282	Thank you for your design. I'd like to see clearer markings in the intersections that there's a bike lane and bike traffic. Also, I think the 4-way stops should include a sign "YIELD TO PEDS AND BIKES" - they should get the right-of-way.
283	Please don't make it so hard for people to drive more than one block on Lake street. I support all the calming elements and the stop signs, but as a long time resident of the Inner Richmond, I miss being able to drive on Lake street to get to places and just to enjoy the scenery. There is also increased congestion on California Street since Lake Street was closed.
284	I am a longtime resident at 26th and Lake and I strongly disapprove of the current proposal. The proposal would not make Lake a Slow Street whatsoever, but rather a normal street that is slightly less attractive to cars. Adding diverters at only 4 points along a 1.6 mile street does not make that street a Slow Street. I strongly recommend the city re-designs the street to make it a true slow street, where non-car uses are prioritized.
285	To the SF City Traffic Engineer, staff, and interested parties in the Lake St Design project: I write to you as an 18-year Lake St property owner and resident, and I thank you for your work on the Design Proposal for Lake Street. Although this proposal falls short of simply restoring Lake to its pre-pandemic (safe, convenient, open) normalcy, the currently-proposed elements are far more cogent and tolerable than any of the 3 "Slow Street" continuances referenced in the SFMTA's public survey earlier this year. To anyone with a statistics or data analytics background, the reporting and analysis of those survey results were largely problematic. The most important finding, that the "No Build" option easily received the most primary support when pitted directly against the 3 "Slow" options, was nowhere to be found. Instead, data from a tiny subset of the overall respondents (Lake St residents) was elevated and overplayed. The survey report was obviously (and perhaps predictably) edited and leveraged as a 'sales prospectus' for one particularly myopic set of opinions and goals within the SFMTA. It is interesting that the resulting Engineering Design Proposal for Lake does not exactly align with any of the 3 "Slow" options from that survey. This discernment and differentiation is appreciated. The addition of stop signs, speed humps and raised crosswalks to further "calm" an already-calm Lake St are appreciated and welcome and supportable. While it is surprising that 26th and 27th, with their actually-dangerous blind uphill southbound crosses, are not assigned new stops or daylighting, the overall calming elements are acceptable and supportable. Also, the complete removal of any/all pandemic-era temporary "through traffic" signage is entirely welcome and appreciated - the sooner the better, please. However. The proposed permanent traffic diverters, and any "no entry" signage (however limited in scope) are simply NOT acceptable or appropriate for Lake St. Given the extra safety provided (to an already-safe street) by the new calming measures, any implementation of "special closed street" barriers will only continue the confusion and entitlement that has existed in the many months since pandemic restrictions were lifted, and traffic demand has risen. With literal acres of wide sidewalks lining the entirety of Lake, why would our "Vision Zero" City offer even a slight hint that strolling up the middle of an active roadway is remotely advisable, much less encouraged? It is ironic and true that indulging the Slow Street ethos for too long past its relevance will almost certainly undermine support for similar ideas and programs when their time might arise in the future. As an aside - how is 'feelings over facts' policymaking faring lately in the Education and Law Enforcement departments of SF government? Please REMOVE the entire notion of "Closed Street" barriers, diverters, and no entry signage from the final proposal. Those same purposes will be just as effectively, and more safely, achieved electronically - simply by the SFMTA keeping Lake's pandemic-era status in all of the major GPS services and mobility companies that use them. The ideal post-pandemic outcome for Lake St would have been a simple return to its pre-pandemic all-access normalcy. With that said, having traffic even calmer - and having relegated the silly "Special Private Road" debate to the history books - will be the next best thing. Thank you for your consideration
286	1. Why are the Slow Street barriers all being removed? I have personally seen cars speed down Lake street, breezing through with complete disregard for stop signs. The physical barriers are the single, only thing that forces these cars to slow down. They won't even slow for children walking in the street. I would even argue that Lake St needs more physical barriers, so I am not sure why this proposal is getting rid of all of them.

287	<p>2. I would argue that every intersection needs to be an all way stop. 6 additional is not enough. We should be making it know that Lake is a full stop street to further discourage drivers from using it to cut traffic. 3. I do think the diverters will be useful. The proposed diverter on Lake and 2nd ave is well placed. I disagree with slowlakestreet.com that it should be moved to Arguello. That would make traffic at the Arguello intersection horrible. Please keep these 4 proposed diverters and consider adding additional diverters. I drive and live half a block from Lake. I regularly park on Lake and would not mind having to maneuver around the diverters while looking for parking. The absolute only reason cars should be on Lake is to find parking, get picked up or dropped off, get home, etc. These cars are normally slow and mindful. When I am looking for parking, I'm already planning on circling the blocks surrounding my house and lake multiple times until I find a good spot, so the diverters really are not troubling to parking and residents of lake. If I have to go an extra block because of a diverter, so what? More chances to look for parking. I really think the diverters and do not enter signs will be beneficial. I would love to see more added. 4. Have there been considerations for a tip line to send in videos of speeding vehicles and their license plates. It is SERIOUSLY concerning how wildly some people drive and cut and speed down Lake any time of day or night. I see preschoolers and dozens of children walking on Lake for their school lunch breaks or activities. It is so concerning to me how some people ignore stops and only care about getting to their destination as fast as possible. When I see them, I am holding my breathe in horror just waiting for a person, dog, child to be hit. It's so reckless and inconsiderate and it is bone chilling that I have seen with my own eyes these drivers breeze by toddlers, families, kids, and people wide eyed staring wondering "what the hell" while the driver continues on seemingly not thinking twice about the fear and anxiety they are causing. I really think more active measures should be taken to ticket or issue warnings and citations to people who speed on Lake. Traffic cameras perhaps? Look, I am typically against snitching and snitches, and I'm only 25 though this rant probably makes me sound like a grumpy grandpa, but I can't just continue watching these people in cars with complete disregard for safety and protection of human lives. It is infuriating to me and I feel so strongly about this that I might become a snitch if the city opened a report line of some sort. Thanks, A concerned SF Citizen who lives at 8th and California</p>
288	<p>please keep lake street slow with barricades instead of speed bumps and a couple stop signs. there are lots of people who use it to walk to and from mountain lake park pets and children included.</p>
289	<p>For the last 2 years, all of Lake Street's traffic has been diverted onto California Street. This has been a huge quality-of-life benefit to the already wealthier folks (house dwellers) on Lake Street, and a downgrade to the quality-of-life for residents (apartment dwellers) living on California Street. If the entire neighborhood truly wants a "slow street", then the closures should be switched to California Street and studied for 2 more years. Yes, this would include moving the 1-California bus line onto Lake Street. Fair is fair, right? I won't hold my breath.</p>
290	<p>From the standpoint of things that actually make a Slow Street (and not just the basic treatments almost any neighborhood street in SF should have as a matter of course), the diverters are the only feature that are worth implementing. The rest is entirely inadequate. How is a four-way stop sign or a speed table meant to support a Slow Street? I live near a four-way stop, at Clipper and Noe, on a street that has a speed table, and yet the intersection is choked with inattentive drivers, decelerating from 30-40 mph, and is consequently so dangerous to cross that I will avoid using it whenever possible. If you want to create a Slow Street, then actually create one. Don't roll out the usual ineffective traffic "calming" that works almost nowhere else on non-Slow Streets and then think you've done the job. Hard infrastructure, making a physical barrier to cars: that's the only thing that really works. Short of funds? Then get the community to paint some concrete barriers and drop them in the roadway. So many options, all within your discretion!</p>
291	<p>It is not clear to me whether the proposed plan would continue to allow people to walk and play in the street. This is an aspect of Slow Lake Street that should be preserved. Before Lake Street was closed to through traffic there was a big problem on 4th Avenue with drivers coming south on 4th who were trying to "make the light," which they could time by looking at the 'walk light' as it ticked down. Many drivers would speed up, going 40 mph or more when they got to the intersection. Please add major speed bumps on 4th just before California Street to deter such dangerous driving.</p>
292	<p>Do not remove the barriers at most intersections. People already don't follow the rules and travel multiple blocks down slow streets. This will only further incentivize this behavior.</p>
293	<p>Do not remove majority of the barriers at intersections it undercuts the safe street aspect</p>
294	<p>The proposed Lake street traffic barrier at 24th and Lake effectively will force eastbound traffic to divert to 24th and California which is currently configured as a 2 way stop intersection. Turning east east at this intersection is difficult. This needs to be converted to a 4 way stop or move the proposed barrier at 24th and Lake to 22nd and Lake to give motorist the opportunity to access safer, 4 way stops at 23rd and California and 22nd and California. Also, diverting traffic off of Lake to 24th Ave means forcing traffic along the 24th Ave periphery of Rocha,beau Playground. There is a logical fallacy is diverting traffic onto a residential street that by a playground that draws pedestrian foot traffic. Diverting traffic off of Lake to 24th is not an appropriate configuration.</p>
295	<p>This design is a regression back to allowing traffic. It does not allow us to keep lake Street a slow street. As it exists cars can already drive on lake Street. Removing all of the barriers opens it up to more traffic. I would never allow my kids to use lakes to read with this design. It's too dangerous. The barriers need to stay that is the only way you will keep traffic off of lake Street. This design allows cars to use lake Street as an exit point all the way from 2nd Ave to Park presidio this is ridiculous.</p>
296	<p>leave lake street alone if you reopen it. the point of a stop sign is to allow cross traffic but there is hardly any cross traffic on lake. i've lived by lake for over 20 years. cars rarely cross lake. stop signs when there is no cross traffic is forcing one to blatantly and needlessly to contribute greenhouse gas. put in a stop lights instead or traffic circles if you want to help the non existent cross traffic. speed humps that make you slow down below the posted speed limit are also green house inducing as it takes more gas to accelerate than maintain the constant speed.</p>
297	<p>Open lake street to cars. Pandemic is over. This is crazy.</p>

298	what's wrong with the current diverter configuration? right now we have a slow street that is somewhat effective - making the street more accessible to cars will eliminate lake's effectiveness as a slow street. why would people use a slow street if cars are going to be driving on it, for multiple blocks? the proposal makes lake a not very useful street for cars, and nearly indistinguishable from a regular street for pedestrians. the current diverter configuration is adequate. - let's make what's already been working for us for two years permanent.
299	The information regarding proposed design is insufficient and unclear. I have a degree in architecture and still am unable to easily interpret the intent from the very diagrammatic graphics provided. Right now Lake Street has 4 lanes: the center two are used for traffic (one lane each direction) and the two outside lanes for street parking. Several questions: 1) with the new diverters, will there still be two full open lanes running down Lake Street but only one-way traffic on the street, or something else? 2) what if anything is happening to street parking? 3) Several blocks on Lake Street had small planted "islands" in the center at intersections, added in the last 5 years or so. I think those islands are fine/good, but honestly It has never been clear what their intent was/is, since they are not really places of refuge where a pedestrian crossing Lake Street could stop midway to allow cars to go by. Will those planter islands remain?
300	As a Lake Street resident, I am calling on the SFMTA to fulfill their promise to make Lake a permanent slow street. The current design does not do enough to prevent through traffic. Without adequate barriers and signage, cars will drive down Lake street at dangerously high speeds, ignoring any additional stop signs that would be included in this proposal. This would be the end of Lake as a shared community space for pedestrians and cyclists. I urge the SFMTA to make the following changes to their current proposal: 1- Add permanent diverters at every block to prevent through traffic 2- Add clear, permanent signage about proper use of the street
301	The proposed project does too little to limit traffic. It only makes it slightly more inconvenient for cars to drive, it doesn't seem to provide any safe, continuous path for pedestrians to run/walk. Traffic must be restricted much more. Slow Lake Street is such a great benefit to the community, please keep it.
302	We oppose the addition of speed cushions. They are actually a traffic hazard, throwing unsuspecting drivers off balance. With the design element of more all-way stop signs, the speed cushions on net are not an improvement.
303	This has serious impact for first responders getting to emergency rescues. SFFD, SFPD, Ambulances, etc., are impacted and needs to weigh in on dangerous road and intersection closures like this! Every. Second. Counts!
304	How will residents on Funston get onto California, if they can't head north on Funston and then make a right on Lake and another right on 12th, where there is a stop light (at 12th and California). Currently it is extremely dangerous to head south on Funston and try to cross California. No Stop sign on California (for drivers heading westbound) and drivers racing westward on California to make light on Park Presidio. Very, very dangerous intersection (Funston & California.) Also cars heading west on California almost always block intersection (CA & Lake) so Lake residents are trapped.
305	Let me address the proposed plan in two parts. First, it removes two-way traffic barriers at 15th, 17th, 19th, 22nd, 24th and 26th Avenues and replaces them with one-way traffic diverters west-bound at 14th and east-bound at 24th. In my opinion, in spite of all-way stops added at 17th, 21st and 24th, and a raised crosswalk at 15th, this fundamentally leaves the 10 blocks of Lake Street between 14th and 24th open to full vehicular traffic, a far cry from what exists at present. I would like to see traffic diverters, at the very least, at 22nd and at 19th, and the new speed cushion, instead of being placed right on top of the diverter, rather, somewhere between 16th and 18th Avenues. As to the second part, between Arguello and Park Presidio the proposed plan would remove a one-way barrier from 2nd Avenue and two-way barriers from 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th and 12th Avenues, replacing them with a west-bound diverter at 2nd Avenue and an east-bound diverter at Funston and adding all-way stops at 4th, 8th and 10th Avenues, and raised crosswalks at 10th and 12th Avenues. Again, speed cushions are proposed in the same block as traffic diverters, and, in this instance, leave 11 blocks open to very marginally impeded vehicular traffic compared to the present situation. I propose adding traffic diverters at least at 5th and 8th Avenues, if not more frequently, and interspersing those traffic calming measures with speed cushions that are not focused at the same intersections as traffic diverters. The availability of Lake Street to walkers, bikers, neighbors, toddlers learning to walk and elders walking with assistance has been an incredible boon to the neighborhood. Let's keep this community experiment alive and flourishing!
306	We support as much traffic calming, traffic diversion, and car-free elements as possible on Lake Street.
307	My family and I have lived adjacent to Lake Street since 1974. The temporary designation of Lake Street as a Slow Street has done its job by providing an additional outdoor space during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic when we were in lockdown. I thank you for your effort. Now it is time to re-open Lake Street to vehicles. There is no reason to turn a public vehicle road into a private pedestrian way for nearby residents when multiple public parks are in the vicinity for walking, cycling, running, strolling, skating, and dog walking. Especially since the current Slow Lake Street is empty of pedestrians most of the time. Look at the photo on the SFMTA website (https://www.sfmta.com/calendar/june-13-2022-engineering-public-hearing-lake-street-design). There are 3 people visible in the street (not the sidewalk) and all of them are in the established bike lanes. This is how it is most of the time...empty of people. If the concern is to make the street safer and slow traffic down, install a stop sign at each intersection between 2nd Avenue and Park Presidio Blvd. This has historically been the busiest section with drivers eager to access the Golden Gate Bridge at the end of a workday. I do not agree with bumps and barriers in the street because I would like fire, police, and ambulance vehicles and personnel to easily reach me, my family, and my community without delay during an emergency. If this push for a permanent closer is due to increasing private property values, then shame on all of us. Much of this neighborhood has more than enough individual wealth and resources to give a little back to other city residents. I urge you to re-open Lake Street to vehicles with measure to make it a safer street for all to access. Thank you for your consideration.
308	As a property owner on Lake Street, the slow street concept will definitely increase my property value (thank you!). The practical person who actually lives on this street and fully utilizes it (I bike, run, walk my dog, etc) respectfully requests that you open Lake Street to traffic. I think what you're doing to the residents of California Street is quite unfair. The increased noise and traffic is exponentially worse. You're not reducing traffic, just diverting it. Put tax payer funds toward improving Muni and public transit. But if you don't then I thank you again for increasing my property value!!

309	Hi I live in the area and use lake street for parking on a frequent basis. Are you now trying to create and even more white privileged gated community for rich kids and adults to roller skate and bike and run? I thought sidewalks were for running and walking, and bike lanes were for biking? Why would you even let privileged wealthy lake street residents even answer the survey? That is like asking people for a gated community if they like having a security guard at the entrance. Honestly with traffic on California and nearby streets as bad as it is I can only assume the people that concocted this inane idea were taking drugs when they came up with this idea and don't understand how much traffic there already is in SF. This is incomprehensible, and to use public money for tax payers??? What a joke. If lake street residents insist on this only they should be taxed!!! Obviously! If people want to use mountain lake park now that has become harder to drive and find parking. Also this street is a block from presidio park where people can walk and play! So go there!!! Nearby resident.
310	The removal of the slow street is a decision to ignore previous feedback favoring the slow street's existence from residents and nearby users of the street. Even with the traffic diverters and raised crosswalks it worsens the city's bike infrastructure in a neighborhood without a good east-west bike alternative (California street has high-speed traffic at times, and Anza and below also have some consistent car traffic and are too far away). Getting folks comfortable with riding a bike in the city is already a challenge but this just makes it more difficult for folks without cars. I understand that certain intersections like Funston and 14th may realistically need to permit cars to turn on / off of Park Presidio, but that should not permit general driving over 10-block+ regions (like 3rd to Funston). Even with stop signs cars will cruise through these intersections and turn in front of bikes (which would be more frequent under the new measures). There should be more traffic diverters at a minimum, not stops signs that are not routinely obeyed by drivers in the area anyway.
311	The removal of existing slow streets barricades is absolutely unacceptable. All 3 of the proposed slow designs included the upgrade of existing barriers to the new delineator style barricades but the proposed design just removes them. Removing these barriers that are now at every other intersection in favor of just 4 traffic diverters for the entire 30 blocks invites through traffic to return and destroys the value of the slow street. What possible justification do you have for excluding these from the final design when they were included in every single slow proposal?
312	Raised intersections and bumps in the road aren't a deterrent to drivers. People are only looking for a faster alternatives to make it to Park Presidio because of the slowed design of California St. I would recommend putting up permanent barriers on a few blocks on Lake so it's not possible to drive all the way through.
313	Need signage that indicates Lake is a slow street. Need more raised crosswalks and more speed bumps. Need more diverters. Please actually keep Lake a slow street.
314	I love everything you are proposing! Lake Street has become a wonderful walking, running, strolling, and biking thoroughfare for people of all ages.
315	THE OPEN BLOCK OF LAKE STREET BETWEEN ARGUELLO AND 2ND AVENUE CAUSES TRAFFIC TO DIVERT UP THE 100 BLOCK OF 2ND AVENUE. OUR ONCE QUIET AND SLEEPY BLOCK HAS BECOME A RACEWAY. IT'S EXTREMELY DANGEROUS. WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO TO HELP US?
316	Hello, Thank you for the Engineering Public Webpage. Some comments: 1. The barriers will really ruin the aesthetic and enjoyment of Lake Street for any users: pedestrians, bikes, residential cars and visitors to those homes. Part of the beauty of Lake Street is looking down it from 25th Ave to Arguello, seeing the beauty and expanse of it. It is a pleasure to experience it like that, unimpeded. It will look like a war zone with barriers up. 2. Why not configure technology like in parking lots, with gates that can be lifted. And have Lake fully open to Pedestrians on weekends. And closed selectively or at all 1/2 intersections during the week? It can be controlled eventually if not now, remotely. It seems silly and unfortunate to dedicate so many resources (financial) to a very unattractive build that satisfies no one. Wait until the technology and engineering support a more elegant, practical solution. The effort to block out cars is blinding the actual beauty of Lake. The barriers sound miserable. Please do a step-wise approach and do just raised crosswalks first. and not too high. 3. Speed humps are unpleasant for bike riders. Please no.
317	Of course Lake Street residents approve of this. It's so nice to have a private street, private street parking, and a private city park paid for by ALL residents of San Francisco. But it is NOT equitable! If you polled folks on my block they'd also like a slow street closed to outside traffic and parked cars. Name a block that wouldn't enjoy this. Let's ordain every street as a Slow Street! I still haven't received an answer as to why Lake was chosen. Fewer traffic problems here, why not take a high fatality street like Fulton and make it a slow street instead? Place traffic calming measures in place but do not exclude cars. If cars are excluded the city should reduce our property taxes and pass cost of maintenance on to residents of Lake. It is very difficult for some to reach Mountain Lake Park, a treasure of SF. Who has the right to determine this?
318	Hello, I live at 27 and Lake. One giant issue that is missed is continuing to call Lake Street at Street if it is to be turned into a park, playground, wheel chair access, and bike lane, just to name a few. It is simply no longer a street which is such a violation of tax payer dollars and of our basic civic understanding of norms. I've raised two kids in the city who safely learned to ride bike and skateboards safely without the benefit of shutting down 28 blocks of roadways. This is nothing short of unchecked insane behavior.
319	I am a resident who lives on Lake Street and I want to keep the slow street! The majority of Lake Street residents also want to keep the slow street. Slow streets mean less accidents and safer streets. Slow streets are part of SF's Climate Action Plan and better for the climate. Slow Lake is part of the Vision Zero SF Network - to help the city achieve zero traffic deaths is huge! Slow Streets are a successful part of our city and communities future. I am concerned that people opposed to Slow Lake speed through stop signs, move the slow lake street signs and don't follow the law. I'd like to see better barricades put up as well so people cant move them. Please keep Lake as a slow street.

320	<p>The traffic calming measures proposed in this project are wholly insufficient to support the benefits of the slow Lake street project. As a former (and hopefully future) resident of the Richmond who still visits Lake street weekly, the access for pedestrians and bikes along the route has been wholly transformative. It has turned the Richmond from a car-centric neighborhood to a far more pleasant place to be outside of a car. The detractors of slow lake street (and advocates of this project) complain about increased traffic volumes on nearby California Street. While there might be near-term traffic impacts on nearby streets, those near-term challenges pale in comparison to the long term traffic benefits associated with giving people viable alternatives to driving. Those who advocates for cars on Lake Street are change-resistant folks who conflate the pandemic-driven changes in the Richmond, wherein people have more time and flexibility to enjoy the outdoors in the Richmond with a traffic increase driven by a slow street. If San Francisco is serious about combating climate change, allowing NIMBYs to gut a project that gives San Franciscans viable alternatives to driving is a profound mistake. There are 7 other perfectly adequate East-West thoroughfares for cars in the Richmond. For San Francisco to truly free itself from the automobile, dedicating 1/8 of the public East-West right of way to non-car uses is a no brainer. To support these aims, the design must be amended to include barriers at all blocks on Lake, move away from car-focused street markings, and make it clear that local-traffic is the only traffic allowed on Lake Street.</p>
321	<p>I use Slow Lake Street to safely go from my home to businesses in the Richmond, to enjoy nature in the Presidio and to meet up with friends in Golden Gate Park (using 23rd Ave. Slot Street to connect). I am disappointed that the proposed changes to Lake Street will remove the Slow Street designation and make the street less safe for me to travel on as a bicyclist. Please make the following changes to the design: 1) Retain the "slow street" barriers at each intersection 2) Change the traffic diverters from partial to full diverters. Traffic in both directions must be diverted and there must be more diverters 3) Extend the slow street to start at Arguello By making those changes you would respect the wishes of the community who have sent a clear message to you via your surveys that Lake Street should remain a slow street without cut-through traffic (not to mention your own board who voted unanimously to keep Lake Street a Slow Street). Lake Street is safe for pedestrians and cyclists because they are encouraged to use the entire street to travel in. With your proposal Lake Street will no longer be a Slow Street (after the removal of the barriers at each intersection). IT will be a regular street and pedestrians and cyclists will be at the mercy of drivers who can travel without restrictions for more than 10 blocks at a time. Given SFMTA's goal of switching 80% of trips to be non-car trips what objective standards were used to decide to remove the Slow Street barriers and to use partial diverters instead of full diverters? Why does this proposal only contain four partial traffic diverters and not full traffic diverters every four blocks (for example)? Why does the proposal not include any changes between Arguello and 2nd Avenue? Those two blocks are an important connection point from Clay Street (a Slow Street) and needs the same treatment as rest of Lake Street. This proposal INCREASES the danger the pedestrians and cyclists on Lake Street by encouraging cut-through car traffic on long stretches of the street. It directly works AGAINST SFMTA's goal of shifting trips to non-car trips and Vision Zero. Please make changes accordingly.</p>
322	<p>Hello, I live on Lake St. I have 2 young kids and we use Lake street to bike or walk to school. It's been so much safer since Slow street started in 2020. We've seen only positives come out of this project. Thank you for the design and adding the concrete diverters at the 4 points however, I do think there needs to be more diverters to at more streets. If not every block then at least every other blocks. Stops signs or raised pedestrian sidewalks unfortunately will not stop cut through traffic. If designed properly, we could make it difficult for a car to drive fast down the street. Lastly if we want to encourage the use of Lake Street by bikers and pedestrians we must have stencils welcoming them and the purple signs to communicate this. Having no signs to indicate what this street is intended for is dangerous for all. It confuses drivers, and everyone who walks or bikes down this road what the intentions are. Are pedestrians and bikes allowed? If so please be clear about the signs and communications around this. I can't stress this enough. Please have some signs. Thank you for finally making Lake permanent slow street, as voted on by the SFMTA board 2 years ago. It will help us meet the goal of 80% non car transportation by 2030.</p>
323	<p>It is just unacceptable after a year of community input on the Slow Lake Street designs the SFMTA presented it is now completely changed and dumped on us for input. Shame on you SFMTA!! This has been a very controversial topic for the residences of the Richmond District and we thought the design decision was being determined based on the previous designs. Now you just injected more community controversy on the situation. It is apparent that the SFMTA supports Vision Zero when it benefits your political position but not the communities you serve.</p>
324	<p>Open Lake Street NOW. Keeping it close for 2 years and planning to make it permanently closed is anti-family and anti-multigenerational family. Please open street now.</p>
325	<p>I travel to Lake Street in order to bike and walk along it. I am encouraged by the use of traffic diverters in the proposed design, but I wish they were used every block. The current design has so little traffic calming and makes little effort to discourage through car traffic. At another slow street intersection I'm familiar with, Page and Webster, drivers routinely ignore the traffic diverters and continue east on Page. I suspect meaningfully preventing through traffic requires a barrier mid-block or perpendicular to Lake street at intersections, forcing drivers on Lake street to make a right turn and prohibiting left turns from cross traffic.</p>
326	<p>I don't see why this full plan is necessary. Lake street already has bike lanes and sidewalks and access to many open spaces like the Presidio. Yes more stop signs, yes speed cushions, but completely closing the street to vehicles is a hardship to us who live nearby. It diverts traffic to our street, such as Calif St, causing huge disruptions and pollution. Why not close Clement St? It would have way less impact on traffic and be beneficial for commercial activity (see farmers market). Or make Lake Street one way from Arguello to Park Presidio, and one way from 25th to Park Presidio. That would reduce car traffic but help alleviate Calif St impacts. But if this does get approved, then at least consider making Calif St 4 lanes from Arguello to 19th Ave. It's brutal out there now. Resident</p>
327	<p>As a local family, we are in favour of this.</p>
328	<p>The Lake street slow street program is a boon every in the neighborhood from children to elderly. Before, especially between Arguello and Park Presidio, the street was full of speeding commuters avoiding streets with lights during morning and evening hours to go to and from downtown. One of many big advantages is safety. Hope you can go ahead with plans.</p>
329	<p>I am a cyclist. The Lake closure has added too much traffic to California St and Clement st, making these streets less safe for me to cycle. This closure is only cycling friendly to a small group. I almost was hit on California St because there is more traffic.</p>

330	I am a huge supporter of Slow Lake. While I commend MTA for the concrete traffic diverters proposed, I feel more must be done to curb the reckless driving I have seen on Slow Lake. We need more diverters like the ones on Clay and other slow streets and speed bumps. The proposed solution does not go far enough in preserving what the majority of people want.
331	The proposed solution does not go far enough. More barriers are needed, more raised cross walks, signage on every block like the other slow streets. Speed cushions on all blocks. Slow Lake is a major public resource supported by a solid and growing majority of residents. It has turned into a kid friendly, commuter friendly, community friendly safe way to enjoy common space together. Please do more.
332	The proposed design is a start but not enough to protect Slow Lake. Please listen to the majority of residents who support Slow Lake and push the design to further keep cars from using Lake as an expressway at the expense of pedestrians, Cyclists and children commuting to school.
333	Greetings...I have not supported several SFMTA projects over the years as I found many flaws in what they proposed in terms of safety and common sense design. I feel the same way about Lake st. Adding lots of stop signs will not help in safety as a large percentage of car, motorcycles and bike drivers seem to be illiterate and go right thru them or barely slow down. Turn about are much safer. Looking at studies of their use in France the vehicular death rate is 4.6% vs 11.10 % in the US..As for the barrier that is totally overdoing it, increases safety flaws etc etc.Making that stretch of Lake st. a private place for the residents that my taxes would pay forThe car traffic has increased a lot in the last few years and closing off streets and highway increases the potential of accidents due to traffic jams..I thank you for reading all the comments..Take care
334	I want Slow Lake to remain closed to through traffic and barriers/signage reinforced.
335	Please at traffic blocks at all intersections to inform drivers that it's a Slow Street.
336	I am a strong advocate of No-Slow-Lake. However, the proposed design using just the Traffic Calming elements and Stop Signs is a reasonable and equitable compromise. I am wholeheartedly against the Traffic Diverters, for one, because they "dump" Lake Street "problems" onto the neighboring side streets and California. Slow-lake advocates want no thru-traffic so they can shop locally, but there are no shops on Lake St. They want space to build community, but they can get permits for closed-street community events like everyone else. They want full traffic diversion to use the streets for park-play-bike activities, but they are immediately adjacent to GGNRA Presidio and Mountain Lake and already have bike lanes in both directions. My interest is as a homeowner-resident of the City and I sometimes use drive Lake to the beach, the Legion of Honor, Lands End. My interest also stems from a belief in full, fair, equal access to all, including disabled and elderly who can't bike or walk or board or disembark public transportation.
337	The proposed design solutions are nothing more than a traffic calming strategy. Rather than addressing Lake Street as a true, multi-use public space, the design acquiesces to the primacy of motor vehicles and merely offers tepid gestures to limit their access and speed. The ability for all age groups to recreate in a variety of ways on Lake will be prohibited by its return to a single-use: motor vehicle throughput. In a neighborhood where the street grid provides a rich opportunity for traffic dispersal, and where Lake Street could have been a model of multi-use public space, MTA has relegated all local non-drivers to the second-class status they've grown accustomed to. Safety, non-motorized access, air quality, noise abatement - all sacrificed once again and as ever to the motor vehicle. MTA should know better - and likely does - and should have the political will to ensure a safer, cleaner, more equitable future for San Francisco.
338	Yes please do implement all these proposed changes. with California Street cut down to 1 lane in each direction, Lake needs strategies to keep it safe.
339	I have loved on Lake street for 20 years. Every day I carefully cross lake at 20th in my car to access my house/garage and every day I witness a near accident, as children are unattended and do not look for cars no matter how slowly they may be traveling. Lake st as a slow st may give the bicycle coalition the access it wants/likes to the gg bridge and Presidio and beyond, but this plan is elitist and insane. Open Lake now.
340	I think it's a bit hard to fully understand how the traffic diverters work as visualized on the map and the cross section view. Can a video demonstration be created as an example? It's hard to tell how traffic is being diverted. It would be helpful to see an example in action to show the "from" and "to" either from a pedestrian or driver's perspective or both! Anyhow, this looks good overall! I don't think the changes are drastic and still provide access to pedestrians, bikers, runners and drivers.
341	This proposal doesn't keep Lake st as a slow street. What's the point of slowing traffic if the street will just be for cars again? Can we keep Lake as a slow street? Either keep the current slow street barricades or add some other explicit signage saying that pedestrians are allowed to walk in the middle of the street.
342	After it is implemented, it should be monitored for two years. The monitoring should include an annual report to SFMTA, a public hearing and a comment period similar to this one. It may be necessary to amend the plan from time to time. If needed for public safety, some emergency amendments may be made by SFMTA and the SFMTA board should approve at a public hearing. Other amendments that are not deemed an emergency for public safety should be proposed in the annual report and reviewed at a SFMTA public hearing. Traffic and pedestrian and bicycle safety on California Street, parallel to Lake Street, should be monitored as part of the Lake Street monitoring to determine impacts on public safety on California Street.
343	Please add some type of enforcement. I have almost been run over while cycling on this street. Combination Mom vans/SUV's and others...not just delivery vehicles. Enforce infractions with tickets
344	To Whom It May Concern. I have reviewed the proposed changes to Lake Street and, as a nearby resident (I live on 8th between Lake and California) would like to give my input. Some of the changes are positive (raised crosswalks, new stop signs) but some are I think negative and should not be introduced. Specifically, the concrete diverters. Ambulances and fire trucks should be able to proceed directly down Lake Street, without any barriers. In situations like these seconds and minutes may literally be the difference between life and death.

345	As a longtime resident of a Lake St cross street (an avenue in the very high 20s), I really appreciate the attention that this project has gotten from the SFMTA as well as from our diverse gaggle of involved San Franciscans. This has been, in a word, messy, but messy is a sign of democracy at work. Selfishly, I love this design, and this mildly surprises me. The traffic calming measures are great. I wouldn't care if you put raised crosswalks and four way stops at every non-traffic light intersection on Lake St. I purchased a bike during the pandemic. Under this proposed design, Lake St. would be a great street for cyclists of all types due to the proposed entry barriers (I hereby propose that heretofore these barriers be affectionately and informally known as "Tumlins"), which will keep the majority of cars off of the two main (inner and outer) Lake St. stretches. In the future, when I choose to drive down Lake Street, this proposed design offers me a direct, low traffic option. You see, I have no qualms about driving onto Lake Street in the opposite lane wherever one of the barriers is placed, waiting for a safe opportunity to do so, of course. I've lived in Europe and know where a little traffic rule or suggestion can be effectively bent, and this is certainly such a situation. The good news for the SFMTA is that I am an outlier, as 99% of drivers will just move on (to California St, Clement St, etc) in the face of an assertion of authority that the Tumlins and associated signage shall present. So, for reasons that are principally near and dear to my own personal situation and for the maximization of my quality of life (and not to enable a long range strategic plan to cut emissions, avoid traffic fatalities, and//or serve as a model for the rest of the country to emulate), I hereby declare my unequivocal and wholehearted support this proposed design as it has been crafted and submitted. Great going Jeffrey, Eillie and the significantly resourced SFMTA team who have worked on this project and have managed to absorb more feedback that we would ever wish upon our loved ones. So in the words of Italian cycling legend Francesco Moser, "Andiamo ragazzi!"
346	I live a block from Lake Street. I regularly use Lake Street for cycling, walking, and running. Reduced traffic on Lake over the past two years has been wonderful. I love to see people out and about, and families enjoying open space. Generally I think the proposed design is a positive step. I would also favor more unobtrusive signs (similar to those on Page Street) at additional access streets on to Lake. I want there to be an atmosphere of slowness on Lake, so people feel free to move about on it. I think it would be valuable to remind motorists who enter on the access points from the south that they are coming into a special space.
347	Hello, I love slow lake street but I am concerned that people weave around the current traffic diverters in their vehicles too fast. Hopefully the raised crosswalks and all way stops will help with that. I'd like to ask that we increase the proposed 4 traffic diverters to 6. I think adding one at 7th Avenue and 19th Avenue would allow for good spacing between traffic diverters to act as a reminder to vehicles that this is a slow street.
348	I live on Lake & 23rd Ave and, after reviewing the proposed Lake Street Design, I'm in full support of the proposed improvement plan.
349	I am OPPOSED to this final proposal because: Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. Closing Lake St. is unnecessary: it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies.
350	Keep Lake SLOW!
351	Hello SFTMA, I live close to Lake Street and ride my bicycle along it frequently. I like it the way it is now with almost no traffic. I don't want changes, except perhaps the raised crosswalks. (as a bicycle rider, I prefer flat surfaces, but can compromise for pedestrian safety matters). I don't drive, so I can't testify to traffic impacts on neighboring streets. I suspect, based on my bus riding experiences, that the traffic has not increased substantially on California, Clement (where I live -- but my apartment does not face the street; my observations when I am walking along Clement or riding is that traffic is not up substantially), or Geary Boulevard. We are in a climate emergency. I support efforts to create spaces that are car-free. Most people can drive a lot less than they already do. Those who cannot -- people going to landscaping jobs with heavy equipment, delivery drivers, contractors, and some disabled or elderly people -- can drive. The rest of us should have lots of car-free spaces that we can embrace safely for our activities.
352	I think that this design is extremely disappointing and does very little to preserve the "slow" nature of slow lake street. Aside from four blocks, it returns Lake Street to a normal road. It does not do nearly enough to protect this important part of our city's walk and bicycle network. As someone who gets around the city only via walking, bus, and MUNI, I incorporate slow lake street into so many of my commutes because I can observe a material difference in my safety along this stretch. Please revisit designs to ensure that Slow Lake Street remains SLOW and SAFE!
353	This proposal will do nothing for traffic safety. Instead it will make vehicle traffic on Lake, and California Street more difficult and dangerous.
354	I live a few blocks from Lake Street. I typically walk along Lake once a day, and run the length of Lake three to four times a week. Slow Lake Street is a wonderful asset of the neighborhood. I fear that the proposal's significant reduction in car barriers along Lake will greatly increase the number of cars, and so greatly increase the danger of walking or running on Lake. Cars have lots of other options for making it through the neighborhood unencumbered while walkers and runners do not. I would like to see at least the same number of permanent barriers and diverters in the final proposal as the current number of temporary barriers along Lake.

355	I have lived on the 7th Avenue cul-de-sac north of Lake for 26 years. I ride a bike, and I walk a dog, and I use public transportation, and I drive a car. I firmly oppose closed or slow Lake Street, primarily for these reasons: 1.Slow Lake St. continues to divert/increase traffic on neighboring streets. 2.Closing Lake St. is unnecessary: it has wide sidewalks, bike lanes, and adjacent parks. 3.Slow Lake St. remains unused and sits empty all day, almost every day. I have many photos taken at optimum use times, and the street is empty. 4.Cement diverters will make for an even more dangerous situation for drivers and pedestrians. 5.Slow Lake St. has become a publicly funded private street. 6.Fire, police, and ambulance emergency vehicles cannot quickly access Lake St., creating a dangerous situation for all neighbors in emergencies. It is absolutely absurd to make a street which has wide sidewalks and good bike lanes into a closed street which sits empty while those of us who have to use cars to access our houses are now driving multiple extra blocks with heavy traffic to get anywhere. Proponents of the closure cite accommodation of children getting to school - children do not use Lake Street to walk or bike to school; however, their parents and school buses used to use it for that purpose. They are now having to divert to nearby streets, creating additional traffic on them. The time cars are spending on SF streets is increasing, not decreasing.
356	PLEASE just reopen Lake. No traffic diverted. Add speed bumps if you want. The street is a two way street, there are healthy bike lanes, wide sidewalks, and a park nearby. The "alternate" transportation people are not using this street in droves give it back to the entire neighborhood. If issues arise after a year of open lake, let's talk again. Your forced anti-car situation is not making it better for our neighborhood (I live at California and 7th and see daily the chaos pushed to California due to "slow" Lake. The lack of respect for the overall neighborhood by sfmta planners & a few advocacy groups who do not represent the area in general is crazy. You're not going to force me to a bike -I already walk, use Muni and also have a car since Muni doesn't serve me with options to get where I go in a timely and efficient manner. Please stop forcing your crazy slow street concepts on us they are not being utilized by the people you think will do so. Ps- will you plan on enforcing road rules for bikes at all the new 4 way stops? And can we get a 4 way stop at Calif smd 7th for safety?
357	Leave Lake Street as it was prior to the pandemic. Slow Lake Street is a stupid idea! No Build!
358	Please consider that many residents oppose a permanent change to Lake Street. Lake street should be reopened to its pre-pandemic state. Open Lake Street asap. Do not close it to locals.
359	The traffic 'diverter' will not be anymore effective than existing road closed signs. A permanent impenetrable barrier is needed at these locations. Reference existing infrastructure at: -Broadway at Florence (above the tunnel) -Montgomery north of Green -Greenwich at Leavenworth -Vallejo at Montgomery -Chestnut at Larkin Instead of the listed chicanes (unworkable 'diverters'), these barriers would make certain blocks dead-end to ALL vehicle traffic. Two 3-ft wide aperatures would allow pedestrian traffic through. Motor vehicles will have routes on adjacent streets. These barriers would be best installed mid-block in several places. They need not be located at endpoints as the proposed diverters are, but may be rather more effective 2-3 blocks inboard from those locations with one near the middle as well to stop aggressive bypassers.
360	Please fully re-open Lake Street as it was prior to the slow street. It is unfathomable to me that we would choose to turn a public street into a park and further limit traffic flows in our neighborhood. We have already had the traffic diet on CA Street (which was fine on its own and safer) and the suspension of critical bus service on CA (1BX and 1AX). Further based on the results of the recent election, we will not have much needed new investment to improve Muni any time soon. We need a fully functioning street and not another park for rich people to live on. Please re-open Lake Street!!
361	Don't understand the giant concrete traffic diverters on the ends. Lake street is the first street as cars approach from the north and blocking the entrance will just confuse and anger drivers. With a street as wide and with such wide sidewalks I don't understand the logic there. Please remove the traffic diverters.
362	I would like to see the proposal include more permanent diverters (four is a remarkable minimal number). I would also hope to see paint lanes for cars removed.
363	In order to facilitate the safest and broadest use of lake street by active transportation methods. signs, and interventions are needed at every intersection. otherwise cut through car traffic will use lake and make it unsafe and unusable leading to less overall use and creating dangerous conditions for young and old.
364	The description of the project and history of surveys regarding Lake Street cite statistics from people who live on or adjacent to Lake Street. I'm interested in what the results are for people who live elsewhere in the neighborhood, including, but not limited to those who live on California Street. I walk through Presidio Heights, The Presidio, Mountain Lake Park, around the Presidio Golf Course, and at Lake Street every week. Lake Street always has ample room for those walking on the sidewalks. I see no reason to gift a near-private street to residents of Lake Street and throw more traffic onto adjacent streets. Sure, I'd love to set up a pickle-ball court in the middle of my street too, but it is after all a street, so I don't expect to do so. There is a public park and walkway one block from Lake Street from Arguello to Funston. A slow street here seems like overkill.
365	I am NOT in support of this design. This proposal returns Lake Street to a car-first space, and does not reflect the needs and desires of the community as shown through TWO public votes and SFMTA studies. The Slow Street Program has as its mission to allow streets "to be used as a shared space for people traveling by foot and by bicycle". The closure of Lake Street has been a wonderful boon to pedestrians, cyclists, runners, families, and pet owners. It has enhanced our sense of community and ownership of this space. It has brought neighbors together, has given children a safe space to socialize and recreate, and improved health by allowing for a safe, protected space. This proposal will return Lake to a vehicle-first space and destroy this community. Indeed, the Open Lake Street community is gleeful with the design. While I support the 4 concrete barriers, there is really nothing else to discourage vehicular traffic. It would be ideal to have these barriers throughout the street. At minimum, I would suggest this design incorporate the flexible barriers found on other slow streets AT EVERY INTERSECTION. Please reconsider this design. Please follow the desires and needs of the Lake Street community. Please keep Lake a Slow Street in practice, not just in name. Thank you for your consideration.
366	1. I worry about the safety of the car lane merging into the bike lane at the 4 traffic diverter locations. This seems very unsafe for both cars and bikers, especially young bikers. Ideally Lake street would be safe enough for a 10 year old to bike from Arguello to 30th Ave without adult supervision, but this does not seem possible with this plan. 2. It is unclear how cars traveling south from the Golden Gate Bridge will efficiently get to points east of Park Presidio (eg. to homes along California St or Lake Street) without a massive traffic build-up. Currently cars can take a U-turn on Lake street at 14th Ave to cross Park Presidio and head east. The traffic light at 12th at California allows for easy left turns onto California. If traffic is diverted to Funston where there is no traffic light (ie. no light at California at Funston) our only choice will be to take a U-turn at California at 14th which will cause a big back-up!

367	There are not sufficient diverters. Diverters should be in place at all intersections to prevent over-use of Lake by drivers who are using it for through traffic. The current design is necessary but *insufficient* to meet the stated goals of Slow Lake. We need better infra to keep cut-through drivers off of Lake.
368	I use Slow Lake Street pretty much every day when commuting/running errands on my bike or walking to a restaurant for lunch or dinner. The road closure has actually inspired me to spend more money at local restaurants because Lake Street is typically so pleasant to use. However, the last few weeks, I have noticed an increase in reckless driving on Lake Street by people who are probably against the street closure, and who are trying to make a point and doing their best to make it feel unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists, as they drive much too fast all the way from Park Presidio to Arguello, dodging the road closure signs in a dangerous manner. It seems like it happens nearly every time that I use Lake Street. I am afraid a child or elderly person is going to be run over by these aggressive and reckless motorists, if it hasn't happened already. For that reason, I think the proposed traffic design elements and calming measures will make Lake Street a lot safer for the people who use it and live there. I support the the proposed design elements that will make the street less accessible as a cut-through route for through traffic!
369	I support as car-free of an option for Lake as possible, as the street provides critical pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure in this otherwise very car-heavy neighborhood. Drivers have begun speeding through and driving on lake again as if the street is not designated as slow, and as such I encourage you to consider a permanent erected barrier to limit the ability to pass straight through in a car.
370	Privatizing city streets for the privileged few (creating a new gated community within the city) seems like a horribly revanchist idea. If I and other city residents can't use Lake Street, why should my tax dollars go to maintaining it? I live on Franklin. It's noisy and there is traffic day and night. Can I have some "slow street" action here, too? Or are slow streets just for "special" neighborhoods?
371	The slow Lake street project has enabled community gathering in new ways, centering on exercise, conversation and coming together. We are able to see our neighbors and enjoy the calm environment, easing access further to Mountain Lake Park. It should be noted there are two main streets very close by that run parallel to Lake park, Clement and California, further lowering the need for car access on this road.
372	I think it needs more diverters. Lake is on my exercise bike loop that I've chosen for minimal car traffic. I'm a senior and don't feel comfortable riding with traffic anymore and Lake is perfect for cyclists, peds, kids, joggers, etc. It was a low-traffic street before but now it feels like a big plaza where families can ride or walk together, and seniors and disabled don't need to worry about getting hit by cars.
373	I support the Lake Street Design project. I live on Lake Street and very strongly support keeping Lake Street as a Slow Street even after the pandemic is over.
374	I am against keeping Lake a slow street. I have been living on Lake St. for 37 years and use Lake as my primary method of traveling east and west. Calif. St. is not an alternative because I have a bad back and stage 5 kidney disease, and it hurts to travel over a bumpy street. When the MTA decided (why?) to reduce Calif. St. to 2 lanes, the re striping caused multiple deep holes on the roadway, making it dangerous and painful to negotiate. If the job of the MTA is to improve traffic and safety, why wouldn't it do a complete job and pave the streets it changes? The MTA is searching for a solution when there is no problem. Lake St. was never an undue danger to pedestrians or bicyclists. All the engineering in the world is not going to stop reckless or inebriated driver;a stronger police presence will. Closing Lake St. puts the MTA in the back pocket of the bicycle coalition. (These hypocrites who never stop or even slow down for a stop sign and present a far greater danger to pedestrians.) The closing of Lake St.is selfish. Lake was built and maintained for motor vehicles with wide sidewalks for pedestrians and bike lanes. Drivers are not pariahs. There are plenty of parks and playgrounds. I wouldn't think of trying to deny my neighbors from recreational infrastructure; they should not deny me and the thousands of other motorists who use Lake in a proper, legal way.
375	The proposed plan does NOT do enough to make Lake Street a safe place for alternative modes of transit such as bikes and scooters. Additional stop signs are far from the design options we voted on a few months ago! Lets stop favoring the interests of fossil fuel companies and online delivery corporations who benefit from reopening Lake Street. The new proposal is very disappointing.
376	The proposal does not feel adequate to address the dangers that Lake Street has faced for years. Cars will continue to speed between intersections, blow over speed bumps and run through intersections. Additionally, this doesn't at all address the massive communal gathering and safe recreational space that slow Lake Street has provided. The amount of foot and bicycle traffic Lake street receives daily is substantial and by restricting that and reinstating it as a thoroughfare is in direct antithesis to San Francisco's commitment to limit private vehicle use and promote safe spaces for pedestrians and bicyclists.

377	<p>The design's four concrete diverters at some entry points to Slow Lake are critical to continue protecting the safety of pedestrians, people with disabilities and limited mobility, and people using bikes, including countless kids and seniors. SFMTA should approve and install those four diverters immediately. I ask for the following improvements: 1) More diverters. I am deeply concerned about the complete removal of the 22 Slow Street barriers currently on Slow Lake and the complete lack of diverters for two 10+ block stretches in the current draft design. 10 blocks is too long of a stretch without barriers to eliminate dangerous and speeding cut-through traffic, as drivers will cut north to speed down Lake Street to get to the bridge, making the street unsafe for kids, seniors, people with disabilities, and people using sustainable transportation. SFMTA should either add additional concrete diverters or the standard slow street diverters (white posts and purple signs in the driving lane) to replace each temporary barricade and add those diverters at every other intersection on Slow Lake. Diverters should also be added at the critical entry points on 25th and Arguello. The temporary barricades should remain in place to ensure safety until the permanent diverters can be installed to replace each and every temporary barricade. 2) Clear Signs in Driving Lanes. The lack of signs and stenciling on the street in the driving lanes is very concerning. It's confusing for drivers and dangerous for vulnerable people outside cars on Slow Lake. If we are in fact welcoming use of these streets by pedestrians, kids, people with disabilities, and people on bikes, we need to be extra clear in the design and infrastructure to avoid serious injuries and fatalities. Please add clear Slow Street signage and infrastructure in the driving lanes at every entry point to Slow Lake. To meet our goals of Vision Zero and 80% travel by sustainable (non-car) modes by 2030, it's critical that we continue Slow Lake and keep it as a part of this network. We are looking to you for your leadership. Slow Lake has profoundly improved the Richmond District and the City. Thousands of adults and children from all neighborhoods on bikes, scooters, foot, motorized wheelchairs, and more use it daily to commute, shop, exercise, or get to school. An extensive March 2022 survey showed resounding Richmond District support for Slow Lake. Please support these (ours implies it's a mass email from an organized group) improvements to help Slow Lake continue as a successful street that invites all residents to use Lake safely and sustainably.</p>
378	<p>The removal of the "Closed to Through Traffic" signs at almost all intersections is negative and will encourage through traffic, making it virtually impossible to use the street to jog or bike with kids. -Whatever the final design is, it should keep the legal status which designate Lake as a "Slow Street" on Google Maps and prevent apps from diverting traffic onto it if there is a backup on California. -The raised crosswalks would be a reasonable replacement for the "Closed to Through Traffic" signs _if_ they were built at every intersection, so that they actually deterred through traffic; i.e. so that a car would have to go over 20 speed bumps over 10 blocks. -As someone who drives over speed cushions pretty fast, I assure you that speed cushions do nothing to slow or decrease the amount of traffic. -As someone who walks on Lake regularly - Stop signs are constantly ignored. Adding more will just encourage people to tap on their brake and roll through them instead of stopping at the ones in place if there are fewer. -The hard diverters at 2nd and Funston are good and should not only be kept at those locations, but installed at regular (2-3 block intervals) as well. Conclusion: Please redesign Lake to be like Page Street with flexible bollards and diverters at _every_ intersection, keeping it similar to the existing Slow Street Configuration or increasing the solutions which _limit_ traffic.</p>
379	<p>This design is frankly a joke. It will make it less safe than the current temporary implementation it has now. This needs signage that this is a slow street and it certainly needs more than 4 partial diverters over 20+ blocks. If this design is implemented, it will make Lake a more dangerous street for all. Please improve this design and give the community what it wanted.</p>
380	<p>I support slow streets and Slow lake. Please implement more barriers than you have in the plan. Thank you.</p>
381	<p>I support Slow Lake but would like more raised crosswalks and diverters on every block like Page Street so I can continue using Lake to walk safely.</p>
382	<p>I love Slow Lake and want more signage and stop signs.</p>
383	<p>With stop signs at every corner and a generous bike lane designated, I don't see any reason for Lake St to be closed to traffic.</p>
384	<p>You are creating an even worse safety hazard on 2nd Avenue between Lake St and California. Since Lake closed from 2nd to 28th Ave, cars now speed down that block of 2nd Avenue. You should either open Lake entirely, or add the block of Lake from 2nd to Arguello to the closure, with the associated speed and safety measure you propose at the other intersections with Lake. Our block of 2nd Avenue abutting Lake has become a speedway since Lake closed and someone is going to badly hurt or killed. Please listen to we residents of 2nd Avenue who have been saying this to SFMTA repeatedly for months.</p>
385	<p>The SFMTA took California Street to one lane during the pandemic without proper notification or engagement of residents. It also allowed parklets on Clement while closing Lake Street. Geary is expected to go under construction. Meanwhile, MUNI service to the neighborhood has not been fully restored. There is no CA express in lower California Street. Meanwhile, WE ALSO HAVE the Presidio, Mountain Lake Park and most people have backyards. Slow Streets are for people who don't have access to open space. I believe in slow streets but not on Lake Street when you ample open space, reduced neighborhood access on CALifornia, Clement and Geary and SFMTA has NOT restored MUNI service.</p>

386	<p>Thank you to SFMTA for your work on this project. I recently moved in with my wife and two young children to 7th Avenue between Lake and California. I grew up in San Francisco, and while I remain very committed to the city, I readily admit it is not the most kid-friendly place to grow up thirty years ago, nor is it the easiest place to raise a family today. However, because of Slow Lake Street, every day, I see children learning to ride their bikes, and families riding together to and from school, or the park. By connecting the Presidio and San Francisco's wonderful parks with a car-free east-west thoroughfare, the city has provided an amazing and universally accessible resource for residents that few other urban or suburban locations could match. It is incompressible why we would ever want to revert back to a car-dominated Lake Street. I understand there is a cost to closing Lake Street to traffic - residents in Seacliff and Pacific Heights enjoy using Lake Street to go grocery Shopping in Laurel Village or to get to Marin must instead use California, Clement, or Geary streets (or use Muni!). However, as evidenced in the survey results, the benefits clearly outweigh the cost, particularly for the lifeblood of our city - families with children, who are increasingly leaving the city at rapid rates. Questions around accessibility, safety, or emergency access are completely unfounded and totally disingenuous. Those that need to drive can continue to use Lake Street safely; thousands of drivers use slow lake each day right now. The fundamental question here is if Lake Street should be used as a high-speed thoroughfare like California and Geary. If so, then the proposed design is fine. However, to do so, would be to disenfranchise families and continue to push those few remaining families out of the city. If not, the design must be fixed to prevent drivers from using Lake as a through-street: 1) Upgrade the four partial traffic diverters to full traffic diverters to eliminate cut-through traffic. 2) Add diagonal diverters or block-end closures at all intersections to ensure cut-through traffic on Lake Street is eliminated. 3) Extend Slow Lake Street to Arguello Street and 30th Avenue to allow for more connections.</p>
387	<p>Not being able to turn left from 24 Avenue onto Lake street heading East creates a problem for our block. I am on Lake between 24th and 23rd Ave. For those that need drop offs to their homes for either themselves or deliveries means that cars will either enter on 23 or 22nd Ave and head West, then they need to take a u-turn to get on the correct side of the street (odd numbered addresses) for drop offs. This will create a mess for walkers, bikers and drivers. If someone did not get on the correct side of the street, that person would have to cross into traffic and it would be a hazzard as bikes speed down the street. I want to keep Lake a Slow Street but with no more barriers or traffic restrictions that there are presently.</p>
388	<p>Thank you to SFMTA for your work on this project. I recently moved in with my wife and two young children to 7th Avenue between Lake and California. I grew up in San Francisco, and while I remain very committed to the city, I readily admit it is not the most kid-friendly place to grow up thirty years ago, nor is it the easiest place to raise a family today. However, because of Slow Lake Street, every day, I see children learning to ride their bikes, and families riding together to and from school, or the park. By connecting the Presidio and San Francisco's wonderful parks with a car-free east-west thoroughfare, the city has provided an amazing and universally accessible resource for residents that few other urban or suburban locations could match. It is incompressible why we would ever want to revert back to a car-dominated Lake Street. I understand there is a cost to closing Lake Street to traffic - residents in Seacliff and Pacific Heights enjoy using Lake Street to go grocery Shopping in Laurel Village or to get to Marin must instead use California, Clement, or Geary streets (or use Muni!). However, as evidenced in the survey results, the benefits clearly outweigh the cost, particularly for the lifeblood of our city - families with children, who are increasingly leaving the city at rapid rates. Questions around accessibility, safety, or emergency access are completely unfounded and totally disingenuous. Those that need to drive can continue to use Lake Street safely; thousands of drivers use slow lake each day right now. The fundamental question here is if Lake Street should be used as a high-speed thoroughfare like California and Geary. If so, then the proposed design is fine. However, to do so, would be to disenfranchise families and continue to push those few remaining families out of the city. If not, the design must be fixed to prevent drivers from using Lake as a through-street: 1) Upgrade the four partial traffic diverters to full traffic diverters to eliminate cut-through traffic. 2) Add diagonal diverters or block-end closures at all intersections to ensure cut-through traffic on Lake Street is eliminated. 3) Extend Slow Lake Street to Arguello Street and 30th Avenue to allow for more connections.</p>
389	<p>Thanks so much for your work on the project. I live in the Inner Richmond and use Lake Street almost every day for walking and running. Although I think the design proposal is a step in the right direction, I wish there were more diverters and barricades to ensure that the street really stayed slow and safe for pedestrians and bikers.</p>
390	<p>I strongly oppose the permanent traffic barriers and am in support of the additional 4 way stops, speed bumps, and elevated intersections. I am a Bay Area native and have lived in the Richmond District/Sea Cliff area for the last five years. Lake has always been a critical east west corridor for me in my day to day life from my job, visiting family in Pacific Heights, visiting friends and businesses in the Marina and Presidio, and getting around the Richmond district. As a new mother, Lake continues to be critical to accessing the plentiful parks and playgrounds right off Lake street, as well as visiting family and getting my child to doctors appointments. Permanent barriers would make these visits to family and doctors more difficult and lengthy - with a crying new born in the car even a few extra minutes added on to a commute are challenging. Obviously I cannot ride a bicycle or walk with my newborn for these errands and appointments. The permanent barriers would not give me and my child the same access to Lake street as it does to those who prefer to bicycle or walk. I do also walk on Lake street sidewalks with my child daily for recreation and the sidewalks are plentiful for both myself, the stroller, and any other pedestrians. On these walks, with the current slow street, I do witness children playing games in the middle of the street often unattended by any adults and many dogs running in the middle of the street without leashes. I fear that the permanent barriers would only increase such occurrences as many would feel they are further entitled and protected to use the middle of the street as they see fit.</p>
391	<p>This project proposal seem absurdly complicated and not entirely reflective of what the local community is requesting. This also does not address congestion on California street due to left turns into Park Presidio. Instead of this complicated, expensive project, the committee should install left-only signals on California and Clement to Park Presidio to alleviate the congestion.</p>
392	<p>There are accommodations to most blocks of Lake Street EXCEPT the the 00 Block of Lake Street and 100 Block of 2nd Avenue...which this plan feeds traffic directly into and bears the direct burden of this plan. The chaotic intersection of 2nd Avenue and Lake Street is right outside my front window. I do not need some traffic study to prove this is a misguided plan. I see it every day. California Street reduced to one lane each direction. Clement Street closed on Sundays for Farmers Market. Geary Blvd to massive construction for BRT. Slow Lake Street is coming at the worst possible time. Better rethink this one.</p>

393	1) Change the speed limit of all slow streets to 15 MPH. Enforce the limit. 2) Make it obvious at every intersection that Lake Street is slow - with many strong barriers, at least every 2-4 blocks. Speed bumps are fine, if they actually make a difference. More stop signs won't help much if some cars try to get to maximum speed between every pair. 3) Don't make complex rules about what is OK. No through traffic - period. If you can, enforce the rules with cameras, maybe mobile ones. They should pay for themselves and more. A network of slow streets is the only way I or anyone sane will switch from their cars to their bikes or scooters. 5000 pound vehicles driving at 30mph just 2 feet away from me is terrifying, because they can kill you if anyone makes a goof. Restrict them from our best pedestrian/bike/people streets.
394	Does the proposed plan make the street usable for many of the current activities such as walking, cycling, skateboarding for all participants (especially younger and older). Has the idea of closing Lake Street on weekends been considered? Is making Lake Street one way feasible and leaving another lane for a variety of pedestrian uses? I'm glad to see the current proposal includes many efforts to slow traffic in a variety ways. I have often seen cars accelerate down the street as if pedestrians and cyclists were not present. That kind of disregard may result in pedestrian injuries.
395	As a resident of the block affected by the diverter on 2nd Avenue, I would like to see greater transparency in the decision making that determined closing Lake on Arguello was not the most viable option. There are long-time residents here whose opinions deserve to be validated, given their real and tangible status as stakeholders. Why should public opinion supersede that of those that are living with the negative consequences?
396	Please, please, please, please DO NOT implement the proposed design. Lake Street is NOT a private cul-de-sac for its residents, and should NOT be permanently altered at the expense of all the other residents of Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, The Richmond, Sea Cliff, Vista Del Mar, Jordan Park and the rest of the city, who need to use the street to access the freeway, the Presidio, Lands End, Ocean Beach, and other desirable locations in the northwest portion of San Francisco. Why should the rest of us have to overcrowd California Street, making it more dangerous and slow, so that a select few of the city's residents can walk in the middle of the road instead of the sidewalk? California Street will be ruined by the influx of traffic: already-difficult parking will disappear; MUNI busses will be impeded, affecting even those who are not in cars; and residents of California Street will struggle to back out of their driveways and be subjected to increased street noise. There is NO benefit to residents of Lake Street that is achieved by these proposals that could not be implemented in a more common sense, mutually agreeable way. Lake Street has beautiful, shady, tree lined sidewalks that are wide and accessible to all pedestrians. There is no reason to want to walk in the middle of a road designed for cars. Lake Street has spacious bike lanes on both sides of the road, so bikers have no need to bike outside of those lanes. If bikers desire to ride where there are no cars, there are plenty of places to do so within Golden Gate Park and the Presidio, which are conveniently close to Lake Street. Closing the road to cars will likely not encourage people to bike who normally would not have. Only a limited number of people are able to bike, and it is not a feasible commute if only Lake Street is open to inexperienced city bikers. It is possible to increase safety on Lake Street without making it inaccessible to cars. In order to increase safety when turning on to Lake Street, four way stops should be implemented at more intersections. This will make Lake Street safer for pedestrians and easier to turn on to for residents of the avenues without causing unwanted issues for residents of Lake and California Streets. Raised crosswalks, speed bumps, and diverters are not necessary. Diverters also block residents of Lake, the avenues, and the Presidio (at the 14th Street entrance) from accessing their homes, which is ludicrous. Who does this plan benefit? It does not increase overall safety, it has a negative impact on the vast majority of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods, and it is sure to cost a lot of taxpayer money and cause an extended disruption through traffic. This plan is short-sighted and selfish on the behalf of residents of Lake who support it, and there are NO MAJOR BENEFITS only alarmingly obvious drawbacks.
397	I fully support keeping Lake Street a Slow Street, but these updated designs do not do enough for safety. There should be more robust traffic diverters (like the one proposed at 24th) at EVERY intersection, raised crosswalks, and larger signage too. Speed bumps and flimsy plastic posts are not enough.
398	Lake street should remain a permanent slow street. There's little reason for traffic and it's an invaluable public good.
399	I am concerned that an adequate traffic study has not been conducted regarding the closure of Lake Street. From May through October, Park Presidio and access to the GG Bridge backs up all thoroughfares. Closing Lake Street will continue to increase the traffic on CALifornia and other residential streets. CALifornia has been reduced to one lane and is often backed up as is Clement Street. I'm unclear why the city is limiting access when public concern has not been adequately captured. I do not believe Lake Street should be closed.
400	Overall I find that there is much to like about this plan. Additional elements can always be added later as needed. I have some suggestions: 1) Reducing posted speed to 20 mph should be pushed. Adding MPH readout signage at key locations would also help. This will emphasize the aspect of slowing down the traffic. 2) I suggest that all corners with entrances into Mountain Lake park have at least one cross walk raised to further slow traffic. This should be emphasized at Funston and 11th, as those will not be all way stops. 3) The speed "cushions" should not have "wheel gaps" in them. This defeats that purpose of calming speeds, allowing many vehicles to drive on "flat surface". 4) I have noticed that speed cushions work to slow most vehicles. However many of the higher end SUV's (Range Rover, Land Rover, BMW, Mercedes, ...) have suspensions that allow them to roll through at higher speeds. This is sad. Not sure how to improve without going to a sharper edge. 5) Lake Street is used by many bicyclists. The design should not do any of the "Euclid" effects that really are detrimental to bicyclists, such as: speed cushions across uphill bike lanes where motorists oddly have wheel breaks or roundabouts that cut off the bike lane to merge autos and bicyclists.
401	The new design is terrible and does away with slow Lake and pedestrian access to the street. Please update the design to allow for pedestrian use of the entire street from 2nd Ave to 25th Avenue.
402	Slowing down Lake and making it accessible to traffic is what I thought I voted for. I am against traffic diverters. When was this added? My college aged son bikes and he has been complaining that Clement and California St, especially west of Park Presidio, has become more dangerous since there is more traffic. He states that not everyone benefits from the Lake closure who rides a bike here. For some, it has made cycling more dangerous. Aren't parks set up for children and family biking? It seems dangerous to tell families that their children are safe when neighborhood cars are allowed to park, drive into garages and back out. No diverters is going to stop this.

403	<p>There needs to be a more concrete solution rather than diverters. I've seen cars drive around the current barricades and the presence of them just angers drivers more, and they tend to focus on swerving around them at high rates of speed and miss pedestrians crossing into the crosswalk, making it more dangerous. There needs to be more signage about slow streets throughout the design and speed limit signs. Stop signs will not deter motorists from speeding. I walk here almost daily after work, and I've seen most do the "california stop" or slightly tap the breaks in order to "beat" the pedestrian to the intersection. Maybe put a stop sign at every block? Every other block still seems like an incentive to cut through from California street. There should be more speed bumps on the roads leading into lake street, to cut traffic. To further discourage cut through traffic, certain streets should be closed to vehicles entirely, except as a single lane for residents to turn into their residences. If you maintain two way traffic, you dont remove teh incentive of ppl cutting from 19th to Arguello. Can we create the roundabouts (similar to Parker ave. and Euclid), as I feel this has a better chance of slowing traffic as drivers can just pile right through with an obstruction in the middle and need to take greater care at the intersections (it will also enhance the landscaping on Lake street). Suggest also painting the bike lanes because right now, when there are cars, pedestrians, and bikes, the cars tend to drive over the bike lane, around pedestrians - need something to highlight the bike lane Also I notice when walking alot of cutting traffic is to diverted from California to make the turn at Arguello. If that signal can be metered to be even slower to change, that might help discourage cut traffic. And then there is better education at the entries regarding pedestrian right of way on slow streets. I've had people nearly hit me then gesture with the hands up (like WTF are you doing walking on the middle of the street kind of look) and others flip me off (while accelerating at a higher rate of speed). Please save lake street and do all you can to discourage vehicles apart from local traffic to residents.</p>
404	<p>Please return Lake Street to a normal street. Parks are open and Covid is over, the reason for the slow street in the first place. Mountain Lake park is next to Lake Street for open space. Lake Street already has a bike lane and wide sidewalks. California Street is now a mess.</p>
405	<p>I am disappointed with this proposal. As someone who lives on the corner of Lake St and 26th Ave, I use Slow Lake Street weekly to get around the neighborhood. I believe that this proposal makes it too easy for cars to get around onto and transport on Lake Street. Even with the current status quo, there are sometimes drivers ignoring the barriers and signage, making it dangerous for those walking and biking. I believe that the proposal needs to be redone with many more barriers and signage declaring Lake Street a Slow Street. Additionally, there needs to be more stops signs and the cement barriers. Please keep Lake Street a slow street and make the Richmond a great neighborhood to live in!</p>
406	<p>The slow road idea will increase the value of every single property on Lake Street. Have you considered doing this in Bayside? Creating what's in effect a gated community on a tony public street is truly the most divisive show of "money talks" I have seen since Nancy Pelosi's street (Broadway) was repaved while 7th avenue remained a potholed mess.</p>
407	<p>Thank you for your work on this, we look forward to the changes and support methods to keep Lake Street a Slow Street and safe for all methods of travel and recreation, with a priority on Pedestrians and Cyclists.</p>
408	<p>Our 4 yr old daighter rides hrr bike on lake street everday. It has been awesome until recently. People in cars are no longer obeying "not a through street". We watch cars fly through block after block and it has become more dangerous. The new plan needs more physical deterrents for cars. It is too watered down. The city needs to do more to encourage families to live here, and a permanent truly slow lake st is great for kids. Please add more physical barriers at each intersection</p>
409	<p>I am dismayed with the state of the current plans for Lake St. For the past 5 years, I have been riding to commute to work and drop off my child at school in the Presidio using Lake St. as one of the primary low-traffic sections of our route. For the past 2 years, we've been riding side-by-side- with my child on his own bike. The fact that we were even able to entertain the idea when we started was predicated on the existence of slow streets like Lake, and here's why: There are plenty of routes to choose in this neighborhood with bike lanes on them, but when riding with a smaller, less confident rider, these bike lanes actually serve to make us (or at least make us feel) less safe. When there are clear paint lines on the road, drivers instinctively feel like cyclists must only ride on one side of them, while the other side is for exclusive use of drivers of motor vehicles. We can feel this viscerally as people drive their cars much closer to us, crowding us closer to the door zone, where other inattentive motorists often open their doors in our path while entering or exiting their vehicles. Contrast this to the current slow Lake street, where, in part due to the fact that the rules are vague and the signs are numerous, drivers seem to sense that they're in a "shared space", and give us extra room regardless whether we're in a bike lane. In addition drivers seem to move more slowly through this space (and isn't that the point?). The proposed design (which does not appear to match any of the design versions I originally saw when they were first released) seems to equate more 4-way stops and speed cushions with what is currently in place. This, however, is a HUGE downgrade in the usability of the street, especially for parents with their smaller riders in tow. In addition to the loss of the consistent messaging about the street being closed to through traffic, 4 way stops are in many ways MORE dangerous for younger, less experienced bike riders, who lack the kind of attention and quick decision making skills adult riders and drivers possess. I am worried that this current design will roll back one of the most wonderful silver-linings of the last couple of challenging years. Please reconsider this design, and help SF parents like myself feel like we're working forwards towards having a network of safe streets to support families who are struggling to remain car-free, rather than rolling back safe infrastructure to capitulate to the status quo.</p>
410	<p>Is this some kind of joke?!? This is incredibly watered down and VERY disappointing. This is not a Slow Street design. What makes Slow Lake so successful as a community space to improve health, shift trips to sustainable modes, and get to local businesses is a reduction in cut-through traffic, which speeds and drives recklessly on Lake Street. It's important to note that even with the current "No through traffic" signs, drivers continue to swerve around them and race down Lake! My family and I have had several dangerous close encounters. The proposed design will only make it worse! My family lives on Lake and uses Lake every day to commute to school, work, or just to get outside. We LOVE how much safer we feel compared to other streets in the city. Why do we have to fight so hard to keep this? First JFK, now Lake? Where are our priorities? This is exhausting! All of this after the official survey showed more than 80% support from Lake Street residents and promised barriers along Slow Lake. This is NOT what we supported and we will NOT be supportive of any design this reductive. Let's do more than the bare minimum next time. Please include these items in the next iteration: 1. More traffic diversion. (2 for 28 blocks is ridiculous!) 2. Clear signage in the driving lanes. (paint on the ground, etc.) A Slow Street should look and feel different than every other street in the city, so please design it that way!</p>

411	If Lake street is voted to remain closed to cars will the tax payers still have to foot the bill for upkeep? Or, can we tear out Lake street and return it to a natural habitat?
412	While the permanent design is an improvement from the pre-Slow Street, I am concerned that the permanent design removes the 23 existing "No through traffic" barricades and replaces them with four concrete diverters. This will encourage more dangerous cut thru traffic and create very long long stretches (~10 blocks) of Lake Street to Park Presidio which will enable speeding on a Slow Street. Please include more concrete diverters and/or white posts and purple signs in the driving lane, more signage to make it clear to automobile drivers that Lake Street is a Slow Street that prioritizes pedestrians and bicycle riders and Extend Slow Lake to Arguello Street and 30th Avenue.
413	Hi, I signed up for project updates. the last update I received was in March. I read about these new designs in the Examiner. Why was I not informed about the latest development? This current version wasn't included in any of the options that the SFMTA presented, and looks like it represents the worst kind of compromise: the people who want to reopen Lake are going to complain that it's not open enough (the traffic redirecting). And the people who want to keep the slow street are obviously going to say that the proposed design is no longer a "slow street" which the new design clearly throws out the window. Why did the SFMTA not commit to either offering the city more *real* slow streets, or acknowledging that driving is the preferred method of transport and design the traffic scape accordingly? Why not change the name of the design project, since this is no longer a proposed design for a slow street? Sincerely, A 15 year resident of the Richmond District.
414	We need more diverters not less. The new design will not address speeding motorists. (motorists treat speed cushions, stop sigs and raised crosswalks as a slight inconvenience) This project has been approved *twice* by the SFMTA board. Twice. Thank you for your work on Slow Lake bc I know you've been run through the gauntlet. My family uses Slow Lake to get to public school, preschool and to essential services along the Inner Clement corridor. We mode shifted bc of Slow Streets, JFK Promenade and the Great Walkway. Save Slow Lake Street!
415	I object to the proposed design for Lake Street. The proposed design would allow the full width of Lake Street to be used by cars, subject only to a small number of diverters (fewer than at present), some speed bumps and more stop signs. In contrast, under the current Slow Street program cars are generally prohibited from using Lake Street, except for a block or two to access premises located on Lake Street. Thus, under the current program, the full width of Lake Street is available for pedestrians, bicycles, etc. The closing of Lake Street has been wonderful, and Lake St. should not be made more available to cars. The full width of Lake St. should continue to be available for pedestrians and bicyclists, without their having to be concerned about cars. I live about a half block from Lake St. and prior to the pandemic frequently used Lake St. for car travel. Although, the current program on Lake St. inconveniences me when I travel by car, I still prefer that it remain closed to cars, except for cars that need to access premises on Lake St., and then only for a block or two. Early in the pandemic I did a lot of bicycling and walking in the middle of Lake St. Currently, due to some back problems, I am not using Lake St. for bicycling or walking. However, I look forward to again being able to walk and bicycle on Lake St. without having to be concerned about frequent car traffic. Thank you for your consideration of my views.
416	I am concerned that currently and with the new design the slow street signs that are every block are not really followed. Are we being more permanent signage at every other street to replace the current slow street signage. We live on Lake Street and have lived there for four years. We love the slow Lake Street. It is finally safe for our kids to be able to cross the street and not worry about them getting hit by speeding cars. We would like to maintain the current signage and enhance it if possible. The Clay Street slow Street signage seems to be more effective at diverting traffic. Will we be getting something like that on Lake Street? Before it became a slow Street, there used to be a police car that would periodically park at the end of the street (5th and laid) just to catch cars speeding through the stop signs. I am worried if we lose our slow street signage these speeding cars will return and be a danger to all those living in the neighborhood.
417	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous. I am strongly opposed to this plan.
418	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
419	I have lived on W. Clay St. which is off of 24th Ave. for 25 years. I raised three children and four dogs safely on this street. I do not want to see our street compromised with increased traffic and speeding cars to get to a destination. The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
420	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.

421	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
422	I live on 24th Ave, North of Lake St. This section of 24th Ave, the connecting portion of West Clay and the same section of 22nd Ave are all too narrow for two cars to pass each other at normal speed. The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. 24th Ave, West Clay and 22nd Ave in West Clay park are not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous. If there is to be a diverter it would be better placed at 25th Ave. Though that location is problematic on its own way too.
423	I live in the Presidio and use the 15th Avenue gate daily. Cars leaving the presidio via the 15th avenue gate have two choices when they need to get to Park Presidio Blvd.: turn left on lake street and cut through 1.5 blocks of Lake's "slow street", or proceed another block south to California, and then make a very dangerous left turn. The intersection at 15th and California is infamously dangerous because westbound traffic coming from the Park Presidio stoplight has 3-4 blocks without a stop sign and are often speeding, as well as the visual hazard of the parked cars along California creating a "blind corner". Frequently presidio traffic chooses to go on Lake between 15th and Park Presidio, because of the stress and danger of the intersection at 15th and California. The intersection of 15th and California needs to be improved with a 4-way-stop sign if the goal is to keep cars safely off of lake street. Otherwise you are funneling more traffic to an already stressed and dangerous intersection. Either that, or this project should acknowledge that "cut through" cars should be easily allowed to use lake street to get from the 15th avenue gate to Park Presidio Blvd. For the record, I support all of the proposed improvements to keep Lake a safe slow street. But this amount of work should not ignore 15th and California- this is a problem intersection that will only become more dangerous if all the traffic from the Presidio 15th avenue gate is forced there.
424	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
425	As a resident of West Clay Street I feel the proposal cause great harm to the people who live on West Clay Street, It also does not ease traffic but will increase it as there will be backups on West Clay since the street is too narrow. Having lived either on Lake Street or West Clay for over 50 years Lake Street has never had too much traffic to handle and should be reopened as it was prior to the pandemic. Schools are open and children can go to the park, which is one block away, and people can still congregate on the sidewalk or use the bike lanes for riding bikes. The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
426	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
427	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
428	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. Two cars cannot safely pass without one of them pulling into a driveway or vacant parking spot. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous. As it is, emergency vehicles struggle with West Clay. The proposed diverter at 24th will exacerbate this. I might propose that the diverter go at 23rd, to direct all traffic over to California or Geary.
429	Tax dollars should not be used to create a private road. We don't see similar actions in neighborhoods that are not as affluent. California is now down to one lane in areas and diverting Lake street traffic to California is causing significant backups and traffic. We are not back to normal traffic and the traffic jams caused due to increased traffic on California are not reasonable.

430	I object to the proposed diverter at the intersection of Lake st and 24th avenue. The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. Currently when 2 oncoming cars meet in the street one must find space to pull to the side in order for the other car to pass. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
431	If, as a neighbor states, Lake street between Park Presidio and 24th Avenue will NOT be a slow street but a through street, I am most unhappy. What is the point of being a slow street if it will open to traffic and runners, walkers and kids on bikes, trikes are not allowed in the street. I do not want a barrier on 24th and Lake. We submitted our wishes for plans and this plan was not on any options. I live on Lake between 23rd and 24th.
432	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
433	I live on 22nd Ave. north of Lake St. I am AGAINST the proposed traffic diverter at 24th Ave. It will funnel drivers north into the relatively narrow streets of West Clay Park to get back onto Lake St. at 22nd Ave. This will cause noise and congestion. I see no good reason for closing the two block section of East-bound Lake St. between 24th and 22nd Aves.
434	Ban Cars on Lake Street
435	I used Lake Street for biking and walking several times during the pandemic. It was wonderful. Please keep it as a permanent post-pandemic slow streets with full priority to pedestrians and bicycles; not cars.
436	I am generally in favor of "calming" traffic on Lake Street, but I STRONGLY oppose the diverter for eastbound traffic at 24th & Lake. I live on West Clay street, a narrow street north of Lake, and the only outlets are the stub ends of 22nd and 24th Avenues. West Clay as well as the blocks of 22nd and 24th Avenues north of Lake are narrow streets (narrower than the blocks south of Lake) and two cars driving in opposing directions cannot pass each other. When exiting West Clay on 22nd and 24th, we routinely are required to pull to the side in a driveway to allow the opposing traffic to pass. The proposed diverter will unnecessarily force more traffic on to northbound 24th and greatly compound this problem. I fully support a 4 way stop at 24th and speed bumps along Lake, but the diverter at 24th will just compound an already complicated situation. If you do insist on the diverter, I suggest place it at 23rd Ave & Lake. It will force traffic onto California as 23rd Ave. ends at Lake and eastbound traffic would be forced to turn right (south on 23rd Avenue.
437	Please keep ALL Slow Streets signage and diverters!!!
438	Please implement the design suggestions from Friends of Slow Lake and Luke Bornheimer. Make it a true slow street.
439	I support the proposed changes and also would encourage more traffic diverters.
440	The plan doesn't seem to accomplish any of the goals of slow lake. I personally would like to see more speed bumps put it along lake at the moment, some cars (perhaps those in opposition to the slow street) are speeding down Lake, putting pedestrians at risk. I would like to see all of Lake closed to thru traffic and speed bumps put in!
441	The traffic diverters should be designed to encourage traffic to turn right and south to California Street, not to the north of lake blocks as these are basically Cul De Sacs or in the case of West Clay Park a horseshoe that would only lead traffic back to Lake street once again and send extra traffic to a street that should only be accessed by residents and delivery services as these are not through streets. this is not clear in the proposal and should be clarified. The diverters for east bound traffic must be designed to force right turns only with the exception of residents of the streets that would be accessed by turning left. Alternatively use an L shaped diverter that would force right turns only. Local residents could then access their own streets by driving from California straight through (e.g. 24th Avenue) or by driving west bound and turning right into their own residential street.
442	The existing arrangement seems to be working just fine. Can you please just leave it as it is? We don't need any new construction. If you have extra money you want to spend, maybe can direct it toward sand removal on the Great Highway in order to keep the roadway open to vehicular traffic.
443	I live on 24th Avenue, north of Lake Street. I strongly favor reopening Lake Street to the way it was pre-pandemic.
444	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
445	I use Lake Street to bike to school. Please change the proposal to have more barrier things than what's in ur plan. I feel safety on a slow street and won't with the proposal because cars will just drive around the barriers. Since there's only like two I think cars will just ignore them.
446	I was pleased when the MTA Board voted unanimously to permanently make Lake Street a slow street. But the current plan doesn't match the MTA board's instructions to staff because signage isn't on every block or even every other block. The current proposal is the most dangerous outcome. Drivers will act as though the street is completely open. Bikers, walkers and those in wheelchairs will assume the street is a slow street. Tragic results are inevitable. Regarding wheelchairs I push my mom up and down Lake Street daily. Using the street is much preferred over sidewalks with their undulations and obstructions. Also when we use the street my mom and her friend are able to go side by side as I push my mom.
447	why are there still cars here? drivers have shown themselves unable to not kill numerous pedestrians every single year.

448	<p>I live on Lake Street, and I appreciate everything the Mayor, our Supervisors, and the SFMTA have done with Slow Streets and the current Slow Lake Street design. Prior to the pandemic, there were frequent vehicle collisions on 25th. It appears the traffic light encouraged drivers to chase the light, increasing speed and creating circumstances contributing to collisions. Cars near the intersection have been frequently sideswiped, and my neighbor's front garden on Lake was once severely damaged by a speeding driver. Slow Lake has been transformational for our family and has, in fact, kept us from a planned move to Marin County. My two middle school boys used Slow Lake and Slow Clay for the past 2 school years to commute by bike to and from school. Over time, 6-12 schoolmates joined them daily, creating a sweet "bike pool" of kids. This bike pool has been amazing for their mental and physical well-being and importantly, has eliminated 12-24 daily school drop-off /pick-up car trips on California and other streets. Due to the larger percentage of children walking, biking and scootering to their school, one of our crossing guards noted that school and neighborhood traffic has never been so light, delighting, I'm sure, the residents that live near the school. I am happy to see some concrete diverters in the design for Slow Lake. However, I propose the following improvements: 1) Add Concrete Diverters to 25th and Arguello. Please add diverters to the critical entry points onto Lake, including 25th and Arguello. The 25th Avenue intersection is inherently dangerous with cut-through drivers speeding to catch the light. Kittedredge School, located at the intersection, is a K-8 elementary school, which by its nature attracts a cluster of children at that intersection throughout the school day. Without a diverter on 25th, pedestrians, bike riders and school children are vulnerable to cut-through drivers. 2) More Diverters. I am concerned about the removal of the existing barriers and the lack of barriers or diverters for two 10+ block stretches in the current draft design. 10 blocks is too long of a stretch without barriers to discourage dangerous and speeding cut-through traffic, making the street unsafe for children, seniors, people with disabilities, and people using sustainable transportation. SFMTA should either add additional concrete diverters, or at a minimum install the slow street purple and white diverters utilized on Slow Clay at every intersection on Lake. The temporary barricades should remain in place to ensure safety until the permanent diverters can be installed. 2) Clear Signs and Communication. The lack of signs and stenciling on the street "in the driving lanes" is concerning. It's confusing for drivers, which in turn puts vulnerable people outside cars at risk. If we are "in fact" welcoming the use of these streets by pedestrians, children, people with disabilities, and people on bikes, the design, infrastructure and communication need to be clear to prevent collisions that result in serious injuries and fatalities. Moreover, clear communication responds to drivers that complain about the lack of clarity around acceptable uses of Slow Lake. Please add clear Slow Street signage and infrastructure in the driving lanes at every entry point to Slow Lake. For example, please consider "Local Traffic Only" and "Right (Left) Turn for Local Traffic Only" at the intersection on 25th. Please also make the signs around Kittedredge school more visible, including 15 MPH signs, and add mid-crosswalk signs on both sides of the crosswalk on Lake and 25th. Slow Lake is not closing the street for private use. It's in fact opening the street to anyone - regardless of income or status as a car owner - who wishes to transport on Lake in a safe and sustainable way. I personally know people outside the neighborhood who travel to Lake (some by bus!) in order to walk, bike or scooter to locations such as the Presidio, Land's End, the Legion of Honor, China Beach, and Baker Beach. To meet our goals of Vision Zero and 80% travel by sustainable (non-car) modes by 2030, it's critical we continue Slow Lake and keep it as a part of a City-wide network of slow streets. We are looking to you for your leadership. All of us, including those who oppose calming measures, have good intentions. However, we must, together, encourage carbon-free modes of transport by reserving a very small percentage of streets that truly prioritize sustainable use over car use. Slow Lake has profoundly improved the Richmond District and the City. Thousands of adults and children from our neighborhood and from other neighborhoods "on bikes, scooters, foot, motorized wheelchairs, and more" use it daily to commute, shop, exercise, walk their dogs, or get to school. An extensive March 2022 survey showed resounding Richmond District support for Slow Lake. Please support improvements to help keep Lake slow and safe for sustainable use by everyone. Thank you for your continued support.</p>
449	<p>I am writing to ask that Lake Street remain inaccessible to thru-traffic, and stays accessible to cyclists and pedestrians who use Slow Lake Street as a safe street to walk, run and cycle on. I regularly walk down Lake Street in the Inner Richmond to Mountain Lake Park, as well as bike along Lake to Baker Beach and Central Richmond. Most importantly, I'm asking that the current plan for Lake Street be modified to prevent cars from using Lake Street to bypass California Street in the Inner Richmond to access Park Presidio Blvd and the Golden Gate Bridge. There are not enough vehicle diverters in the current plan, and without them the end result will be drivers taking over the space for thru-traffic and creating an unsafe street to walk and cycle on. There need to be additional vehicle diverters added on westbound Lake Street between Arguello and Funston (ideally at 6th and 10th Avenues) to prevent this thru-traffic and restrict Lake Street to local traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
450	<p>We walk to school every morning in the Richmond District - and every morning we stand at the crosswalk at 22nd and California and watch people looking at their phones and driving recklessly. We've started wearing bright day glow clothing to feel safer walking around our neighborhood. Lake Street has been a small respite from that constant concern. However now we're dealing with angry drivers speeding through and ignoring slow street signs. I appreciate that SFMTA wants to reduce traffic on Lake Street, and I support making the proposed changes. However, the proposed design doesn't go far enough. Lake Street should be safe enough for kids and families to walk and bike to school. In August 2021, the SFMTA Board voted to keep Lake Street a permanent Slow Street. We think the design for Lake Street should truly stop dangerous cut-through traffic from speeding through our neighborhoods. I would like SFMTA to strengthen the design with additional cement diverters in both directions at major intersections (25th, Park Presidio, Arguello, etc) to eliminate cut-through traffic entirely and make the street safe for kids to walk and bike to school. Cars should not be able to speed down 10 blocks of our slow street without interruption. I also ask SFMTA to commit to monitoring average daily vehicle volumes and speeds on Slow Lake after the new traffic diverters are installed, and to increase traffic diversion as needed to prevent cut-through traffic and make the street safer, while also allowing residents to still reach their homes in cars. Every kid in San Francisco should feel safe walking and biking to school. We need Slow Lake to be part of a street network that's truly safe for families with kids, people with disabilities, and seniors. Please move forward with the proposed Slow Lake design as a baseline, and commit to strengthening it in the future!</p>
451	<p>Please keep Lake Slow Street! Cars already dominate most of the city. It's good to have an open space where kids can play and people can walk freely. It's also much quieter.</p>

452	As a resident on the North side of Lake street between 22nd and 24th Aves, this plan for a new concrete diverter at 24th avenue is absolutely disasterous for our block of Lake street and the West Clay neighborhood. The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay will no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, CRITICAL emergency response teams (SFFD and ambulances) will be diverted as well, and will be forced to delay their attention for the time needed to be diverted or deal with diverted traffic in front of them! There is a large population of elderly residents living on west clay and is proposal is 1) incredibly dangerous for those elderly folks who live there 2) incredibly frustrating and difficult for those of us living on Lake street that will need to be detoured by three blocks EVERY SINGLE DAY just to get to our own homes!!!! I'm respectfully URGING SFMTA to restore Lake street to its pre-pandemic state as soon as possible.
453	Madness! The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. is funnelling cars on to a narrow 2 block street (West Clay St.) that goes nowhere but back up to Lake St at 22nd Ave. This will REDUCE SAFETY. There is not enough room on West Clay to safely increase the amount of cars rushing through the street. Have the planners actually been to the intersectio of 24th Avenue and Lake St? This is In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous. Emergency vehicles will also be diverted depending on where they are coming from. That :30 sec to 2 min delay could be the deciding factor on saving a life or burning house.
454	The SFMTA and San Francisco seem to have forgotten that streets were designed and created for automobile traffic many decades ago. Sidewalks are in place for pedestrian use, handicap corners installed, and convenient neighborhood parks already in existence. THERE IS NO NEED FOR PARTIAL OR FULL STREET CLOSURES TO CARS. LEAVE LAKE STREET OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC AS IT ONCE WAS BEFORE THE PANDEMIC. LAKE STREET SHOULD NOT BE A CLOSED AREA FOR AUTO TRAFFIC.
455	Hello, I live with my daughter and her husband on Lake Street. I am 86 and disabled. My daughter or my caregiver take me on nice walks on Lake Street and it is really nice to walk on the street where it is easier for me to manage my walker. It is so nice not to have so much traffic. The design looks good but I would like permanent barriers where the existing barriers are located. I'm afraid without the barriers cars will drive fast again in between. Also, could you add some handicapped parking spaces on the street? It would be nice to reserve some space for people with disabilities to park. Thank you.
456	I live with my daughter on Lake Street. I am 86 years old and I enjoy walking on Lake Street very much. I am a little afraid of dogs, and the sidewalk sometimes gets crowded. Walking on the street is very nice and it is safe and quiet. I am so happy to hear that slow Lake will be permanent. It is such a good idea. The one comment I would make is to include permanent barriers to replace the temporary barriers. Thank you
457	I live on Lake Street with my parents. I am a high schooler. For the past two years, my friends and I walked or biked to school every day using Slow Lake and Slow Clay. It was awesome, especially during the pandemic. My parents were supportive because they felt it was safer for me to bike or walk on slow streets, and it saved a ton of gas. I also use electric scooters a lot with my friends on Slow Lake and on Slow Clay. The SFMTA design looks great! However, I think adding a diverter on 25th might be better since there is a lot of traffic at that intersection. Also at Arguello. I think some more diverters and some signs would also be great so drivers understand the rules. Thank you
458	The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.
459	This is ridiculous. You are simply shifting the traffic issues onto adjacent streets that didn't have a problem. This is all so bikes can run stop signs and go faster than cars. Not everyone is able to ride a bike.
460	The proposed diverter at 24th avenue is a terrible solution. The obvious - and hopefully unintended - consequence will be to increase traffic on West Clay which is not designed at all to support thru traffic. Please go back to the drawing board on this one... I am supporter of the "slow streets" but this solution seems designed to please no one.

461	<p>I have lived on Lake Street for 10 years, and I appreciate everything the SFMTA has done with Slow Streets and the current Slow Lake Street design. I'm a strong supporter of Slow Lake and I am pleased the SFMTA voted to make Lake Street (and three other streets) permanently slow. I often walk my dog on Slow Lake, and my kids ride their bikes to and from school on Slow Lake. I also sometimes commute by bike to my office in the Embarcadero Center, and I bike Slow Lake, Slow Clay and the Wiggle. Our street is so much safer and quieter, and there have been no traffic accidents at the intersection of 25th Avenue, which was the site of frequent accidents in the past. I fully support the 4 diverters in the design for Slow Lake, the additional speed bumps and the additional stop signs. I propose the following improvements: 1) Move the Concrete Diverters to 25th and Arguello. Please add, or move the proposed, diverters to the busy entry points onto Lake, including 25th and Arguello. The 25th Avenue intersection is dangerous with cut-through drivers speeding to catch the light. Drivers will not realize the street is a Slow Street until they reach 24th Avenue, which will endanger pedestrians and bikers in the block between 24th and 25th. I note that there is a school on the corner of 25th and as a result, there are several children often on that block. 2) More Diverters. Please install the slow street purple and white diverters utilized on Slow Clay to replace the existing temporary barriers on Lake. I am concerned that the multiple blocks with no diverters will attract speeding once again. 3) Clear Signs and Communication. Please add clear signage and infrastructure in the driving lanes at every entry points into Slow Lake so drivers are aware that there will be pedestrians and bike riders in the street. Please also communicate the rules around slow lake usage to the community. 4) Disabled Parking. My mother and my in-laws stay with us on extended visits. All are in their 80s and suffer mobility issues. My father in law is disabled. I would like to see some space on Lake Street reserved for handicapped parking to ensure access for people with disabilities. Slow Lake has profoundly improved our family's experience in SF. For example, a few weeks ago my family of four biked from our house on Lake Street to McLaren Park to watch a show at the newly renovated Jerry Garcia bandshell. This was a safe, comfortable and enjoyable ride because we were able to spend much of the time riding on Slow Lake and Slow Page (and also the bike lanes on Arguello and Valencia). Without Slow Lake as an integrated part of the City's slow street and bike lane network, we would have never felt comfortable taking this trip. SF's slow streets--including Slow Lake--is one of the things that makes this City Great! In short, I see numerous people on bikes, scooters, and on foot enjoying Lake Street daily. It truly has been one blessing that has emerged from the pandemic, and I urge the City and the SFMTA to continue supporting Slow Lake and other slow streets in San Francisco. Thank you.</p>
462	<p>Dear SFMTA, My family and I use Lake Street every day to bike, walk and rollerblade--to get to work, school, and well, everywhere. The fact that it's largely devoid of auto traffic makes all the difference, as the street is actually safe. The proposed design undoes the best elements of Lake Street and appears to reintroduce auto traffic--with some limited attempts to keep speeds low. Why would SFMTA do this? A street without (much) car traffic is a blessing--why on earth would an agency that supposedly promotes transit, walking and biking bring cars, and all the danger they present to bicyclists and pedestrians, back onto the street? Is it just to appease a handful of local residents/motorists? I am not a traffic design engineer, so I don't know exactly what to suggest, but I beg of you to add elements to this design that actually prevent cars from using Lake Street as a way to get to/from the bridge. Perhaps another physical barrier around 6th and other at 19th could help...or at least some signs stating "no through traffic"...or something serious. The current plan appears designed to increase auto traffic--please reconsider. Sincerely</p>
463	<p>The continued closure of Lake Street shows complete insanity! It was okay to have it available during Covid, but to continue having it closed just for a few people who choose to walk down the middle of the road when California Street is horrendously backed up and creating even more emissions is not smart. Lake Street has bike lanes and wide sidewalks! It's time to completely OPEN LAKE STREET! For those of us paying high property taxes we should be able to drive on our streets. It seems that the people making the decisions are living out of the city along with some of the folks living on Lake St wanting a public park at their front door. If these residents will have exclusive use of Lake Street, raising their property values, they should be charged more. The decision to keep Lake St closed after people returned to work has pitted neighbors against one another. Please return Lake Street to its original no build status.</p>
464	<p>Please open Lake Street now. The results of the survey are vastly unfair. Of course the majority of residents that live on Lake Street would like to see their property values increased by having a private park in front of their homes. It's like asking someone who will benefit financially from a decision to weigh in on their own special interests and be amazed at how favorable the results are! It is obvious that this is the case when the residents adjacent to the street are vastly less in favor of keeping it open. I truly believe that this decision has always been decided ahead of time. So much money, time and energy has gone in to these plans that I doubt very much that there has ever been neutrality in this decision process from the team at MTA. We're going through the motions and ignoring the skewing of data from people who will benefit financially keeping the street closed. Those of us that have to exclusively use California street while Lake street remains a ghost town during the week is extremely annoying. Lake Street was already a wonderful street to bike and walk on, I know because I did both before the pandemic. Please open it again.</p>
465	<p>Will the temporary barriers remain up until the project is complete? Where are the diverters to prevent cut-through traffic from major north-south streets? There are 10 unprotected blocks, which enable speeding. Why does this project have fewer pedestrian protectors than the temp Slow Street.</p>
466	<p>Slow 23rd to Slow Lake is a wonderful resource for us. My kids learned how to bicycle on this route. Please keep Lake S-L-O-W. Thanks.</p>

467	<p>Thank you for your work in the current draft of the Slow Lake Street design. I live on 26th Avenue between California and Lake Street. Some of the highlights of the Slow Street program for my family: 1. As an essential healthcare worker, I have been continuing to work in-person throughout the pandemic. Due in large part to the slow street program, I have entirely transitioned from commuting via car to commuting via bicycle. 2. While we used to drive our children to school, we now commute to school (SFUSD) via bicycle or on foot, and having Slow Street options makes this commute much safer for our family. 3. It has brought together the neighborhood in a time when it is difficult to connect safely. We have met and solidified relationships with our neighbors, who we see routinely out on the street. The design's four concrete diverters at entry points to Slow Lake are critical to continue protecting the safety of pedestrians, people with disabilities and limited mobility, and people using bikes, including countless kids and seniors. SFMTA should approve and install those four diverters immediately. I ask for the following improvements: 1) More diversion. I am deeply concerned about the complete removal of the 22 Slow Street barriers currently on Slow Lake and the complete lack of diverters for two 10+ block stretches in the current draft design. 10 blocks is too long of a stretch without barriers to eliminate dangerous and speeding cut-through traffic, as drivers will cut north to speed down Lake Street to get to the bridge, making the street unsafe for kids, seniors, people with disabilities, and people using sustainable transportation. SFMTA should add either additional concrete diverters or the standard slow street diverters (white posts and purple signs in the driving lane) to replace each temporary barricade and add those diverters at every other intersection on Slow Lake. The temporary barricades should remain in place to ensure safety until the permanent diverters can be installed to replace each and every temporary barricade. My family had a very scary experience where a driver intentionally swerved into the bike lane and sped his car directly at my two children during broad daylight as we moved out of the way. The barriers help to keep the cars that do need to travel locally on Lake Street at a safe and acceptable speed. Without physical barriers, I worry that cars will continue to speed through our neighborhood, creating a dangerous scenario for pedestrians and bikers. 2) Clear signage in the driving lanes. The lack of signs and stenciling on the street in the driving lanes is very concerning. It's confusing for drivers and dangerous for vulnerable people outside cars on Slow Lake. If we are in fact welcoming use of these streets by pedestrians, kids, people with disabilities, and people on bikes, we need to be extra clear in the design and infrastructure to avoid serious injuries and fatalities. Please add clear Slow Street signage and infrastructure in the driving lanes at every entry point to Slow Lake. To meet our goals of Vision Zero and 80% travel by sustainable (non-car) modes by 2030, it's critical that we continue Slow Lake and keep it as a part of this network. We are looking to you for your leadership. Slow Lake has profoundly improved the Richmond District and the city. Many thousands of adults and children on bikes, scooters, foot, motorized wheelchairs, and more use it every day to commute, shop, exercise, or get to school. An extensive March 2022 survey showed resounding Richmond District support for Slow Lake. Please support these improvements to help Slow Lake continue as a success for our city. Thank you for your continued support.</p>
468	<p>I am concerned that not enough is being proposed to slow cars on Lake Street. The current plan is really quite a bit less than what's presently on Lake and what the community is asking for. As a regular walker I value the slow streets and feel the proposal is a very watered down solution.</p>
469	<p>Hi, I walk and bike on Lake Street daily. I also live on it. My wife is 69 and I am 61 - so not so young any more. I think there should be more raised sidewalks, more traffic diverters, and more speed humps. The current plan seems quite modest in terms of slowing cross through traffic. I often see cars traveling between Arguello and Park Presidio even now. One speed hump at 2nd and another at 11th will not slow these types of drivers down. They are angry the street has been "compromised." You can sometimes see the anger as they drive by. Driving down Lake needs to be inconvenient for anyone but residents. It has been a joy to see youngsters, hipsters, not-so-hipsters, dog owners, cyclists, skate boarders, and the elderly enjoying the space the street provides. We need to protect this resource. So much of the City is devoted to the automobile. There should be a few streets scattered throughout this wonderful City where those not in automobiles can enjoy that space and not feel threatened. Thanks for hearing me out</p>
470	<p>The proposed diverter at 24th Ave and Lake St. will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow and quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous.</p>
471	<p>Thank you to SFMTA for your efforts toward neighborhood safety and the best use of public thoroughfares. I live on West Clay Street. I was in favor of keeping Lake Street closed to most vehicle traffic and submitted earlier comments accordingly. However, since reopening, conditions on Lake St. have changed. There is increased traffic, and it is no longer safe for pedestrians and young cyclists to use the street instead of the sidewalk. It is time to return to previous conditions with some safety measures. I am now in support of reopening Lake Street to vehicle traffic with SOME of the calming measures in the latest Lake Street Project proposal. The proposed additional stop signs, speed cushions, and raised crosswalks strike a good balance between pedestrian safety, cyclist safety, and vehicle traffic. I am opposed to installation of a diverter at 24th Ave. Please note that 24th Ave. north of Lake St. is functionally a one-way street. The street is too narrow for cars going in opposite directions to pass each other. Almost always, one car has to pull over for the other car to proceed. If there is a larger vehicle on the street, like a delivery truck, recycling truck, pickup, or service van, a driver heading south on 24th Ave. has to back up and head east on West Clay St., then south on 22nd Ave. in order to get to California St. In addition, West Clay St. is substantially narrower than Lake or California. We often have to pull over to allow larger vehicles to proceed. West Clay St. cannot support increased through traffic. Emergency vehicles won't have rapid access. I am confused as to the goal of diverting traffic into West Clay Park. Wouldn't the diverted traffic then turn left onto Lake Street at 22nd Ave., or join California Street? If SFMTA must include a diverter, please consider installing it at 23rd Avenue and Lake, which would accomplish what I believe is your goal: to divert traffic onto California Street (which might require a stop sign at 23rd and California). Or, if you install a diverter at 24th and Lake, make it a Right Turn Only corner, to divert all traffic to California St. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
472	<p>The proposed design does not do enough to protect bicyclists and pedestrians. There should be more diverters throughout the street. Every time I run the length of Lake Street there are cars that improperly use it as a cut-through. We need more diverters to maintain this important public space and keep it safe for people.</p>
473	<p>Keep Lake Street Slow! This has been a great escape and space for our kids and neighbors to learn how to ride bikes, enjoy the outdoors, and meet neighbors from the area.</p>

474	Given a chance to make a difference in the climate emergency and make meaningful changes to vehicular use in San Francisco, you've all lost your spine and are looking for ways to pretend to slow a street without slowing it. Your proposal is nothing more than a declaration that gas powered cars rule your world and you'll do anything and everything to make it more convenient for cars. You have a chance to do something, and you're gonna use it to prove you are spineless bureaucrats.
475	Slow Lake Street has served its purpose. The plan is essentially closing Lake Street for the benefit of the few to the detriment of the many. Public space in the area is abundant. Sidewalk space on Lake is more than ample. The plan needlessly creates more congestion on California Street with increased risk of accidents including to pedestrians. Measures to "slow" Lake Street, not close Lake are fairer to all
476	Hello, I just want to express support for this project. Making space for pedestrians and bicycles full-time should be a top priority of the city.
477	I live next to two public schools, one of them is across the street from my home. There is always a lot of traffic in the area. Why is Lake Street special? Slow streets designation seems arbitrary to me. I never see crowds of people walking or playing outside. In fact, I strain myself to remember when I actually saw children playing and adults using slow streets for recreational purposes. Slow streets cause unnecessary traffic re-routing and diversions, as well as congestion on parallel streets or during special events in the neighborhood. Streets are not playgrounds - they are public roads and should stay that way.
478	Please do not put traffic diverters on lake street. this is unnecessary and will cause difficulties for residents
479	I ride my bike regularly on Lake St from the Inner Richmond to access the Presidio. In the mornings, I frequently see multiple cargo bikes with kids on board. Painted lanes are not enough protection, we need reduced speeds and reduced traffic.
480	Compromises don't work and they leave all parties dissatisfied. Please keep Lake Street the way it is currently. By your calculations, 73% of Lake Street residents, including me, want to keep slow Lake Street the way it is now. The four way stop signs on Lake Street don't work now, and the non-compliance puts pedestrians and bicyclists at risk. This plan does nothing to promote pedestrian safety, which is a huge problem in San Francisco,
481	The latest plan - only 4 barricades to restrict through traffic on Lake St - is grossly inadequate to protect the children, bicyclists, people walking dogs, runners and all the other constant activities on Lake Street. Physical barriers every two blocks are necessary. Neither stop signs nor speed bumps restrict traffic. Prior to the pandemic, reckless motorists blew through stop signs at 30 mph on a daily basis. Your current plan is openly dangerous to all the locals who frequently use Lake Street.
482	This proposal does not limit cars enough. 73% of respondents to the previous survey + the board of supervisors agreed this should be a slow street. No car should be allowed to drive more than one block on this street. Traffic diverters should be on every block.
483	MTA board members, I'm writing to urge you to reopen Lake Street, which has become a playground and private boulevard for the privileged few. I find it curious (and disappointingly frustrating) to see Hypocrisy in action. The desires of the privileged Elite in our neighborhood, those with pricy homes, small households, and of higher class (and special interests, all narrowly focused on a single type of commuter) over the average working /middle class families/ households who require vehicles to get to work, to drive dependents to school, afterschool/ camp activities and for groceries, seems to reign supreme. Multiple people family structures do not [cannot] use bikes for managing errands on behalf of several people. They use bikes as leisure and exercise tools.) While a select few Lake Street residents now treat the street as their own private park and playground, most families in the neighborhood (like mine) suffer from the increased heavy traffic and congestion on neighboring streets. I have seen an uptick of road rage, 'impolite' driving behavior, and congestion on the adjacent streets. It's amazing that the entirety of needs for ALL neighborhood residents, including families with several kids (or is that not approved of in this city?) are simply ignored. They don't count? Who decides who can / cannot be doing their daily routines on a bike? Who decides how people should be shepherding their kids around for their various appointments, education related commutes, and camps. (Is it a given that everyone is well enough/ physically fit to act as personal chauffeur's pumping the gears for their dependent's sake.) (The need for a designated street for biking as a whole, which is a wonderful outlet for many, simply does not exist here --in the richmond-- or on lake street, which already has wide, ample bike lanes for all who need. The parks nearby, world-class, worthy of envy of other cities, include mountain lake in the inner richmond, the presidio, of which several entrances are situated right off lake, as well as lincoln park/ lands end in the western outer portion of lake street, precludes any urgency in "reclaiming more territory" for cyclists and joggers. There is, realistically, plenty of outdoor, expansive space for all the joggers, skipp'ers, runners out there, as well as cyclists, skaters, and scooters. This all leads a simple person like me to conclude that there is an agenda being promoted here. Do not know for what, and for whom, nor who profits off of such implementation, but it isn't in the interests of the entire population, is classist, and does not take into account opinions of ALL the residents being affected by these upcoming, permanent plans.) In short: The inequity caused by Private Slow Lake Street is apparent. Private Slow Lake Street benefits a privileged few while making daily life significantly more difficult for the vast majority of neighbors. City agencies should not be in the business of causing inequity among residents. Reopen Private Slow Lake street now. Sincerely
484	It looks like all the traffic barricades were eliminated from the proposed design. I don't think that will allow the street to remain safe with pedestrians walking on the street. Cars won't slow down when going down the road without them dispute the speed humps. If this is going to remain a slow street it won't be able to be accomplished without the use of those barriers. Please add them back in. Thank you for your time.
485	This proposal goes against what the majority of the respondents voted for. This proposal changes Lake back to a normal street and doesn't maintain the mixed vehicle and pedestrian use promised. Please revise the plan to prioritize pedestrian use with the use of traffic barriers to not only limit traffic but prevent fast driving down the road which makes it the most dangerous .

486	Please Open Lake Street! In addition to the many issues involved in making Lake St a slow street, there has been increased speeding traffic for all the Avenues (100-200 blocks) off of Lake street, especially the 100 block of 2nd Avenue. I have lived at 142 2nd Avenue for 27 years and have worked tirelessly with our neighbors, SFMTA, and Supervisor Stefani's office for the last two years to explain how the implementation of Slow Lake and the placement of the sign have turned our quiet family-oriented 100 block of 2nd Ave into a high volume traffic detour and dangerous speedway. Yet, even in this final design, SFMTA still has NOT made the very small adjustment that would have fixed our problem. A permanent concrete diverter is planned for the intersection of Lake and 2nd Avenue instead of Lake and Arguello. This is really frustrating that after more than 2 years, we still cannot identify even one reason why the urgent unanimous request of 60 voting residents on our block is being ignored. I hope with this final and binding decision, SFMTA will consider the feedback ONLY from the residents ON or AROUND Lake Street vs. that of the general interest groups and coalitions. Please Open Lake Street now and implement traffic calming measures as necessary.
487	I oppose the redesign of Lake Street. Lake Street should be reopened restored to the way it was before the Slow Streets Program. This would be the fairest for all parties. Bike lanes and sidewalks already exist on Lake Street. This misguided project to close Lake Street is elitist and the ultimate in entitlement. The affluent people around Lake can't even be bothered to use the bike lanes and sidewalks, instead they want to commandeer an entire public street. No Build option is the best course for Lake as it would preserve easy access to parks and the Presidio instead of making it more difficult for most to the interest of a privileged few.
488	Please do NOT install a diverter at 24th Avenue and Lake Street!!! It will REDUCE SAFETY by putting too much traffic onto the narrow, quiet streets of West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). This diverter will funnel considerable traffic onto West Clay, 22nd Ave (North of Lake), and 24th Ave (North of Lake). As a result, West Clay would no longer be a safe street with these newly diverted drivers attempting to get from 25th Ave to Eastbound Lake St. West Clay is not wide enough to safely support this increased traffic. In addition, this would make emergency response particularly difficult and dangerous. This is an unimaginable consequence of 'opening' Lake ST. up again.
489	Please add more diverters to prevent cut-through traffic.
490	Traffic diverters prevent through traffic. That doesn't make sense. The streets were built for through traffic, and it doesn't prevent pedestrians and bicycles from use of the sidewalks/streets.
491	I would encourage the design to include stop signs at every avenue and speed bumps (not humps like 12th Ave) on every avenue. The current plan with the barrier on Funston is going to cause drivers coming off Park Presidio to speed up the avenues to access Lake. Additionally, pre Slow street designation, drivers NEVER observed the cross walks on the non stop sign intersections. Example 10th Ave with it's access to the Presidio was absolutely perilous to cross as a pedestrian.
492	Please provide a few more traffic diverters on Lake. This small accommodation provides exponential benefit for children and pedestrians on Lake.
493	Why are there only a handful of traffic diverted and raised crosswalks? This project is not online with you own Vision Zero goals. Every intersection on this street should have raised crosswalks om all directions with diverters, or some intersections can even be dead-ends. Why are you so afraid of dead-ends? They already exist all over the city and the world hasn't ended. Not ever street needs to allow motorists to cut through. I can't understand why you refuse to accept this and continue to make everything but driving dangerous and inconvenient.
494	I wish you would include more concrete diverters. Lake is an essential part of the Slow Streets network for biking, walking and using sustainable transportation. This design feels inadequate. I'm concerned it will still allow for too much speeding traffic on what should be a street safe enough for kids and seniors to bike on. Please add more signage and design features like concrete diverters to prevent speeding and dangerous driver behavior.
495	I disagree with adding so many permanent diverters to Funston and the 2 blocks east and west of the Presidio Blvd. Locals need a way around all the bridge traffic. this sounds way to costly. The current things are doing its job. There are not that many cars on weekdays. And on weekends its been manageable.
496	Why aren't there diverters at every block? Stop signs are not obeyed by dangerous drivers. Full block diverters or bust
497	As someone who supports a slow Lake Street, this plan is very disappointing to me. It basically gets rid of all the existing barriers and appears to open the street up to two way through traffic. The only changes from three years ago are a few more stop signs (which many through drivers on Lake Street already mostly ignore as they speed along) and some traffic "calming" elements which are unlikely to slow traffic on the street much at all. All of the benefits of slow Lake Street will be lost. No one--cyclists, pedestrians, runners, baby strollers will be safe anymore except in any cycle lanes that remain and on the sidewalk. I urge you to retain and make permanent (and more attractive) more of the barriers, to make the street function much less as a throughway and more as a residential/pedestrian/cycling/leisure destination that it has been these last two-plus years. Thank you.
498	What are you planning to do to mitigate the EXTREME traffic increases on California and the increased car collisions & pedestrian injuries that i have PERSONALLY witnessed on California?
499	I'm all for SLOW LAKE STREET,....my dog was run over and killed by a speeding car a few years before the pandemic,...I was almost hit one time by a car who's driver was blinded by the setting sun. Cars have always sped too fast down Lake to go the the Golden Gate bridge,....
500	I urge the MTA to minimize any permanent measures in this plan, as there has been no demonstrated need for them given minimal utilization of the corridor by bicyclists and pedestrians. The existing measures are perfectly sufficient to slow traffic and any permanent measures would only further hinder the ability of local residents to access their homes and further divert traffic onto an already overburdened California Street. Any changes should be based on demonstrated need, rather than simply residents of the street who would prefer not to have cars traveling across their frontage. This is an ill-conceived project that was supposed to remedy pandemic impacts, and if it was actually being heavily used it might make sense to increase measures, but it is simply not being used at all. Please take logic into account and make the pragmatic choice to minimize the investment of funds and permanent impacts to this street.

Dear SFMTA project staff, Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am a public sector employee often tasked with public efforts including public hearings, accepting and responding to public comment, and related tasks. I understand your response time is limited and I appreciate the work you do. I will greatly appreciate your efforts to answer my concerns about the current design, based on my lived experience using Lake Street 1-2 times a day. Before I share my comments, please know I am employed by the State as a climate adaptation scientist - my role is to determine methods that we can take as a region (SF Bay Area) to reduce the impacts of climate change. The impacts of climate change will be drastic, heart-wrenching, and more and more common without clear, strong, brave, impactful policy changes that deter the use of fossil fuels. One of the clearest local opportunities we have is to encourage alternative means of travel, and work to make pedestrians, cyclists, and others feel safe using the infrastructure in our city. The safety issue is #1 - we won't meet these necessary goals if pedestrians don't feel safe enough to walk or ride, or if they continue to be killed or maimed in the process. First, I applaud the suggested additions of barriers, new stop signs, and raised crosswalks. These additions align with the communications from SFMTA around Lake Street and the results of the surveys - deter through-traffic, slow existing traffic, protect pedestrians of all types. Thank you for considering these changes, I support them. That said, I am deeply concerned about the proposed removal of the block-by-block barriers along the entire stretch. Please provide a response as to what benefit this removal would provide. I encourage SFMTA to review this design, and instead of removing barriers, implement additional more sturdy, protective, less easily-vandalized barriers at all current barrier sites. Removal of barriers makes no sense - please explain clearly why this decision is included, and why SFMTA has determined this would help the above-listed goals of the project. My immediate determination is that this removal of barriers would increase traffic speed, embolden all drivers including illegal through-traffic, and increase car-human harassment and accidents. My deep concern with this suggestion stems from my regular use of Lake Street. I live between California and Clement in an apartment on 7th, and I use Lake Street to run, walk my dog to and from the park (or just along Lake), and bike both directions to conduct my day to day business - exercise, visit friends, do errands, commute to work. Lake Street plays into all of these activities. I imagine I am up there with the most regular users of Slow Lake. I have therefore unfortunately been subject to negative interactions with cars on Lake, some of which have been enough to document to SFMTA including being run off the road by a moving truck that swerved around a barrier and forced me and my dog to jump into the side of a parked car to avoid being hit. I have also experienced countless "buzzes" from speeding cars who swerve these barriers, ignore stop signs, or pull the classic "buzz" next to a cyclist to intimidate us into the shoulders. I should mention I am a large white man, and if I am experiencing this level of harassment, just imagine what my less privileged neighbors experience. Opponents of Slow Lake regularly vandalize these barriers in well-documented attempts to remove them or reduce the need to slow down - so why does SFMTA think removing these barriers somehow matches with the safety goals of Slow Lake or the incredible margins of support for safety and reduced traffic in the surveys? I encourage you to consider my lived experience on this corridor in the updated designs and proceed with the designs' suggested changes along with an additional effort to harden existing barriers as opposed to removing them. I look forward to your response to my concerns. Without clear barriers at existing locations, I expect this design to unfortunately increase driver confidence and negative interactions (read: pedestrian death) due to the proven fact that drivers believe they own streets and Lake Street is actually a pilot to determine if we can at all alter those beliefs in drivers. Best of luck in your work, my family and I are rooting for your success in finding a design that helps mitigate a climate disaster, protects people, and encourages city residents to think twice about driving cars.

501

The SFMTA Board unanimously approved a permanent Slow Street on Lake. This design is not a Slow Street at all; you've even renamed it from "Lake Slow Street" to just "Lake Street Project." The design will not keep vulnerable road users safe and amounts to a deadly, if not outright homicidal, bait-and-switch: you've encouraged people to walk and bike and roll and play in the roadway and now propose a design that will quite literally get them killed by speeding vehicles. Frankly, I resent that this project out with promises of building a citywide network of slow streets to facilitate safe sustainable transportation, and yet now we're here begging for just one single street where cars are still welcome but treated as guests. I don't think that's too much to ask for, especially when that's what the SFMTA Board already voted for unanimously. Slow Streets, streets where drivers already had full local access but as guests, already were the compromise, and yet now you're watering that down again. The proposed design works for no one as a compromise. Drivers will still be mad that they don't have the unfettered ability to use Lake as a through street, yet there will be too much car traffic and no delineators to continue to use the street as a slow street. The result will be a street that is simultaneously too unsafe for people to use yet inconvenient for car traffic: a street that serves no one. Slow Lake was working and delivering mode shift. I've been out and seen kids biking home independently from school and sports practices, families who've told me they've shifted to sustainable modes instead of driving specifically because of the safety of the slow street. The proposed design takes that away and will result in more driving, contrary to the city's transit first, vision zero, and sustainable mode share goals. I call on SFMTA to make the following changes: 1. Reintroduce Slow Street/No Thru Traffic delineators at every intersection, just like Page, Sanchez, and other permanent Slow Streets. The proposed design eliminates 22 delineators, replacing them with just 4 one-way ones. Someone will be able to drive 3/4ths of a mile without even seeing the slightest indication that they're on a slow street. This is unacceptable. The temporary barricades should remain in place to ensure safety until the permanent diverters can be installed to replace each and every temporary barricade. 2. Extend the Slow Street back to the end of Lake. You've silently removed several blocks from the project. For consistency and clarity, all of Lake should be a Slow Street. 3. Add additional diverters. More traffic diverters should be added, and these should be two-way diverters so drivers don't simply drive around them. Diverters should also be added at the critical entry points on 25th and Arguello. 4. Metrics. The performance of the design should be evaluated weekly, with results published on the website. If, at any time, traffic volumes or speeds exceed specified performance targets or the LTS (Level of Traffic Stress) 1 standard, immediate changes should be made with quick-build materials such as additional diverters until those standards are met. 5. The street should be designed to the NATCO All Ages & Abilities Bicycle Facility "Shared Street" category standard (<https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/designing-ages-abilities-new/choosing-ages-abilities-bicycle-facility/>).

502

503	<p>First, thank you for your efforts regarding the Slow Street project. The proposed Lake Slow Street design has insufficient safeguards and does not do enough to keep Lake Street "a safe, comfortable corridor for people of all ages and abilities to pursue active transportation in all forms" as described in the hearing web page. First and foremost, the proposed design has insufficient traffic diverters to keep Lake Street slow. The design eliminates many of the traffic diverting mechanisms (currently barricades), which have been the most effective of the existing elements for ensuring that cars slow down as they enter and drive along the Lake Street corridor. The proposed design replaces those barriers with an insufficient number of diverters and would leave the Slow Street without diverters for stretches of ten blocks or more, leading to less safe conditions for pedestrians, children, and bikers. Residents have observed that the existing barricades encourage drivers to drive on Lake Street cautiously and to pay closer attention at intersections, while still allowing residents and commercial vehicles the ability to access any address on the street safely. ***The proposed design would be improved immediately if the existing barricades at every other intersection were turned into permanent diverters and included as features in the proposed design.*** The proposed new stop signs and crosswalks should be accompanied by traffic diverters at every other intersection. Before it was a Slow Street, Lake Street already had stop signs and crosswalks but, in the absence of traffic diversion, the street suffered from traffic congestion, unsafe and impatient driving, and increased risks for pedestrians and children trying to use the street. As such, the proposed design essentially reverts Lake Street to the way it was a few years ago, and wipes out the many benefits to the community that the current Lake Slow Street provides. To summarize, the proposed design should include permanent traffic diverters at every other intersection (where the Lake Slow Street currently has barricades) in addition to all the other elements in the proposal.</p>
504	<p>People already ZOOM around the temporary/light "traffic diverters" that are on nearly every block. What is needed is permanent traffic diverters on EVERY block, not in only 4 (only 4!!!!) locations. This will bring Lake street back to being a friendly place for cars to drive fast, and without any stop sign enforcement in the city this will change nearly nothing from the pre-pandemic state.</p>
505	<p>I have lived on Lake St as a renter of an old 1 br apartment for 10 years. Slow Lake has been the only plus of the pandemic. I used to fear crossing Lake, as I would do multiple times each day, to walk somewhere and/or get to Muni. Crossing was very dangerous and I was almost hit several times. I have talked with my neighbors and my partner and they have all experienced the same. I live on the Eastern side and cars/trucks/motorcycles, etc. use it as a cut through between Park Presidio and Arguello. Unfortunately I have seen this still happening during Slow Street. The only way to get this street safer for all is to put more speed humps extending the entire width of the street (and please, not the useless kind with the cuts in them that I see in many other streets that let vehicles and motorcycles skirt right through them), raised crosswalks, and more barriers, like maybe at 5th and 8th and wherever else is in between the ones already included in your plan. Stop signs at every block are also needed. I see this on streets south of Geary. Why not on Lake? The best thing though would be the raised crosswalks at each and every intersection and more barriers. I like your plant barrier ideas! I will really miss the slow street, but since it seems it is going away and there's not much to do to change that, please make it safe and calm for everyone. Thank you.</p>
506	<p>Making Lake Street a "Slow Street" is adding more privilege to an already privileged population. Lake street real estate values far exceed those of all the other streets in the Richmond district. They also enjoy a close proximity to the Presidio, as well as Baker and China Beaches. A more centrally located street such as Anza Street would make more sense if decision-making is truly being made with a sense of fairness. Stop favoring the wealthy and privileged.</p>
507	<p>Hi! I walk on Lake most days, and I have serious concerns about the proposed permanent design. In particular, I am deeply alarmed by the effective removal of 18 of the 22 traffic diverters that are currently in place as part of the temporary design. Even with 22 bidirectional diverters in place, every time I walk on Lake I see drivers going around the diverters at unsafe speeds to travel the full western length of the slow street between 25th Avenue and Park Presidio. I fear that removing so many diverters will further encourage this kind of behavior, which makes the slow street unsafe for its intended use. Accordingly, I am asking that the permanent design be updated to include bidirectional traffic diverters at every intersection along the length of the slow street. Additionally, I believe that the current western boundary of the slow street at 28th Avenue should be maintained. If this is not possible, then at the very least, the slow street should extend all the way to 25th Ave on its western end, and no turns should be allowed from 25th Avenue onto eastbound Lake Street. 25th Avenue is a high traffic street, and cars on it often move at relatively high speeds. Allowing those cars to exit 25th Avenue only a single block away from Slow Lake puts pedestrians and cyclists at serious risk.</p>
508	<p>I'm writing to express my support of the lake street proposal. I believe it strikes a balance between slow street measures and vehicle access.</p>
509	<p>1. As a priority comment - putting a Traffic Diverter / Do not enter signage at 2nd Avenue on Lake (or anywhere else) is a massive overreach. We as residents live on these streets. You cannot take away or hinder our vehicular access or the access of those providing services. It is misleading to the community that cars should not enter. If they should enter, they need to drive slowly. Pushing us into oncoming traffic and forcing us into verbal conflicts with those pedestrians and bikers who do not understand how this works is unfortunate and wrong. 2. Adding an all-way stop at 3rd makes no sense. Put an all-way stop at 5th WITH A raised crosswalk. There is substantially more pedestrian traffic crossing Lake at 5th than 3rd (especially as they walk up to the presidio at 5th; oh where there is an open walking path...). And cars zoom through 5th all the time. While you're at it. Add a stoplight at 5th and California ... 3. Better signage throughout. The street is not closed. Residents, guest, and service providers are allowed to drive on these streets. Make that clear. Appropriate signage should be up all along these roads your are changing. It is a Shared street. Not a closed street. It is not closed. Pedestrians need to be aware of where they are walking and show mutual respect if they decided they need to walk down the middle of the street. It is a shared road. Police it.</p>
510	<p>I am definitely not in favor of any plan to divert traffic onto West Clay Street. The street is quite narrow, only allowing travel in a single direction at a time. Any plan that would divert traffic onto West Clay Street would be dangerous to drivers and pedestrians.</p>

511	Regarding traffic diverters - Eastward, one on Lake at 24th Ave. and another one on Lake at Funston while westward, one on Lake at 2nd Ave. and another one on Lake at 14th Ave. My issue with this draft design is that drivers who are able to (and there will be many) skirt around these minimal diverters would have a straight shot on Lake. This has the potential for increased traffic that could decrease the safety for people using Lake Street for walking, running, or biking. Discourage the use of Lake as a through street by keeping the diverters as they are set up now, every two blocks or so. It would be beneficial also if speed limit on Lake is lowered to 15mph.
512	Please keep the slow street barricades throughout the lake street corridor, if the intent is to make the street safer for pedestrians and bikers. Without barricades, we will have a lot of vehicular traffic and we will not be able to use lake street as a slow street
513	Was there consideration given to the fact that you are increasing the traffic in front of Alamo Elementary School on 22nd Avenue? How can we keep from creating a hardship for those who have mobility problems and need easy vehicle access to their homes? How will this affect access by emergency vehicles? Did someone do a visual inspection of West Clay Street? West Clay is narrow and does not accommodate 2 way traffic.
514	Hello-I live half a block from Lake St and I fully support opening it now. The data you are relying on is obsolete and out of date. I once supported closing the street and now I do not and I know that to be true for most people who once supported closure. I walk almost daily on LS. Patterns have returned to prepandemic levels. During the lockdown, the street was very busy with individuals and families walking, biking, skating, running, walking and just about everything else you can think of—it was a life saver. Now during an hour walk, I may pass half a dozen people—all using the sidewalks or bike lanes. The slow street plan is totally and completely unnecessary. And, unwanted by the community. Please abandon your plan.
515	This draft design allows for only two traffic diverters eastbound (Lake @ 24th Ave, Lake @ Funston) and two traffic diverters westbound (Lake @ 2nd Ave, Lake @ 14th Ave). This will increase traffic on Lake St in both directions rather than decrease it. More traffic means it would be less safe for people who would be on foot or bikes on Lake. Please keep the current traffic diverters where they are located now to discourage non-local drivers from using Lake as a through street. Thank you.
516	I live in the Inner Richmond and frequently walk on Lake Street. I love the Slow Street and walk it often and show it off to visitors. Unfortunately every time I walk it, at least one car drives very quickly from 2nd to Funston making it clear that they are more important than we are. I fear that this current plan will not disincentivize ornery people enough. We need more barriers and speed bumps. Thank you!
517	I have lived my entire life on Lake street - and the slow street has been the greatest improvement to my street and neighborhood - over my 46 years. I have walked the length of the street practically every evening. I never felt safe walking on the sidewalk at night but have felt so comfortable walking on the slow street (wearing a light up vest). I have also enjoyed running on the street which you just can't do on the sidewalk. I have tripped many many times on broken sidewalk cement - and that just doesn't happen when you are allowed to run in the road. I have a cognitive disability and my spacial awareness is not good - so being out in the street safely is so important to me. Another element that the slow street has brought is making Lake street feel way more safe. With more people out - not in cars - there is more awareness, foot traffic and I believe way less crime. With cars speeding by - there is less community engagement. Please don't take away this gift - particularly just so cars can speed down the road. Please have enough signs and safety measures to really protect pedestrians and those with mobility issues.
518	It is a mistake to remove the temporary obstacles without replacing them with permanent ones. Even with them in place, drivers go around them as slalom obstacles. With them removed, there will be up to 10 blocks for them to speed through. Why not 4 way stops every single block? If you want to minimize through traffic, why don't you create ONE WAY ONLY traffic which changes direction every 2-3 blocks? ie opposite direction traffic every few blocks. Locals will still use Lake street, and I am quite sure the drive through rule breakers will be eliminated. The street cleaning department will need to do more planning as to how the trucks run, but I am sure they can come to a workable solution.
519	As a resident of Lake Street, it's important to me that Lake Street retains the Slow Street Designation that gives all forms of active transportation equal weight with auto traffic. I would like to see much stronger traffic calming measures on this street. I'd like Lake Street to be treated, in spirit, as an extension of Mountain Lake Park - a public space for all city residents to enjoy.
520	I support slow Lake Street. My family has greatly benefitted from the project, which I see as one of SF government's recent successes. I was very pleased when "Slow Lake Street" was made permanent. However, I fear that slogan may be misleading: What I (and many other supporters want) is a Lake Street that is safe and open for pedestrians, children, and bicyclists. If there was a way for traffic to SAFELY zip between pedestrians at freeway speeds, I would support it. However, since this is obviously impossible, "Slow Lake Street" is a slogan about allowing multiple safe uses of Lake Street. I feel that while traffic slowing elements are important, the most critical component of the project is maintaining sufficient signage to make it clear to drivers that Lake Street is open to bikes and pedestrians, not just to cars. Currently, large neon signs are placed every few blocks indicating this, and these seem to have generally been effective in slowing traffic and diverting through traffic to California Ave. Nevertheless, a motorist pulled over last month to yell curses at my 5-year-old daughter while she was in the street. (I am also aware of other similar incidents of dangerous or threatening motorist behavior towards pedestrians.) Preserving (or, even better, improving!) the current signage is a critical component of a safe Lake Street. Without such signage, drivers will feel empowered to harass pedestrians, no matter how many stop signs are in their path. (After all, to a driver not familiar with the neighborhood the "Slow Streets" situation may come as a total surprise in a nation where cars rule the road!) Thank you for your consideration, and thank you for your efforts to implement and improve the "Slow Lake Street" project. PS: While it is outside the scope of this current project, it might be worth asking ourselves why cars get to drive on (relatively) bouncy asphalt, while our sidewalks are made out of bone-pulverizing concrete. It is far easier to replace a tire than a human knee!
521	If cars are allowed to drive on Lake Street which I am for, adding diverters to force traffic to exit on to West Clay or 24th Ave. in order to continue east on Lake makes no sense. West Clay is a narrow almost one car lane street. Often if UPS trucks, wider cars, go thru other cars going the opposite direction will not be able to traverse. Emergency vehicles will have a difficult time to reaching residents on West Clay. Surely this was not the intention of creating diverters on Lake Street? The City needs to evaluate and reconsider this proposal.

522	<p>While this is an exciting first step, I do not believe it goes far enough to fully enable a truly slow Lake Street. I think one major issue is that cars can use Lake Street as an access road to Park Presidio Blvd. Diverters are needed in both directions at Funston Avenue to prevent cars using Lake Street as an access road to the avenues. Alternatively (or better yet, in addition to this) diverters placed every several blocks would also make though traffic impossible. The signs for the clearly say no through traffic, why not actually make it impossible to go all the way through? I have frequently seen drivers going the full length of Lake, they don't care, they're happy to drive around the slow streets signs. I also witness drivers rolling stop signs when on their though journey on Lake Street; they seem to take that since it's a Slow Street, it also means they don't have to stop at stop signs. Drivers are also generally pretty inconsiderate when on the through journeys along Lake Street. Just the other day I was running and a driver undertook me (passed on my right) as I was running down the street. I was pretty shocked! there was plenty of room to go around on my left however they opted to squeeze between me and the parked cars. I really like what they have in Berkeley where the diverters are a curb that emergency vehicles can clear but passenger cars cannot (though the number of high clearance private vehicles may make this a moot point) and allows bicycles and pedestrians through. Long story short, ideally, it shouldn't be possible to drive more than one or two blocks down lake at a time. At very least, access to and from Park Presidio should not be possible.</p>
523	<p>Congratulations. You managed to subvert the entire purpose of slow streets in a way that not only ruins Lake Street, but you've now set the precedent for watered down implementations across the city. Do us a favor and just make Lake a no-build project. Let the local Lake street residents suffer the consequences of their choices. Redirect SFMTA funding for maintenance and efficiency improvements elsewhere in the city where transit is supported, where Vision Zero is actually a priority, and where people envision a better more livable city. The Richmond and the Sunset are lost causes, spend no more time/money/effort there.</p>
524	<p>Lake Street was designated as a slow street despite your traffic data indicating that it did not qualify for such designation. SFMTA distributed four design alternatives and asked for public comment. The public hated all of them. So you've now given us a fifth. You haven't considered: A. treating blocks west of Park Presidio differently from those to the east, which are a critical route across town; B. installing stop signs at every intersection, like other residential streets in Presidio Heights; or C. treating Lake as a slow street only on weekends, like you do the Great Highway. The central subway -- years behind schedule and billions over budget. Van Ness Avenue -- years behind schedule and millions over budget. Shrink Geary to two-lanes in each direction and California to one, without environmental review and without considering large development projects in each corridor, let alone making Lake a slow street. Is it any wonder significant segments of San Francisco consider you poor, incompetent public stewards. I've voted for ever public transit bond in the past 40 years, except for this year's. And I will not vote for another until SFMTA demonstrates a modicum of competence and common sense. There is NONE evident in your handling of Lake Street.</p>
525	<p>To the SFMTA: The information and design sketches you provided are confusing and hard to understand. I do understand that the 22 diverters will be reduced to 4, and that cars will be allowed in one direction for up to 10 blocks. It seems that this will apply all along Lake Street and that the allowed direction of traffic will change in the various segments. This seems to me to be confusing to drivers and a recipe for possible crashes. What is to stop a driver who is in a hurry from continuing to drive beyond the allotted 10 blocks in the prohibited direction -- and thereby likely crashing into a vehicle going in the opposite direction? Moreover, this plan is contrary to the surveys you conducted showing that 70 and 83.5 percent of respondents favored keeping Lake Street a slow street. The slow street has been successful in providing families, senior citizens and others with a safe place to walk or ride bicycles and also with the ability to walk in a socially distanced way during Covid. I am a neighborhood resident and welcome the people who have come from other parts of the city to enjoy the safety and calm of Lake Street. Allowing traffic (especially with confused drivers) will take away the benefits of a slow street. Lake Street will return to being a cut-through street and will no longer be a safe place for walking and biking. I urge you to rethink the plan and go back to a design closer to the current situation. The additional 4-way stop signs would be an improvement, however.</p>

I have reviewed the project hearing files and have the following comments:

1. I am not in favor of closing Lake Street to all through traffic. Lake Street is a wide street with bike lanes in each direction and wide sidewalks. It is beautifully designed to accommodate all three activities cars, bikes, and walkers. Earlier in the pandemic it was important to physically separate even when outdoors. With the overall reduction in traffic from people working from home and not going to school, there was a clear benefit to closing the street to through traffic— not much traffic was diverted to other streets. Now, as we move more and more into the post pandemic world, much more additional traffic has been diverted to California and other east-west routes; congestion on California is a daily event during the school year. Wouldn't we all love to live on a street with no through traffic? But closing Lake Street just means that some other residents have to suffer the negative effects of traffic congestion. California Street already has the noise, pollution, and safety problems associated with heavier traffic due to commercial businesses as well traffic delays resulting from being one of the most used MUNI bus line routes in the City. I note that according to the Lake Street Project Update that I received from SFMTA on 3/10/22, only a slight majority of neighborhood residents (53.4% vs 46.6% for the No Build proposal) supported a Slow Street proposal. Given the changing post pandemic conditions and the lack of better notice to residents in the neighborhood, it is hardly a definitive mandate. I don't believe the trade off between the benefits to recreationists on Lake Street justify the negative effects closing Lake Street to cars has had on the rest of the neighborhood. I say this as someone who lives one block from Lake Street and enjoyed daily walks on the sidewalks of Lake Street between 28th Avenue and Park Presidio for many years. Who wants to walk in the street, unless as part of a group? Most often, I see walkers on the sidewalk where they are close to trees and landscaping, I never felt that Lake Street was unsafe periods of peak car use rarely coincided with peak recreational use, and bicyclists and some runners were able to use the bike lanes. Further, the SFMTA's decision to close Lake Street was made before JFK Boulevard in Golden Gate Park, a mere 8 blocks from Lake Street, was permanently closed to cars. With 23rd Avenue as a slow street connecting the bike lanes of Lake Street, bicyclists can easily get to GG Park where they can peddle in groups on a wide road with few pedestrians and very few stop signs. Meanwhile, try being a driver on California Street when the traffic to get on Park Presidio backs up to stop and go for block after block. Cars start passing recklessly, and I often fear for pedestrians crossing the street who may be the reason the cars are stopped.
2. However, if Lake Street must be closed because for political reasons, then I think it should be done in the least expensive, least intrusive way possible, and in a way that preserves future options, for example, reopening the street to cars while Geary Blvd is under construction for four or five years.
3. Therefore, I am in FAVOR of implementing all of the four categories of what could be considered traffic calming items approved by the Planning Department on July 21, 2021, (case 2021-007227ENV): Lake Street between Arguello and 25th Avenue, including *Establish do not enter except bikes (I assume this is signage), *establish stop signs, *establish raised crosswalks, and *establish speed cushions, as described in the online document, June 13, 2022, Proposed Parking and Traffic Changes for Engineering Hearing. According to SFMTA's document, these will maintain lower traffic volumes and speeds on Lake Street, while still accommodating local access needs. I am assuming that these will look similar to photos shown in the Slow Streets Toolkit of Design Treatment. While it does not appear that any of these measures will do anything to relieve congestion on California Street, they seem like sensible ways to reduce potential conflicts between recreational users and autos on Lake Street.
4. I am OPPOSED to the traffic diverters shown pages 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the proposed Lake Street Design. Unlike the other calming measures, no photos of what these would look like are provided, only a cross section is shown, which is hard to interpret. This type of diversion is not included in SFMTA's Slow Streets Toolkit of Design Treatment. They appear to be intrusive concrete structures. Also, based on many years of personal observation, I don't think the speed humps west of 25th, which have been added to the Planning Department's list, are necessary. Rarely does anyone build up speed there.
5. Costs: I may have missed it, but I did not see any information in the public hearing materials about the costs of the proposed actions. It baffles me that at a time when we have so many demands on our budget, the very real prospect of a recession, and a very wobbly recovery of our business community recovering from the economic damage of COVID that we would take any action without considering what it would cost. I believe that the approved planning department measures are cost effective, I imagine that the concrete diverters would be expensive and more massive construction projects.
6. None of the findings from the 2021 Lake Street survey indicate strong support for ANY of the design elements specified on B 6 of survey presentation, with many of the potential design treatments drawing nearly as many strongly opposed as strongly in favor. I don't believe that any additional design elements not listed by the Planning Department are necessary, especially since they are not supported by data.
7. I would like to know, specifically, what will be done to reduce/alleviate congestion on

First off, I want to say that I know how long and hard SFMTA has worked on this project, and I know how much you've suffered at the hands of a few people who just want to be able to drive anywhere they want. I feel you. I'm a disabled SF Native. A life-long renter who still lives in the city, and I've been a resident of the Richmond for over 30 years. I'm a WOC who grew up in the Haight in a mixed household. I use a rollator, which is a walker with four wheels. Prior to becoming disabled, I'd walk all over the city. Now my scope is much limited, but I find solace in Slow Lake. About 15 years ago I had the opportunity to move into an apartment on the corner of 18th and Lake. I had always wanted to live on Lake St. But once there, I began to regret my decision almost immediately. Because almost all day long, especially during commute times, quaint Lake St became a freeway. I was personally experiencing bad behavior from drivers who would run stop signs, never yield to pedestrians in crosswalks, and otherwise flaunt traffic laws. Since I grew up on a steep hill, I didn't learn how to ride a bike until I was in my 40s. I would ride up and down Lake, and further noticed that drivers were making Hollywood stops at signs and otherwise endangering the lives of anyone not in a car. It was scary. I ended up quitting riding my bike because it was just too dangerous. Then Slow Lake happened. When shelter in place ended, I continued to walk on Lake. Using it to get from point A to point B, to go to businesses in the Richmond, and to visit friends. I learned that Lake was part of the Climate Action Plan, and as someone who is intimately connected to the Urban Canopy Movement in SF (with the worst Urban Canopy of any major US city), that made me feel great! I also learned that Slow Lake was part of Vision Zero. And as drivers become more and more reckless, and the city seems loath to do anything to handle that situation, Slow Streets become SO important as a safe space for pedestrians and cyclists alike to exist. I started to think about riding a bike again, especially when I realized there was actually a Slow Street network! Last year, one of our cats went missing for three weeks. We received reports from people who had seen him running across Lake. I have no doubt that if Lake had not been Slow, he would not have survived those three weeks. We used to see road kill all the time, but not since Slow Lake. It seems Slow Lake is good for all living things. Slow Lake was made permanent in August of 2021, but the city has treated that decision with little respect. Neighbors from all around have shown they support Slow Lake. And there would be even MORE support if more people knew about the waffling. I've spoken to literally thousands of people who had no idea Slow Lake was ever in danger. I've spoken to elders and folks with mobility issues who've told me that walking in the street (and not on the janky sidewalk) provides them with a sense of security and freedom they can find nowhere else in the City. I've spoken to folks with young kids who are trying to teach their children that the future will likely be one without cars. I've seen a sense of community that I've rarely experienced in this city, as a *58* year old resident! And it's not just about people who live around here. It's also tourists and folks from outside the neighborhood enjoying the street! So what I'd like to say is that I love the diverters, and I'm hoping you'll consider more than just the four proposed in the final build. I'd really love to see diverters on 6th Ave and Lake and 8th Ave and Lake, because those are major inlets into Lake St. Maybe partial diverters or at least the purple signage where we have the "Local Traffic Only" signs. I'd love to see Lake stay Slow.

527

528 This proposal is tantamount to creating a private road for this wealthy area. It isn't equitable and must be stopped. I am very opposed to all of this proposal.