



DRAFT MINUTES

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

1. Roll Call

Chair Mandelman called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and noted that Commissioner Haney was excused from items where he would be absent later during the meeting.

Present at Roll Call: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent at Roll Call: Commissioner Safai (entered during item 11) (1)

2. Chair's Report - INFORMATION

Chair Mandelman reported that San Francisco had a lot to celebrate in June with the State and City reopening from COVID-19 restrictions, the celebration of their first Juneteenth as an official national holiday as well as LGBTQ+ pride. He said he was honored to join San Francisco Pride and the African American Arts and Culture Complex for a special Juneteenth / Pride event. He added that he enjoyed the unveiling of the monumental reckoning ancestral sculpture series in Golden Gate Park last Friday, and he is looking forward to an exciting and safe Pride weekend ahead. He congratulated Commissioner Haney celebrating in the first ever Tenderloin Pride Festival on Market Street, and Commissioner Walton for leading the second annual District 10 Pride Ride down 3rd Street to Gilman Park. He said occasions such as these remind them that their streets are used more than for just getting around but also as community building places and it is on them to ensure the spaces are safe and welcoming for all. Chair Mandelman said their streets are for everyone and they know there is much work to do to repair the harms of the past through their ConnectSF Streets and Freeways Strategy, which is on the agenda, and will be commencing outreach in July.

With respect to the Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Report, the culmination of a multi-year planning effort by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments, Chair Mandelman thanked regional agency staff for being present at the meeting to discuss the strategies in the comprehensive land use and transportation strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and house Bay Area residents at all income levels. He said despite some disagreements they have with the inequitable land use distribution underlying the plan, they do have many shared priorities in the plan including Muni and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) core capacity improvements, the importance of Vision Zero and active transportation networks, and the Caltrain Downtown Rail Extension project, among other key investments.

He shared that their next phase of ConnectSF will be the update of the countywide transportation plan, known as the San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP), which will



be consistent with and further detail Plan Bay Area 2050 within San Francisco. Chair Mandelman encouraged those interested in the Plan Bay Area presentation to also participate in two public input opportunities: June 22 at 5:30 p.m. on the draft Plan and Draft EIR and June 28 at 5 p.m. with a West Bay - San Francisco and Marin - focus. He noted that the plan and EIR documents and meeting information can be found at planbayarea.org.

Lastly, Chair Mandelman reported on the smooth re-opening of the city last week and he thanked Governor Newsom and Mayor Breed and all the hardworking staff across governments including City Hall, along with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and regional operators like BART, Caltrain, AC Transit and the Water Emergency Transportation Agency, for making the city accessible. In July, he said, they will have presentations from SFMTA and BART on their next set of service restorations, including BART's late-night service and many more Muni lines and cable car testing in August. He said there is certainly a lot to look forward to and thanked both agencies in advance.

There was no public comment.

3. Executive Director's Report - INFORMATION

Tilly Chang, Executive Director presented the item.

There was no public comment.

4. Approve the Minutes of the June 8, 2021 Meeting - ACTION

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Peskin moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Mar.

The minutes were approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)

Consent Agenda

5. **[Final Approval] Allocate \$9,762,378, with Conditions, and Appropriate \$300,000 in Prop K Funds for Ten Requests, and Allocate \$926,928 in Prop AA Vehicle Registration Fee Funds for One Request - ACTION.**
6. **[Final Approval] Approve the Fiscal Year 2021/22 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program of Projects - ACTION**
7. **[Final Approval] Program \$2,050,000 in Senate Bill 1 Local Partnership Program Formulaic Program Funds to Two Projects, Amend the Prop K/Local Partnership Program Fund Exchange for the 101/280 Managed Lanes and Express Bus Project to Reprogram \$1,300,000 in Prop K funds to Two Projects, and Appropriate \$1,300,000 in Prop K Funds, with Conditions, to Two Projects - ACTION**
8. **[Final Approval] Adopt the Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget and Work Program - ACTION**



9. **[Final Approval] Approve the Revised Administrative Code, Debt, Fiscal, and Investment Policies - ACTION**
10. **[Final Approval] Authorize the Executive Director to Execute Master Agreement, Program Supplements and Fund Transfer Agreements-Thereto with the California Department of Transportation for State-Funded Transit Projects - ACTION**

Vice Chair Peskin moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Commissioner Walton.

The consent agenda was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Melgar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Safai (1)

End of Consent Agenda

11. **Adopt the Upper Great Highway Concepts Evaluation Final Report - ACTION**

Commissioner Mar thanked Chair Mandelman and the other Commissioners for the opportunity to consider the Transportation Authority's report on the Great Highway. He said that it is important to consider the best use for this stretch of pavement on the city's western coastline. He said this discussion predates the current pandemic and the closure to vehicles that began 14 months ago. Commissioner Mar continued by saying that rising sea levels and exacerbated coastal erosion will change the city's coastline and already have. He remarked that the Ocean Beach Master Plan that was completed a decade ago and acknowledged the need for long term coastline retreat. He said that in 2023, the section of the Great Highway south of Sloat Boulevard will be permanently closed to vehicles as part of this retreat, because it cannot be safely maintained as a roadway. Commissioner Mar pointed out that because use of this roadway as a through route for driving must change, alternative best uses should be considered for the Sloat Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard section of the Great Highway.

He said that 14 months ago when the Great Highway was closed due to sand on the road, he requested to continue its closure to vehicles during the shelter in place to provide a space for socially distanced recreation and transportation. He continued by saying it has become an iconic destination for recreation in the city and that it has hosted art installations and music performances. He said it hosted the largest civic action and marches for social justice in the Sunset District ever.

Commissioner Mar acknowledged that this has become a divisive issue within the Sunset and Richmond Districts and has created negative consequences for traffic flow, congestion, and neighborhood connectivity by car. He said that the Transportation Authority has worked with SFMTA to bring dozens of new traffic calming measures to the outer Sunset that were needed before COVID-19 and were key to making the streets safer. He acknowledged that the improvements were not sufficient to address the ongoing impacts to neighborhood connectivity as the city reopens its economy and community life.

Commissioner Mar said that the analysis presented by the Transportation Authority



staff is focused on the long-term future of the upper Great Highway. He said that the analysis was a distinct component of the broader District 4 Mobility Study and is distinct from a short-term pilot proposal that was discussed in a joint hearing of the SFMTA Board of Directors and Recreation and Parks Commission.

Hugh Louch, Deputy Director of Planning, and Camille Guiriba, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the item.

Commissioner Chan thanked Chair Mandelman, and Transportation Authority staff for their efforts creating the Great Highway Final Report. She said it provided her with information and that she needed to better understand the concepts evaluation. She continued by saying the presentation showed the pressure points on the roadway in different scenarios. She said that as the project continues, she would like to see more inclusivity and transparency in terms of outreach. Commissioner Chan said that, as the representative for the Richmond District, the conversation around full closure is unacceptable. She acknowledged that many of her constituents have enjoyed the Great Highway as a recreation space during the pandemic. She said it provided some of her constituents a new way to envision the Great Highway, so a full reopening of Great Highway was also unacceptable to her. She said that now is a turning point where real changes can be made to Great Highway.

Commissioner Chan said she is leaning more towards a timed promenade for the immediate future. She was disappointed that staff did not dive deeper into the promenade/two-way roadway concept but understood that it would have a much higher cost. She remarked that she saw a full promenade in a two-way roadway as a great investment for the city in the long-term. She said that there are ways to explore north/south direction transit to the Richmond District. She continued by saying she would like SFMTA to review their options for the Great Highway.

Commissioner Chan said that the full closure of the Great Highway pushes cars into Golden Gate Park and reduction of car traffic in Golden Gate Park is a goal of hers. She also said that she disagrees with schedule confusion as a con for the timed promenade. She said that if outreach was transparent and inclusive to all residents about the changes to Great Highway and other changes within the city, there would provide less confusion about projects. She continued by saying that schedule confusion speaks more about the way city agencies operate than the confusion of the city's communities. She concluded by thanking Transportation Authority staff for their work on the report.

Commissioner Mar expressed appreciation for consideration of the importance of policy goals as a criterion for the options put forth. He also appreciated the evaluation of traffic impacts of the closure and reopening of the Great Highway as communities and the economy reopen.

Commissioner Mar said he appreciated Commissioner Chan's perspective on the timed promenade option as a middle path forward that would still allow for the recreational benefits of the closure of the Great Highway during the pandemic while also relieving the traffic concerns in the outer Richmond and outer Sunset Districts. He said that he is excited about exploring the long-term vision about a full transformation of the Great Highway into an ocean front promenade. He continued by saying that achieving this goal requires more significant planning with public input



and much more investment in the streets and transportation infrastructure on the west side of the city.

Commissioner Mar asked how the data on the recreational use of the Upper Great Highway during the pandemic compared to the pre pandemic recreational use of the pedestrian pathway and Ocean Beach.

Ms. Guiriba said that the Recreation and Park Department collected the data on usage and passed the question to Stacy Bradley, Deputy Director of Planning for the Recreation and Park Department. Ms. Bradley said that they did not have data on pre-pandemic use.

Commissioner Mar asked if there was data on recreational use of the Upper Great Highway in the months of April and May that could be compared to the data from January, February, and March that showed a month-by-month decline.

Ms. Bradley responded that the decline continued in April and May but that the Upper Great Highway is still the second most visited park. She continued by saying there is a need to continue to collect data on how many visitors use the space as the economy reopens.

Commissioner Mar asked for more description about the costs, extent, and length of time it would take to make the improvements to transportation networks necessary for both the full closure and partial closure of the Great Highway concepts.

Mr. Louch responded by saying that on the northern side of the study area there were a range of options that could be implemented quickly and other options that would take several years. He asked Sarah Jones, Director of Planning for SFMTA, to respond further.

Ms. Jones said that one of the near-term options would be to start with the idea to add one signal. She said SFMTA is already planning to add a signal on Lincoln Way and 41st Avenue, and this project is in their Capital Improvement Plan. She continued by saying this was a short-term improvement. Ms. Jones said that the 3-signal option would take more investment and consideration. She said that the option that would close access between Lincoln Way and Martin Luther King Drive on Chain of Lakes Drive would be easy to implement physically but would require more discussion and connection to ensure access to the park in that scenario. Ms. Jones continued by saying the proposed southern improvements would fall into the category of long-term projects.

Commissioner Mar responded that the improvements needed in the event of Great Highway partial or full closure seemed to require much more planning. He asked if there was already funding for the capital project that would include adding another signal on Lincoln Boulevard and 41st street and what the timeline was for installation.

Ms. Jones responded by saying that the installation would fall into the 1-to-3-year timeframe and said that there were also some very near-term solutions that could help ease some of the current situation.

Commissioner Melgar started by saying that she has not committed to one of the options for Great Highway at this time. She asked what options there were to redirect traffic from Interstate 280 to Highway 1. She continued by asking what impact the



concepts in the presentation would have on bike commuters within the area and if there would be a dedicated bike lane on the Upper Great Highway when it is closed to cars. She followed by asking the cost of maintenance in the event of increased pedestrian and bike traffic and whether sand removal activities were reduced during the pandemic and if that would be returned to pre-pandemic levels if kept closed to vehicles. Commissioner Melgar continued by asking if there were plans for improved maintenance for the restrooms due to increased pedestrian and bike use. She also asked that the potential improvements on Sloat Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard be considered regardless of which option is taken on Great Highway.

Mr. Louch responded to Commissioner Melgar stating that traffic is projected to use Sunset Boulevard and local streets within the Sunset district that have more capacity and that the diversion analysis considered the full set of street network options available.

Ms. Jones said that the bike and pedestrian connectivity at Sloat Boulevard and Skyline Boulevard are under consideration as part of the Public Utilities Commission's (PUC's) adaptation project.

Commissioner Melgar responded by saying she did not see a connection between the PUC adaption project's presentations on traffic pattern analysis and the concepts presented for Great Highway. Ms. Jones said that balancing the SFMTA and PUC adaption project has been an ongoing effort. She said that the expected situation of traffic diverting back to Great Highway after they can't use the Great Highway Extension, has had varied impacts that they were not expecting.

Ms. Bradley said that the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department has not developed detailed plans if Upper Great Highway remains closed to vehicles, and that the design would be informed by community input, but she believed there was support for a dedicated bike lane. She continued by saying that maintenance around the bathrooms at Sloat Boulevard are part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area property, so the Recreation and Parks Department is not in control of the operation and maintenance. Ms. Bradley noted that there have been some conversations about a joint management agreement.

Commissioner Walton asked who provided input throughout outreach, and if there was a database of response percentages by district.

Ms. Guiriba responded by saying that there was data available in the report and map of responses by zip code.

Commissioner Walton asked if there was data based on percentages by race or income.

Ms. Guiriba responded that they did not collect other demographic data on survey respondents.

Commissioner Walton asked if there was data on usage of the Great Highway based on participation during weekdays and weekends by race.

Ms. Guiriba responded that the Recreation and Park Department was considering collecting that data.

Ms. Bradley added that counters are currently not collecting demographic data but



will collect more robust datasets in the future.

Commissioner Walton asked if there was data on usage based on geography.

Ms. Bradley responded that they would collect data based on origin in the future.

Commissioner Walton asked if there was a commitment to diversity in the area and why there was not data collection that included demographics data.

Ms. Bradley responded that there were limited resources for data collection but in the future the data collection would be more robust.

Commissioner Walton said that it is important to collect demographic data to ensure that the option chosen for the Great Highway is inclusive.

Commissioner Chan said she would like to make a motion to amend the report. She said that after hearing from Commissioners Mar and Melgar, she would not be voting to approve the report unless the staff recommendation was removed.

Director Chang, responded by saying that the Transportation Authority would reflect the Board's guidance and asked what Commissioner Chan's recommendation would be for a path towards approval.

Commissioner Chan said that she would not support the staff recommendation but would consider voting on a report that included information about all concepts.

Director Chang said she would consider removing the staff recommendation from the report, but not the findings, and proposed bringing the revised report back at the next reading to include the recommendation about additional data to monitor.

Chair Mandelman suggested that Director Chang follow up with Commissioner Chan to shape a proposed amendment.

Commissioner Melgar requested that the findings in the report include the PUC analysis of traffic impacts on the closure of the Great Highway Extension.

Commissioner Preston said he wanted to express his support for the full closure of Great Highway and said that there were many constituents within his district who have enjoyed using the Great Highway as a recreational space. He asked if there was a short or long-term plan to connect the Great Highway from north to south using public transit.

Ms. Jones responded that currently SFMTA was not considering adding a public transit line on the Upper Great Highway due to the lack of access from the Upper Great Highway to local streets. She said that public transit could be improved in the area, including returning the 18 route to service.

Commissioner Preston said he acknowledged the difficulty of planning new transit lines with service cuts but stressed the importance of long-term planning to address the lack of north/south access on Great Highway.

Ms. Jones responded by saying SFMTA was working on improvements to north/south transit but that they were focusing on other north/south routes besides Great Highway.

Ms. Guiriba added that the District 4 Mobility Study to be presented next month will



provide ideas for improvements to north/south transit including a conceptual express bus service between the Richmond and the Peninsula, but the model showed modest changes in mode shift.

Commissioner Safai said that he recalled when the parking lot at the San Francisco Zoo was a public pool. He continued by saying that much of the city's oceanfront space and activation has deteriorated over time but sees the Great Highway as an opportunity to bring more interest in building more recreation spaces within the city. He acknowledged the difficulty of residents near Great Highway whose parking and quality of life have changed due to its increased use. He said that he hopes in the future the Board could reach a resolution on how to activate the ocean space while balancing the interest of residents. He said that it was important in the event of full closure to consider a transition period to study both the positive and negative impacts on the area.

Vice Chair Peskin said that the Great Highway falls within the coastal zone and that the Coastal Act encourages public access and recreation. He asked if there had been any consultation with the Coastal Commission and suspected that any option taken would require a coastal development permit.

Ms. Bradley responded that Recreation and Park Department spoke briefly with the Coastal Commission and that any permanent changes would require a coastal development permit.

Vice Chair Peskin said he believed that even short-term changes to area would most likely require a coast development permit.

Ms. Bradley responded that the zoning administrator said that coastal development permits would not be needed for temporary modifications.

Vice Chair Peskin said that the City would issue a needed permit as long as the option taken was consistent with the Local Coastal Plan, but that it would be appealable to the Coastal Commission. He asked why they chose two years for the pilot.

Ms. Bradley explained that two years was enough time to monitor changes in traffic flow and implement modifications as needed.

Vice Chair Peskin asked who the lead agency was.

Ms. Bradley responded that the Recreation and Park Department and SFMTA are jointly sharing the project. Ms. Jones added that the two-year timeframe was necessary to understand the impacts to the area and continue to make necessary adjustments. She continued by saying at the end of the two-year timeframe policy and decision-making bodies could reflect on their findings and decide if they want to continue with the plan or make specific changes.

Vice Chair Peskin said that there was an issue of public trust in whether a two-year timeframe would become permanent without the agencies taking responsibility for the monitoring that was indicated. He suggested that the extension of the contract for the Ferris Wheel in Golden Gate Park from 1 to 5 years served to erode the public trust in the Recreation and Park Department.

During public comment Luke Bornheimer, organizer of Kids Safe San Francisco, said he supported the full promenade option, adding that it provided an opportunity for



an equitable space for recreation and solutions for those with car related challenges.

Paulina Sayer, a 28-year resident, said that she supported reopening the Great Highway. She said that the roadway would not continue to see the same foot traffic and it is not pragmatic to divert vehicle traffic that could be easily accommodated by the Great Highway.

Zach Lipton of Kids Safe San Francisco said he supported a full time Great Walkway. He said that the Great Walkway was an opportunity to reach the city's goals. He continued by saying that action was needed soon to address traffic issues related to the closure of the Great Highway Extension and climate change.

Steven Hill, a resident of District 4 for over twenty years, said that tens of thousands of lives were being affected by this change and asked for data on impact on working people. He expressed support for Concept 2.

A caller said that the re-opening of Great Highway is critical for first responders and that responders should be consulted regarding the closure. They said full closure would affect first responders' ability to reach accidents especially during more popular days.

Richard Rothman of the Richmond District said he supported Concept 2 and wanted to associate his comments with his District Supervisor Chan. He said the study did not include information on commuters, many of whom come from outside of the city, such as those from the Veterans Affairs Hospital and that further action was needed to avoid traffic congestion for commuters to the area.

George Willing said that he opposed the Great Highway resolution without amendments. He requested a clear framework for resident outreach and transparency on data gathering.

A caller from the outer Richmond District said the city could become a global leader if the Great Highway is transformed into a beachfront recreation space. they said that traffic noise would return with cars and it is currently much quieter which provided a better quality of life.

A caller said they wanted to draw attention to the June 10th joint hearing. They said that the residents who have dealt with the impacts of the closure on a daily basis have been ignored. They said that the Board should oversee the data used to make decisions and that agencies have made their decision without taking the public into consideration.

Jean Bartholomew of District 4 said they supported a car fee pilot of the Great Highway. They said they use the Great Highway to commute via bicycle daily and that they were aware of transit challenges within the city and supported traffic improvements over the two-year period.

Mike Chan said they supported a two-year 24/7 promenade. They said it promoted better health within the city and was more friendly to other means of travel outside of cars.

A District 1 caller and member of Open the Great Highway urged the Board to reject the report. They said the data was incomplete and said it was unreasonable as there were other recreation spaces available within the city that do not negatively affect the



mobility needs of residents.

Judy of Open the Great Highway urged the commission to reject the report. They said it has been a disaster for residents and the data had been collected by agencies with an agenda for permanent closure.

Kristen Leckie, Senior Organizer of the San Francisco Bike Coalition, said they supported the two-year closure and permanent closure. They said it is an opportunity for the city to add a recreation space the size of the Great Highway is very rare.

Michael Kaufman of the Richmond District said that weekday use will continue to decline, the closure is more expensive than estimated in the report, and that a closure is not aligned with wider city objectives and goals. They continued by saying that it worsens safety, transportation, and climate change objectives.

Rick Burling said that car-free Great Highway has been a huge improvement and it has been a very equitable space.

Steve Dillick of the Richmond District urged the Board to reject the closure to vehicles. They said that the report did not consider the impacts of first responders and did not consult the Office of Emergency Preparedness. They proposed closing the highway for specified times throughout the year.

Jay of the Richmond District said they supported full closure and seasonal closure. They said they did not see the traffic congestion that others claimed to see from the closure.

Jose Fontera of the outer Richmond District opposed the closure of the Great Highway. They said that the report did not pay attention to localized increases in traffic on Sloat Boulevard and did not consider increases from the economy reopening.

Steven Gorsky, a 40-year resident of the outer Sunset District, said he opposed the pilot program and supported Concept 4. He said the data was insufficient and that the commissioners had already decided to close the Great Highway.

Paula Katz of District 4 said she supported Concept 3 and that it was safer than Concepts 2 and 4. She said she knew and saw many people who enjoyed the open space and that it could become a major attraction.

Jodie Medeiros, Executive Director of Walk San Francisco, said she supported a 24/7 promenade. She said she wished to see SFMTA and the Transportation Authority begin to implement solutions to traffic challenges.

Eileen of District 4 said they opposed the Great Highway final report. They said the report only evaluated a narrow set of options. They said they supported widening the roadway to allow for both pedestrians, bicycle, and vehicular traffic, and urged the commission and staff to consider this option.

Heather said they enjoyed a car-free Great Highway for cyclists and pedestrians to use safely and supported the two-year pilot closure of the Great Highway.

Abby said they supported a 24/7 two-year pilot of a car-free upper Great Highway. They said that the closure has been an enjoyable space for all and has been beneficial to the coastal ecosystem.



Bruce Halperin District 2 said that drivers in the area have many alternative routes. He said he used the space frequently and patronized local businesses. He said they have not experienced increased traffic on residential streets during peak hours.

Dave Alexander of District 1 said they supported a two-year pilot program. They said that the Ocean Beach Plan already has plans for closure and that the Board should adopt the plan sooner rather than later.

Eric Rosell of the Tenderloin said they supported the two-year pilot program. They said Great Highway promotes better quality of life and safety. They continued by saying it was important to consider the current climate crisis.

Stacey Randecker of District 10 said they desired to see a development similar to the Great Walkway at the Embarcadero and other corridors within the city. They said to address the climate crisis the city needs to end travel by car.

Will Murphy of District 5 said they support the car-free promenade. They said they use it more often now than before and patronize more businesses in the area. They added that the city should be transit first and that closure is aligned with that policy.

Zack Steuben of District 11 said they support a car-free Great Highway. They said that reducing usage of personal cars is necessary to meet the city's climate goals. They added that there were improvements that could address traffic diversion.

Mitch Conker of District 7 said they supported keeping the Great Highway car-free. They said that there are a few places within the city to cycle safely and the closure to car traffic at Great Highway was a step towards reaching the city's Vision Zero goal.

Sandy Cutter of District 4 said they support full closure to vehicles for two years due to the climate crisis and because transportation accounts for 40% of carbon emissions.

David of the outer Sunset said they support Concept 3. They said that it has relieved car traffic in the area, and the ability to walk on the Great Highway has helped their physical health.

The Board recessed at 1:30 p.m. and reconvened at 5:01 p.m. and resumed taking public comment.

Hazel of District 1 said they hoped to see the Board keep the Great Highway closed to cars and open to pedestrians and bicyclists to follow along with the city's Vision Zero policy and the Climate Action Plan. They said the street is eroding into the seashore and it's much nicer as a bicyclist who has been hit by a car in the past.

Megan of District 4 and Kid Safe San Francisco who lives two blocks from the Great Highway said she was excited about it continuing to be closed to cars, and nature was already reclaiming the roadway. Luis, Megan's partner said they support it being closed to cars and they enjoyed seeing families using it. They added that keeping it fully closed will open it up for potential park and playground improvements.

A resident of Sunnyside said that a safe Great Highway free from motor vehicles has been important to them as a senior. They expressed support for the staff recommendation and support to adopt the report. They added that the city could do a better job of directing car traffic away from the Lower Great Highway.



Dan Baralini of District 5 said they have been biking or walking on the Great Highway several times a week and that keeping cars off can improve quality of life for residents. They said they support the staff recommendation for a full promenade.

Amy Morris of the Richmond District said the car-free Great Highway is important because of the unique space it provides for safe cycling and community. They urged the Board to support the staff recommendation for a full promenade.

Christina Shih of the Richmond District said they do not know how they can displace 18,000 cars a day for the benefit of 4,000 bicyclists. They said the people who are enjoying the Great Highway have not seen the negative impacts on Golden Gate Park, Chain of Lakes, and Lincoln Way which are backed up.

Susan George of District 9 said they have used Golden Gate Park and the Great Highway throughout the pandemic and is important to them as a senior to provide a safe place to ride. They said they support keeping it car-free.

Josh Kelley of District 4 said he has two young children and wants to keep it closed to cars and open to people permanently. He said traffic is a problem but can be addressed and there should be more buses. He said highways for cars are fossil fuel infrastructure and that we need to build a resilient green city.

Cliff Bargar of Potrero Hill said it has been convenient at times to drive on the Great Highway between the Peninsula and the northwestern part of the city. They asked the Board to leave the staff recommendation in the report.

Adam Jamon of District 1 said they support option 3 and request that the Board approve the staff report as written. They said they use the Great Highway to walk, bike, and recreate and that it helps them get to Irving and Taraval Streets where they can visit shops without a car. They said the staff report showed ameliorations for problems and that traffic should not be directed to Chain of Lakes.

Sarah Doherty of the Mission District said they became a bicyclist by learning on the Slow Streets during the pandemic. They said the closure has improved their physical and mental health greatly and that they are in support of keeping the Great Highway closed.

Sean Wills of the Mission District said they support closure to cars and the opening to pedestrians and bicyclists. They said they need to have a green city to fight climate change and fossil fuel infrastructure and mentioned that the benefits the Great Highway being closed to cars has provided to them.

Patricia Wise, 30-year resident of Lower Great Highway and Open the Great Highway member, said she supports reopening to cars and is against the pilot. She said that the amount of people using the Great Highway does not justify the closure and 20,000 cars diverted into residential streets causes gridlock, carbon emissions, and unsafe driving and walking conditions.

Justin of District 8 said they are in favor of keeping the Great Highway closed to cars, including Concepts 3 and 5. They said they are thinking about raising a family in the city and that to become a real progressive city they need to think about ideas that are friendly for the future.



Michael Cohen of District 1 said the Great Highway should be open to residents who drive and there are places in the city to learn how to ride bikes safely without negatively impacting residents. He said that the 18,000 cars being diverted onto adjacent roads contributes to increased greenhouse emissions are being ignored.

Kimberly, said they are in support of a permanent closure of the Great Highway and said they ran a half-marathon and appreciated the space and freedom and a place to avoid the high risk of getting hit in the city.

John Winston, resident and senior in District 7, said they have a beautiful waterfront that needs to be honored. He said global warming and climate change are really an issue right now and hard decisions need to be made.

A long-time Ocean Beach resident said they would be fine with a sharing plan. They added that they are concerned about exclusion and said automobiles should be accommodated and cited section 1.6 of the city's code.

Jenny DeSilva of 46th and Lincoln Avenue said they hope the Board keeps it closed to cars. They said the Great Highway is their family's favorite place in the whole city and mentioned community activities that happened on the Great Highway.

Dave Alexander, with the Richmond Family Transportation Network, said they would like the Board to not make any amendments to the staff recommendations.

Aldo Castaneda of 46th Avenue and Noriega said they loved having the Great Highway closed this past year and that it has been a way to reconnect the neighborhood to the ocean in a new way. They support keeping the Great Highway closed.

Alex Miller of District 3 said they support keeping the Great Highway car-free and said a permanent car-free Great Highway would preserve a great public place for people throughout the city to enjoy.

Charlie 32-year resident of District 7 said they are opposed to closing it to vehicles. They said the city is forcing drivers to stay in their cars which causes more greenhouse gas emissions and undermines Vision Zero. They said the streets were less safe when vehicles get diverted onto residential areas.

Lauren Nizaro of the Castro said they support keeping the Great Walkway closed to cars and open to people. They said it addressed the climate crisis and gives people a safe way to walk and bike.

Eric Chase, city resident, said they are in support of a full car-free promenade. They said that they can change travel patterns by allocating street space for alternative modes and the Great Walkway is an example of what is possible. They added that the city cannot be a leader on climate change, the environment, or Vision Zero if they backtrack.

Elizabeth Stampe of District 8 said they support keeping the Great Highway car-free and appreciated the slow streets.

Martin Munoz said they support option 3, and the opening of the Great Highway for walkers and bikers and closure to cars.



Cynthia Coffin, outer Richmond resident, said they support Concept 1 and reject the pilot proposal.

Bob Atkinson, member of the Grow the Richmond and Streets for People supported keeping the Great Highway completely closed to cars. They suggested investing in making the 18 and 29 Muni lines faster and to approve the report as presented.

Elias Zamaria of District 5 said they would like to see the Great Highway continue to be closed to cars.

Kenneth Russell of District 7 said they support the full closure pilot. They said they should encourage people and activities outdoors and not encourage driving.

Jason Howie of District 5 said they are in support of keeping the Great Highway closed to vehicles. They said they appreciate how the space has become a center of community activism and a place where people can bike and enjoy the space.

Amy Adina of District 4 said they support keeping the Great Highway closed to cars. They said they enjoy the space now and it is their favorite thing about living in the Sunset.

Joe Demento of District 8 said they support keeping the Great Highway closed to help the city achieve its climate goals.

Dominic of the Sunset said they support keeping the Great Walkway open to humans and free from cars.

Jim Murphy, born and raised in San Francisco on 34th and Wawona, said their father was nearly killed by a car speeding through their neighborhood. They said the only solution that is reasonable would be putting a bike lane next to the current multi-use walkway.

Ellen, resident of the Great Highway between Kirkham and Lawton, said they support option 3.

Dan Federman of District 5 said they support a two-year four-lane full promenade pilot.

Leslie Benedict of District 1 said they support a car-free Great Highway.

Marielle Wiseman of the Mission said they oppose the pilot project.

Claire Prowse of District 2 said they support option 3, keeping the Great Highway car-free.

Rio Teva of District 1 said they support keeping the Great Walkway open to pedestrians and closed to cars.

Yasmin Staton of District 4 said they oppose the continued closure of the Great Highway and oppose the two-year pilot. They cited an online petition with 9,000 signatures to reopen the Great Highway.

Peter Tannen, retired transportation planner for SFMTA and District 8 Transportation Authority Community Advisory Committee representative speaking on his own behalf, said he supported full or partial closure and urged the Board to approve the staff recommendation as written.



Gabriel of District 2 and Kid Safe San Francisco, said they are in favor of keeping the Great Walkway open.

Reverend Nancy Pennycamp of District 1 said they support a full promenade.

Angie Petit-Taylor of District 7 said they support keeping the Great Highway closed.

David Stone of Inner Sunset and Board member of Inner Sunset Parkside Neighbors said they are in support of the pilot moving forward and the Great Walkway.

Larry Lapidus of District 4 said they are supportive of keeping the Great Highway closed to cars.

James Mason of District 8 said they support option 3, closing the Great Highway to cars and supported the two-year pilot as written.

Robin Ham of District 7 said they support option 3, the full-closure to have more safe spaces for families.

A caller from Pacifica said the best route for them to get to the Veterans area is to use the Great Highway and it has been inconvenient having it closed.

Eric of the Richmond District said keeping it a car-free space would be good for local businesses, local community, and would increase property values.

A resident of the Sunset said the Great Highway wasn't designed for residents of the Sunset but as the Great Walkway, Sunset residents can walk and bike.

Jane Natoli of the Richmond District said they support option 3 to make the Great Highway a promenade.

Andrew Sullivan of District 5 said they support the report and option 3 and encourage commissioner to support a plan to divert all traffic to Sunset Boulevard and impose enough traffic calming and slow streets.

Stephanie Fong of District 5 said they support keeping the Great Walkway closed to cars.

A caller from District 1 said they support option 3 and the two-year pilot of the full closure for the promenade.

A caller shared their support for option 3.

Monica Gwel of District 1 said they support opening the Great Highway to humans and closing to cars.

Karen of District 1 said they support option 1 and keeping the Great Highway open to cars, or an alternative where it is open to cars five days a week and closed on the weekends.

Monica Moreno of District 7 said they support keeping the Great Highway open to people.

Tony Villa, resident on the Great Highway and Kirkham, said they support option 1 and opening the Great Highway to vehicles.

Nicole Horner of District 9 said they support option 3.



Maria Vargas of District 7 said they support opening the Great Highway to vehicles.

Jen Gan, resident of Outer Sunset, said they support keeping the Great Walkway open to pedestrians and others.

Bob Wise, resident of the Lower Great Highway said they are in favor of putting the Great Highway back to the way it was as a roadway.

Christine Terres of District 1 said they support Concept 3 and the pilot project as written.

A resident of District 7 said they support the 24/7 closure to cars.

A caller said they support option 1 to reopen the Great Highway and to amend the report.

Kieran Farr said they support the closure of the Great Highway to cars.

A caller said they are in favor of the pilot and the closure.

Amanda Sedono, resident along Great Highway and fourth generation San Franciscan, said they opposed keeping the Great Highway closed.

Rhonda of District 7 said they oppose the full closure of the Great Highway but would support option 1 or a compromise.

Nicole of District 4 said they support keeping the Great Walkway open to pedestrians.

Elizabeth Harmon, born in San Francisco and moved to Ocean Beach in 1974, said they support the closure of the Great Highway 24-7.

Nicholas, resident of District 4 at 46th and Taraval, said there is no alternative to the ocean environment. They thanked staff for their work and asked to keep the highway closed.

A District 7 caller said the Great Walkway could be a beacon for tourists and new opportunities and business and supported keeping the highway open for pedestrians 24/7 and closed to cars.

A resident along the Lower Great Highway said they were against keeping the Great Highway closed and against the pilot program, indicating concerns with the dunes being trampled.

A resident of the Richmond said they supported Concept 3 for a full pilot of a 24/7 car-free space.

James Gretty, 13-year resident of Districts 5 and 2, said they frequently cycle on the Great Highway and support the 24/7 closure to cars.

Sean of District 5, member of the San Francisco Transit Riders and San Francisco Bicycle Coalition, said they supported the 24/7 closure of the Great Highway.

Chris of Moraga and Lower Great Highway, said they skateboard on the Great Walkway every day and support the 24/7 closure for people to walk on the highway.

A lifelong resident of San Francisco and a member of the Open the Great Highway group said they are fully opposed to the closure of the Great Highway and the pilot



project. They said that the closure of the highway violates the Ocean Beach Master Plan and the San Francisco Golden Gate Park Master Plan.

Sarah of District 1 and former District 2 representative on the Bicycle Advisory Committee said she supports a full promenade because of its high use and safety. She said it would be confusing to open then close it when the extension will close to cars, and that we need to start planning for that now with a comprehensive climate change plan. She said she biked Sunset and the Richmond at rush hour and didn't see much traffic.

A caller who lives with their husband and child in the Richmond said they are opposed to the closure and pilot program. They cited concerns of parking and beach access, increased traffic on Sunset and 19th Avenue and the extra greenhouse emissions in Golden Gate Park. They added concerns about Richmond residents not having a way to get out in an emergency.

A resident of the Sunset said they in-line skate on it several times a week since it is one of the few flat roads without cars or bad pavement. They said it improves safety and makes it a more desirable neighborhood to live in and increases property values. They said they support the permanent closure and it should be named the Great Esplanade.

A District 1 caller said they support the Great Walkway. They said it helps them patronize businesses in the outer Sunset because it's a safe, north/south bike route and helps them avoid driving to get food or to reach Stern Grove. They asked the Board to not remove Concept 3 and to recognize the imminent impact of climate change.

A District 9 caller said they support keeping the Great Walkway closed to cars and favored Concept 3. They said they don't own a car and the closure is important for Vision Zero and climate goals. They said they use the space weekly and hope that the Board expands the network of safe streets, bike lanes, and bike trails so that the green space is accessible to all.

A second-generation Richmond District resident said they oppose keeping the highway closed. They said the city is becoming more unwelcoming to working people and essential workers. They said their partner worked at Stanford on vaccine distribution and their commute has increased by 30 minutes. They proposed a compromise to close it on Sundays but working people need to get to their jobs.

Lindsay of District 3 said they visit the Great Highway via Muni. They cited recent plans in Paris, and said San Francisco should have plans developed to that scale. They said they feel for nearby residents but don't think it makes sense to reopen something that has to close again in a couple of years. They asked the Board to keep it closed to cars.

A caller from 42nd and Vicente said an open waterfront raises property value and reduces the barrier between the city and the ocean. They said their street could be impacted by traffic but it's worth it with people of all ages, ethnicities and income levels using the Upper Great Highway.

A Richmond District resident born and raised in San Francisco said they support opening the Great Highway. They said Veteran Affairs workers need to travel from the



south. They said it is a shared space for pedestrians and bikers, and traffic cannot traverse because there are bottlenecks through Golden Gate Park. They said people are running the stop signs and destroying the dunes.

Adam, a District 6 resident and physician said they support keeping the Great Highway car-free. They said they shouldn't have a highway at surface level speeds with people going 35 mph as it isn't safe. They said the highway was already falling into the sea and should be kept car free.

Vanessa, a District 3 called to voice their support for option 3, the two-year pilot. They said it has been transformative and good for their health, businesses, and climate.

Sophie of District 4 said they support option 3. They said they have a young kid who loves walking on it every day, and it is one of the few streets that is totally flat and elevated from cars. They said they have lived all up and down California and it's a huge asset to the city and neighborhood.

Chris of District 9 said the people of San Francisco should not sign their name to this report because it is fundamentally flawed and biased. They said to improve the Great Highway and access for all, there needs to be an unbiased report.

A District 1 caller said the closure violates the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Golden Gate Park Master Plan, and the disaster evacuation plan so they prefer to have the Great Highway open.

A District 5 caller who is an immigrant and a worker without a driver's license urged the Board to support the two-year pilot project. They said their family depends on transit and the city has not done enough to create equitable safe streets, especially for the most vulnerable and hard-working residents. They said they need to help families and drivers safely get out of their cars, and cars back on the highway won't do that. They said the best way to reduce car traffic is to create safe and car-free alternatives.

A District 2 caller said they support keeping the Great Walkway open to pedestrians and cyclists and closed to cars. They said it is a unique public space that they use at least once per week. They cited the climate crisis as a reason to not open more roads to cars and traffic. They said they would love to see public transportation options, and a decrease in fossil fuels to create a more equitable city.

A caller said they support keeping the Great Highway closed to vehicle traffic 24/7. They shared their appreciation, and said they used it almost every day with their family and are very excited and hopeful that it will stay as is.

A District 1 caller who grew up in San Francisco said they are in favor of opening the Great Highway. They said having it closed during the pandemic was fine, but people driving to the Great Highway are creating more congestion on side streets.

A District 5 caller said they are a mom and mostly get around the city on foot though they own a car. They asked leaders to consider creating a huge, oceanside park for everyone, and generations of people will thank them.

A fifth-generation San Franciscan and Sunset resident said they appreciated the Great Highway during the pandemic but wanted the Board to consider a compromise because of traffic redirected to residential streets and safety concerns. They cited



many open spaces in the city, and suggested the road can be used for commute hours and potentially closed on the weekends.

A District 5 caller who doesn't own a car asked the Board to keep the Great Highway closed to cars and open to people. They said the pathway can be crowded and not friendly to pedestrians, and in reopening to cars, the city is telling people it's better to be in a car.

A District 1 caller, doctor, and mother to two young children said they support a two-year pilot project and a full 24/7 closure. They said they take their children to preschool by bike on the Great Highway, so it's not just recreational. They said they want leadership to do something for the health and well-being of their residents.

A Golden Gate Heights resident said that the Great Highway being closed has helped businesses during the pandemic and created job opportunities. They said it is important to address the climate crisis and impacts cars have. They said the Great Highway will become a destination for visitors and that they want it to stay open.

Sarah, born and raised in District 1, expressed support to keep the Great Highway open to people and bikes and asked the Board to consider it and a two-year pilot program. They shared that they were a transportation planner and that there are tools for mitigating unsafe driving on local streets.

A caller said they support reopening the Great Highway to vehicle traffic. They said 27,000 people visiting a week is amazing, and that will increase with the pilot program. They said people are driving to get there and if folks really care about climate change the road should be opened back up because they don't want so many people driving to get to the Great Highway for recreation.

A District 7 caller said their son loves biking on the Great Highway, adding driving in traffic for 30 minutes to Golden Gate Park is challenging, but now their family can walk or drive to the Great Highway and bike every weekend. They asked the Board to approve the pilot and keep the Great Highway open to people 24/7.

A District 5 caller expressed support for the pilot project and option 3. They said it has worked great over the past year and they support the traffic calming measures in nearby neighborhoods.

An outer Sunset caller said they and their wife bike and have two kids. They expressed support in keeping the road closed to cars, ideally option 3 but are also open to sharing. They said there aren't many places for their kids to bike safely other than the Great Highway and now JFK.

A District 1 caller expressed interest in keeping it open for adults and kids.

Another caller also expressed interest in keeping the highway open for adults and kids.

Mark, a San Francisco resident and PhD candidate at UC Berkeley, asked that the city keep the road car-free and approve the pilot. They said San Francisco needs to do this to achieve Vision Zero and climate goals.

A caller speaking on behalf of their two-year-old daughter said their daughter is delighted by the Great Highway where she can play on her scooter away from cars



and they need this space in their city and their leaders to stand up for this space.

A long-term Richmond District resident said that they need to open up the highway to alleviate traffic in Golden Gate Park and 19th Avenue. They said it's a matter of safety for children who need to bike to school through Golden Gate Park and also for emergency vehicle access.

A Richmond District resident since 2015 said they have used the Great Highway for socially distanced walks, and they hope to see it continue to be a pedestrian and bike friendly place.

A District 5 caller requested to keep the Great Highway open to kids and adults and everyone in between.

Emily, 10-year resident of District 10 and parent, said they want to stay in San Francisco and the Great Walkway attracts them to stay longer because it's hard to live in the city without a car and with a small child.

Priya of the Outer Sunset and a mother of two, said they bike and use Golden Gate Park, slow streets, and the Great Highway to get around safely. They want to keep the Great Highway open to the people.

Maria from the Mission District said they want to keep the Great Highway open and closed to cars.

Graham, father of two, car-owner and resident of District 4, said they want to keep the Great Highway open to people and closed to cars 24/7.

A District 7 caller said they want to open the highway to cars during the week as a compromise.

Matt of District 4 said they want to keep the Great Highway closed to cars. They said they live three blocks from the area and use the walkway regularly. They said traffic in the area is inevitable, but they need to adjust to a more robust work from home environment.

Chair Mandelman noted that Commissioner Chan wanted to propose amendments to the resolution, and additionally, other Commissioners wanted their comments reflected in the resolution. Chair Mandelman also noted that during the recess, Director Chang and staff worked on the proposed changes suggested by the Commissioners' offices.

Director Chang outlined three parts of a potential amendment: 1) Remove the staff recommendation to consider specific long-term concepts for the Great Highway, and to instead summarize the evaluation findings for all concepts as the conclusion of the report. 2) Add the following four recommendations to the report. First, to monitor the use of the facility by race and income. Second, for SFMTA to prioritize traffic management planning and design for the Sloat-Skyline and Sloat-Sunset interchanges as part of the SFPUC adaptation project and EIR. Third, to explore the feasibility of improved north/south public transit to serve local and regional trips in the corridor. And fourth, for San Francisco Recreation Park to coordinate with Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) to increase bathroom and other maintenance. 3) Add reference that the Coastal Commission has jurisdiction on permanent changes to the Great Highway.



Commissioner Melgar seconded Commissioner Chan's motion and thanked Director Chang for putting the information into writing. Commissioner Melgar said she sought to correct the record regarding misinformation that came out while the Transportation Authority Board was in recess. She said that, except for Commissioner Mar, she believes she has spent the most time on the Great Highway and she wants San Francisco to have what other international cities have which is an open space on the waterfront that allows walkers and bikers safe access to the water. She stated that climate change is real and racial segregation and exclusion to open space is also real. She said that in her past role working with at-risk kids in the Mission, Excelsior, and Bayview as Executive Director of the Jamestown Community Center she learned that many, if not most, children had not been to the ocean except through the program. She said their infrastructure, particularly on the West Side is built around cars and they are not moving fast enough to improve walking and biking. She said the report points to the fact that people traveling from I-280 to Land's End must cross through District 7 streets like Lake Merced Boulevard and Sloat Boulevard, which have seen lots of fatalities and collisions, particularly with pedestrians. She said any long-term solution that puts more stress on pedestrians and bicyclists in District 7 must be addressed. She said that, as they look to reduce dependence on cars, they need to make sure they address that for everyone while they make the space open to all.

Commissioner Melgar also noted that the Board was voting on a report, and not on a long-term solution. She said she appreciates that they are keeping their eyes on the data in the recommendations for all proposed solutions, and not just one. She said that it is not time to make a recommendation and they need to include all voices as they make this important long-term decision. She added that they should be thoughtful and consider other related projects, such as ConnectSF, as they make decisions like they are for the Great Highway.

Commissioner Mar thanked the commissioners for their time in the hearing. He said while they are only considering approval of a report today, the Board will ultimately play an important role in determining the future of the Great Highway. He thanked everyone who weighed in on this study including those who called in today. He also thanked the Transportation Authority team. He said that he originally requested the city repurpose the Great Highway for recreation as part of the pandemic response because he believes in the vision of an iconic Ocean Beach promenade and managed retreat from the coastline as a compelling long-term vision for the Great Highway. He said he believes the traffic challenges that it has created are solvable problems but to solve them will require major investments and a traffic management plan for the West Side neighborhoods as well as investments to improve north/south public transit access for the West Side and the equity analysis that Commissioners Walton and Melgar requested. He said they also need a meaningful public process and thoughtful planning. He said he does support adopting the report and agrees with the report's long-term recommendations for a full or partial promenade on the Great Highway with needed traffic and transportation network improvements.

Commissioner Mar said he appreciated the proposed amendments and Director Chang and staff for their work on the amendments to ensure completeness of the report. He said that even though the Board is not deciding on the pilot project at that meeting, he does support moving forward with a weekend only pilot project in the



near-term. He said he wants to lift up the Transportation Authority's recommendation to have clear metrics and thresholds for evaluating a pilot and triggers that would require reconfiguration or reconsideration. He said that the concerns the Commissioners raised have not been solved and would take time and money to solve. Commissioner Mar said that while he would support a pilot, he would not support a full closure pilot. He said the street had a full closure for 14 months, and it showed potential, but even with reduced traffic from the pandemic, problems remain that need to be solved. He suggested that as the city moves to the next phase, they should give relief to residents who have been facing congestion, and make connectivity improvements to make a bold transformation in the future. He said as they emerge from the pandemic, he wants to see San Francisco Recreation and Park and SFMTA do the kind of outreach the Transportation Authority has done to have a meaningful public process to present a pilot project that balances the benefits with the real and urgent needs of West Side residents. He said there is room to compromise in the short-term with a pilot to collect data and do the work that will take years to improve transportation in the area. Commissioner Mar said they need to keep the long-term vision in mind while they do the work in the short-term to make the long-term possible. He said he is willing to accept the proposed amendment to encourage his colleagues support for the report.

Commissioner Chan said it is good to be with Commissioner Mar and Melgar on this issue. She said the Richmond is different than Districts 4 and 7 and the outreach to date has not been inclusive of Richmond District residents and that has fostered mistrust with the process. She said there is a misunderstanding among some folks regarding what the Board is voting on today. She said the Board is not voting on a project proposal and that this misunderstanding is a sign of lack of outreach. Commissioner Chan called for SFMTA and Recreation and Park to do a better job on outreach when it comes to explaining the process.

Commissioner Chan said she opposes both the full closure and the full opening of the Great Highway, and her personal standpoint informs this perspective. She said that she has lived in the same outer Richmond location since 2011 and during that time, she worked at City College and before the pandemic, she did not have public transit access that allowed her to go from 43rd Avenue to City College in under an hour or without a transfer. She added that she also worked in San Mateo County and had to drive. She said she needed to visit her mother who was terminally ill at the University of California San Francisco (UCSF) Parnassus campus and the hardest times were during her last days before she passed away when she had to find a hospice facility and the closest was in Pacifica. She said she wanted to visit her twice a day from where she lived at 43rd and Geary, so due to her personal experiences she thinks the Great Highway cannot be closed at the moment.

Commissioner Chan also said that she opposes the full opening of the Great Highway. She said she and her son walk their puppy on the Great Highway and enjoy the experience. She said for these reasons, she believes a timed promenade is the best solution for the Great Highway in the immediate term to gather data. She said in the long-term she looks to the staff to monitor and make a recommendation, and she is committed to fighting for funding and resources if needed. She said she started out as a pedestrian in the city and rode public transit and did not own a car until she was almost 30. She said she is not a good cyclist but she does understand that



connectivity from the Bay to the beach through Golden Gate Park and she would like to see that continue. She said she does not think Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Drive should be open to vehicles and they should leave that to Lincoln where they should do some investments. She said she preferred investing in traffic signals and closing MLK Drive to vehicles to minimize car traffic in the park. She said that her recommendation was to adopt an amendment that removes the staff recommendation and keeps all concepts on the table. She said rather than having the Board endorse one concept over another, the city should focus on data gathering for further analysis with all of the concepts proposed. She said that she wanted to be clear that her proposal to remove the recommendations from the report does not remove any of the concepts in the report.

Commissioner Stefani said she had a few questions. She expressed concern about removing the staff recommendation regarding the concepts, and stated that she noted that the report was already public and did not understand why the Board would vote to remove a part of it. She noted that the Board had not agreed with staff on recommendations in the past and that the Board has not ever asked them to remove their recommendations from reports. She said that it would not feel honest to remove the staff recommendations.

Commissioner Stefani continued by saying she wanted to be careful that the vote did not set a bad precedent. She noted that the Board accepted the JFK Drive report recently and that the full Board did not necessarily agree on the specific recommendations. She also asked for clarification on amendment 3 regarding whether the Coastal Commission or Planning Department had jurisdiction over the Great Highway. She said she did not want to vote on something that is not legally correct. She noted that Vice Chair Peskin has expertise with this. She asked if counsel or staff could clarify or ask Coastal Commission staff. She said she wanted to make sure there was an understanding about who had jurisdiction before voting on the report.

Chair Mandelman said he appreciated her point.

Vice Chair Pekin said that Commissioner Stefani is correct. He said he brought up the jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission to make the Board aware of the larger context of the Local Coastal Plan. He said the Coastal Commission has delegated the Coastal Act Authority to the City and County of San Francisco except for certain parts of land by Lake Merced. He said that San Francisco is the only coastal county that has such a small amount of land under direct Coastal Commission jurisdiction. The Planning Department and its Commission could issue a local coastal development permit for this project. He said he was raising a question to ask whether the two-year project would rise to the level of having to issue a permit. He said he can check with Coastal Commission staff, and in any event, under the Coastal Act, anything on the first road closest to the ocean is appealable to the Coastal Commission itself. He said he did not want to add an amendment but wanted to make sure Commissioners were clear on the legal framework.

Commissioner Stefani thanked Vice Chair Peskin for his clarification and said that she wanted to ensure that the Board made an amendment that reflected his comments.

Chair Mandelman said that staff had given the Board an option to make changes to



the report which had been moved and seconded. He said it is within reason to change the report in the manner suggested, but that it is a matter that the Board should discuss.

Commissioner Preston said that he objected to some of the language he heard in public comment from people who were advocating for biking and pedestrian safety. He said these people were advocating for public space in a way that is consistent with their Vision Zero goal. He said reasonable people can disagree, but he rejects the idea that people advocating for these things are a special interest that should be disregarded. He thanked people for calling in tonight and noted that it was an important conversation to have even though the meeting ran late. He said he thinks the Great Highway is a significant part of the city's car-free network, which is why he has advocated for Concept 3. He said he appreciated his colleague's comments and looked forward to further discussion before it comes to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Preston reiterated that the Board was not approving or disapproving a pilot or picking a long-term concept. He noted that the Board was being asked to discuss and potentially adopt a report completed by Transportation Authority staff. He said this does not mean that the Board was formally adopting the reports' recommendations. He said he does share some of the procedural concerns raised by Commissioner Stefani regarding whether the Board should amend out recommendations made by staff. He said that staff prepared a report and shared what they found. He proposed a friendly recommendation to instead add a statement to the resolution to clarify that the report includes recommendations from staff and that the Board is not making any decision between the different options laid out in the report. He said this could preserve the report while making it clear that the Board is not choosing one concept over another. He said he will defer to others and will continue pushing to make the Great Highway part of the car-free network and looks forward to further engagement with colleagues and constituents on the topic.

Commissioner Chan asked to make a point of clarification regarding why she is proposing a motion.

Chair Mandelman said Commissioner Chan could provide her clarification if Vice Chair Peskin and Commissioner Melgar are okay with deferring to her on that.

Vice Chair Peskin said he already spoke to Commissioner Stefani's comments on the Coastal Commission language which does not need to be included in an amendment.

Commissioner Chan said staff had specifically recommended Concepts 3 and 5 but had not studied Concept 2 thoroughly. She said it needs to be clear that the Board wants Concept 2 to be considered for the long-term future.

Commissioner Melgar said she would support either option - either amending the report recommendations or amending the resolution, and she seconded Commissioner Chan's motion. She read to Commissioner Stefani what concerned her in the staff recommendation under section 4.2. She said the report was silent on Concept 2 and if they are adopting the report, it seemed like they were also adopting that stance. She said that it felt like an overreach for staff to say they are not considering Concept 2 in the long-term when there are also other things they need to consider that are not in the report. She said that is why she seconded Commissioner



Chan's motion. She said that she supports whichever option makes it clear that all concepts be considered fully.

Commissioner Stefani thanked Commissioner Melgar and said she wanted it to be on the record that the staff recommendation had been made, the Board was adopting the report, and that some Commissioners disagreed with some of the recommendations in that report. She said she would not vote to remove anything from a report that had already been made public. She said she thinks that the third part of the proposed amendment should be removed and that the first part of the proposed amendment should be clarified as described by Commissioner Melgar.

Chair Mandelman said the Board has a small and large choice to choose from. The smaller choice would determine whether to include the mention of the Coastal Act, an issue raised by Vice Chair Peskin. He said this could be changed via the report itself or via the resolution. He said he they would leave this decision to Commissioner's Chan and Melgar who made and seconded the motion.

Chair Mandelman said the larger choice is whether the Board proceeds to change the report, a change that Commissioner Chan and staff have worked on. He said it does not seem out of line for the Transportation Authority Board to recommend changes to a report that comes from their own body. He said in this case, most of the report is useful and valuable but Commissioner Chan has requested some changes to the recommendations section at the end. Chair Mandelman said another path forward is for the Board to recommend edits to the resolution to clarify the recommendations.

Commissioner Chan said she is comfortable withdrawing her motion and instead working to amend the resolution. She said her changes would be on page 2 in the second clause to the last. She said she would like to strike out that clause in its entirety. She said the next clause would be to insert "Whereas, SFMTA and Recreation and Parks Department will consider all concepts and findings in this report." She said Commissioner Walton's earlier statements about who is using the Great Highway were valid and there are some concerns that usage was not included or discussed in the report. She said Commissioner Melgar has pointed to other items they want staff to monitor, and she would like to insert a clause listing the items they want staff to monitor.

Chair Mandelman clarified with Commissioner Chan what her changes were.

Commissioner Melgar seconded Commissioner Chan's new motion.

Chair Mandelman asked Director Chang if she is following these changes and feels like she can manage them and reflect them in the resolution.

Director Chang confirmed and said she and staff can make these changes.

Chair Mandelman noted that Commissioner Chan was withdrawing her prior motion and making a new motion to amend the resolution as she described. He added that Commissioner Melgar too withdrew her initial motion and made a new second to Commissioner Chan's motion to amend the resolution, which includes a withdrawal of mention of the Coastal Commission.

Commissioner Chan motioned to amend the item to reflect the removal of the



second to last clause and inserting "Whereas, SFMTA and Recreation and Parks Department will consider all Concepts and findings in this report" and inserting an additional clause listing items the Board want staff to monitor, seconded by Commissioner Melgar.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Haney (1)

Commissioner Walton motioned to approve the item as amended, seconded by Commissioner Chan.

The motion was approved without objection by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Chan, Mar, Mandelman, Melgar, Preston, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, and Walton (10)

Absent: Commissioner Haney (1)

12. Overview of Plan Bay Area 2050 - INFORMATION

The item was deferred to the call of the Chair.

13. Streets and Freeways Strategy and Outreach Update - INFORMATION

The item was deferred to the call of the Chair.

Other Items

14. Introduction of New Items - INFORMATION

There were no new items introduced.

15. Public Comment

During public comment a caller stated that she tried to make public comment on Item 11 but ran into technical issues. Clerk of the Transportation Authority, Britney Milton provided the following email address for the caller to follow up: clerk@sfcta.org.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m.