Date : 7/26/2021 11:03:47 PM
From : "William Isham" ishwish00@gmail.com
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Subject : Great Highway

I object strongly to items 5, 8. And 10. BIG GOVERMENT STINKS!

OPEN THE GREAT HIGHWAY!

Date : 7/27/2021 12:53:52 AM
From : "Diane" djanakes@gmail.com
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Subject : Public comment for SFCTA meeting 7/27/21

I object to items 5, 8 and 10.

Diane Janakes-Zasada
737- 46 th ave
SF 94121
415-577-8567
Sent from my iPad

Date : 7/27/2021 7:27:41 AM
From : "Christina Shih" christinashih@comcast.net
To : "recpark.commission@sfgov.org" recpark.commission@sfgov.org, "MTABoard" mtaboard@sfmta.com, "Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org" Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org, "MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org" MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org, "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org" Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "ChanStaff@sfgov.org" ChanStaff@sfgov.org, "Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org" Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org, "Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org" Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, "Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org" Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org, "Dean.Preston@sfgov.org" Dean.Preston@sfgov.org, "Matt.Haney@sfgov.org" Matt.Haney@sfgov.org, "MelgarStaff@sfgov.org" MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, "MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org" MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, "Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org" Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org, "Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org" Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, "Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org" Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org, "info@openthegreathighway.com" info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject : Public Comment for SFCTA meeting 27JUL2021

Dear Supervisors,

Re Agenda item #5: The continued expenditure on money for studies such as the D4 Mobility Study is a misuse of public money. **The results of this group are shoddy and biased.** The original D4 mobility survey re the Great Highway was so mis-represented during pubic presentations. Examples include the failure to point out that the majority (74%) of Richmond district residents wanted the Great Highway kept open to cars whilst touting the 54% supporting closure.Another is the touted 54% of 3700 respondents which represents only 1988 individuals. As of today, the change.org petitions for re-opening has over 10,000 signers. That's roughly five times a many people want the GH open to cars for every one of the D4 mobility survey respondent that supported closure. That study had poor outreach, little publicity, little validated survey methodology. 18,000 cars used the Great Highway at all hours of the day, all days of the week, during all weather. 4,000 people using it for recreation results in long periods of time with nearly zero use (night time, poor weather).

The recommendations coming out thus far have done little to enhance mobility, rather it detracts by causing circuitous routing and narrowing of traffic to create bike lanes which are rarely used and still unsafe. Sometimes changes result in better traffic efficiency, more safety and more recreational opportunities like the Doyle Drive project. Others make things worse like the closure of the Great Highway. Some slow streets may have had beneficial effects but the vast majority that I have encountered do not have enough use to just the continuation of slow streets (21st Ave, Cabrillo, Golden Gateway) The studies re slow streets make laughable conclusions like the Page Street closure had minimal impact on nearby streets. California St has been greatly impacted by the conversion of Lake Street to a slow street. That decision seemed to have ignored the narrowing of California from a four lane street to a two lane street for Muni purposes. Just like the GH closure ignored the two year construction work on 19th Avenue and the slow street

closures in GG Park. All ignore the significant contractions in Muni service (suspended and shortened routes) making public transportation a non-option.

Re Agenda item #8: Now the D4 Mobility Study group is using another poor quality survey to identify and modify 9 corridors in the Sunset for “improvements". 287 respondents done only on-line ignores people unable or unwilling to use on-line surveys - people with limited internet access, people not adept with computers, people whose primary language is not English. So far not impressed with the recommendations of this group.

Re Agenda item #10: How can Vision Zero goals be used as a justification for actions such as the Great Highway closure? You closed a traffic artery with zero pedestrian injuries/deaths for the past 7-8 years and diverted 18,000 cars/day to residential streets. You closed a very safe car artery with timed lights that controlled traffic speed, divided by a wide median that prevented head on collisions, had controlled intersections for pedestrian crossings, had no cross traffic which decreased intersection collisions, and had a physically separate walking route and diverted traffic to streets with none of those safety features. It’s ironic that the only serious pedestrian injury on the GH was after the closure to cars when a bicyclist hit a pedestrian causing serious injuries. I see constructions projects that truly increase safety - like the new Lincoln Blvd which separates bicyclists from cars by the placement of bollards and then stupid decisions like the new approach to north bound 101 in the Presidio that diverts traffic into a parking lot with much greater potential pedestrian/bike/car collisions as users mingle in an uncontrolled fashion. Please stop the stupid decisions.

Date : 7/26/2021 9:11:21 PM
From : "Howard Chabner" hlchabner@comcast.net
To : "recpark.commission@sfgov.org" recpark.commission@sfgov.org, "mtaboard@sfmta.com" mtaboard@sfmta.com, "Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org" Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org, "MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org" MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org, "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org" Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "ChanStaff@sfgov.org" ChanStaff@sfgov.org, "Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org" Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org, "Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org" Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, "Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org" Gordon.Mar@sfgov.org, "Dean.Preston@sfgov.org" Dean.Preston@sfgov.org, "Matt.Haney@sfgov.org" Matt.Haney@sfgov.org, "MelgarStaff@sfgov.org" MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, "MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org" MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org, "Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org" Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org, "Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org" Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org, "Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org" Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org, "info@openthegreathighway.com" info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject : Public Comment for SFCTA meeting July 27, 2021 - disapprove agenda items 5, 8 and 10

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not accept the D4 Mobility Study for the Sunset until the recommendations for the biking-prioritized number of streets is reduced from nine to a reasonable number. D4's statistics reveal that 89% of Sunset residents prefer and need to use their cars for driving alone or carpooling, while only 2.2% of residents ride bikes. Modifying nine streets to prioritize biking does not make sense when bike usage is so low.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for an online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting (some of whom may include the 287), and two meetings with Chinese speakers. This 287 is an inadequate number upon which to base any plans for changing the traffic patterns in a district. Throughout the entire process of closing the UGH and residential streets, the outreach has been abysmal and almost non-existent for a district population of 85,000 people.

In addition, please do not approve Prop K funds for continued studies.

The Upper Great Highway should be opened ASAP.

The petition to reopen it has almost 11,000 signatures – 38 times the number of people who answered the survey.

https://www.change.org/p/residents-of-san-francisco-open-the-great-highway

Closing the upper Great Highway is sheer hypocrisy with respect to Vision Zero. 18,000 to 20,000 cars daily have been diverted onto the streets of the Richmond, and most of all the Sunset. The neighborhood streets have not been designed to handle this volume of traffic.

Read Quentin Kopp's recent piece in the Westside Observer about the Great Highway:

https://westsideobserver.com/news/quentin.html#jul21a

Sincerely

Howard Chabner

Date : 7/27/2021 7:06:55 AM
From : "'Susanne Maruoka' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21 9:30 am

I object to items 5, 8, and 10 to be considered in today's meeting.

To base decisions on surveyed opinions of a sample of 287 people when these decisions impact many thousands more on a daily basis does not reflect a fair democratic process.

Connie Chan, Gordon Mar, and all other supervisors as well as Mayor London Breed are aware of my opinion on this topic. Please listen to the voices of the SF population most impacted by your decision today.

Susanne Maruoka
765 47th Avenue
San Francisco CA

Date : 7/26/2021 9:01:09 PM
From : "'Mike Regan' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, "London.Breed@sfgov.org" mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org, "SFMTA Board" mtaboard@sfmta.com
Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21, 9:30 am

According to SFCTA information, only 2.2% of people ride bikes in the Sunset, while 89% either drive alone or carpool. Yet you continue to push biking at the expense of motorist. Mr. Tumlin continues to push his pet projects on the citizens of SF mainly his affiliation with the SF Bike Coalition. This a blatant conflict of interest and should be looked into.

I am writing to voice my discontent with the way SFMTA is conducting its business and to let you know that I am adamantly opposed to the following items in this agenda.

Item 5

Bicycle Safety Education and Outreach ($220,000) I do not want my tax dollars to continue to fund anything relating to bicycling in SF. If the bike coalition wants to brain wash our citizens let them do it on their dime. They contribute absolutely nothing to the coffers and yet are demanding more.

District 4 Neighborway Network this is just another bicycling initiative to get a pathway for biking. Only 2.2% of the residence in the sunset bike yet you want to spend hundreds of thousands of tax payer dollars to further the bike coalition agenda. (By the way there is not such word as neighborway. Stop making stuff up)

Downtown Congestion Pricing Study - Additional Outreach I again do not want my tax dollars spend on these initiatives. NO CONGESTION PRICING IN SAN FRANCISCO. This will kill the downtown merchants. Your anti car agenda is going to kill downtown and the rest of city. Why would anyone in their right mind come to SF to spend their money. You want to charge congestion pricing, you have taken out the parking, you have made it impossible to drive downtown and yet you think that people will still come here! This is just another way of taxing our residence and it will adversely affect low income people since the only ones that will be able to pay it will be the rich élites that seem to be running this city.

Item 8
D4 Mobility Study: Do not adopt this study as the outreach was dismal at best and once again it is pushing biking on people at the expense of motorist. D4 study outreach/online survey WAS ONLY 287 PEOPLE. All the data, charts, graphs are based on only responses of 287 people! This is in a district of 85,000 people. How can you in good conscience derive any intelligent information from such a dismal outreach? I tell you motorists are really starting to get pissed off at all your actions.

Item 10
Vision Zero SF Action Study: Vision Zero is doing just the opposite of what it is

preaching. Instead of reducing accidents it is enabling them. It should be called ZERO VISION since it can’t see the trees for the forest.

Mike Regan

Date : 7/26/2021 8:30:41 PM
From : "Lois Dress" loisdress@gmail.com
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21, 9:30 am

I object to Items 5, 8 & 10. In the subject of the email

Lois Dress

Date : 7/26/2021 6:50:14 PM
From : "Henry Wong" hwripple1@gmail.com
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21, 9:30 am

Hi SFCTA

I am writing to object to Items 5, 8 & 10.

Sunset Resident.
Henry Wong
hwripple1@gmail.com

Date : 7/26/2021 9:06:29 PM
From : "Kat" meemom@gmail.com
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org" board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, "mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org" mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org
Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21, 9:30 am

According to SFCTA information, only 2.2% of people ride bikes in the Sunset, while 89% either drive alone or carpool. Yet you continue to push biking at the expense of motorist. Mr. Tumlin continues to push his pet projects on the citizens of SF mainly his affiliation with the SF Bike Coalition. This a blatant conflict of interest and should be looked into.

I am writing to voice my discontent with the way SFMTA is conducting its business and to let you know that I am adamantly opposed to the following items in this agenda.

Item 5

Bicycle Safety Education and Outreach ($220,000) I do not want my tax dollars to continue to fund anything relating to bicycling in SF. If the bike coalition wants to brain wash our citizens let them do it on their dime. They contribute absolutely nothing to the coffers and yet are demanding more.

District 4 Neighborway Network this is just another bicycling initiative to get a pathway for biking. Only 2.2% of the residence in the sunset bike yet you want to spend hundreds of thousands of tax payer dollars to further the bike coalition agenda. (By the way there is not such word as neighborway. Stop making stuff up)

Downtown Congestion Pricing Study - Additional Outreach I again do not want my tax dollars spend on these initiatives. NO CONGESTION PRICING IN SAN FRANCISCO. This will kill the downtown merchants. Your anti car agenda is going to kill downtown and the rest of city. Why would anyone in their right mind come to SF to spend their money. You want to charge congestion pricing, you have taken out the parking, you have made it impossible to drive downtown and yet you think that people will still come here! This is just another way of taxing our residence and it will adversely affect low income people since the only ones that will be able to pay it will be the rich élites that seem to be running this city.

Item 8
D4 Mobility Study: Do not adopt this study as the outreach was dismal at best and once again it is pushing biking on people at the expense of motorist. D4 study outreach/online survey WAS ONLY 287 PEOPLE. All the data, charts, graphs are based on only responses of 287 people! This is in a district of 85,000 people. How can you in good conscience derive any intelligent information from such a dismal outreach? I tell you motorists are really starting to get pissed off at all your actions.

Item 10
Vision Zero SF Action Study: Vision Zero is doing just the opposite of what it is

preaching. Instead of reducing accidents it is enabling them. It should be called ZERO VISION since it can't see the trees for the forest.

Kathy Regan

Date : 7/27/2021 6:46:05 AM
From : "'Caitriona Anderson' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Cc : "Mark Anderson" alvarado482@me.com
Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21, 9:30 am.

Hello,

I am a resident of the Outer Richmond. I wish that you recognize my objection to items 5,8 and 10 at today's meeting.
The residents of the Richmond need access to all our roads for the mobility of the entire community.
The city already provides plenty of open spaces for recreation.

Thank you,
Caitriona Anderson.

Date : 7/26/2021 9:03:42 PM
From : "Stephen Gorski" sjgorskilaw@gmail.com
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Cc : "sjgorskilaw@gmail.com" sjgorskilaw@gmail.com
Subject : Public comments: SFCTA Meeting 7/27/2021@9:30 a.m.

Dear SFCTA and Supervisors,

My comments concern opposition to Item # 5 with respect to approving funding to change 9 streets in the Sunset into "Neighborways" or "Neighborway Networks," whatever that's supposed to mean. The project description is unclear. The need for the funds are unclear. The streets should be reopened to exist as they did pre-Pandemic. To do otherwise is unnecessary and too expensive. With only 2% of the 85,000 Sunset citizens using bicycles and 89% driving vehicles, there is excessive focus on creating bicycle lanes that are rarely used.

I also oppose Item #8, the D4 Mobility Study. According to the D4 Mobility Study, the majority of those surveyed travel within the Sunset and between the Sunset and other parts of SF or outside SF by car. If by car is the mode of choice for travel, then **why this effort to close streets to cars**? This would just create more congestion on adjoining streets and reduce pedestrian safety. At the same time, MTA is proposing reducing service.

Lastly, Item #10, Vision Zero, I disagree that our city streets will be safer by closing as many streets to vehicles as possible and deferring huge amounts of funding and changes to accommodate the few bicyclists that are on them. The closure of the Upper Great Highway is a perfect example of how closing a highway created more collisions instead of less, cost more money instead of less, and destroyed an entire neighborhood in the process. Before its closure there were no collisions on the highway in all of 2018, 2019 and 2020, and only 1 collision in 2017. Now there are 18,000-20,000 vehicles with their greenhouse gas emissions in our residential streets, $500,000+ spent on traffic calming that didn't work, it just moved the traffic to a different street, big rigs are taking down phone and power lines in the neighborhood, and our first responders are unnecessarily delayed getting to the beach to help those in trouble and traversing streets filled with speed cushions on the way to hospitals.

These streets need no urgent improvement or more money spent on them to accommodate the 2% of bicyclists that ride on them once in awhile. Open them up like they were before with some people walking safely on sidewalks and some people in vehicles able to drive and park around the neighborhood and near local businesses and their homes.

I fully support the public comments submitted to you today by my neighbor Charles Perkins. In particular, the fact that, "There also has been **no consideration of the negative cumulative impact on our community of obstructing our neighborhood streets at the same time the Upper Great Highway and John F. Kennedy Drive are closed to drivers, 19th Avenue is undergoing a major, multi-year construction project, and public transportation options have been reduced.** Traffic has become overwhelming in our neighborhood by these other events and these added

street closures/obstructions will make traveling within the Sunset District even harder."

Please do not approve funding for a Neighborway Network, please reject the D4 Mobility Study, and if you want to reach your Vision Zero goals, please Open the Great Highway.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen J. Gorski
D4 Resident for 40 years
Voter/Taxpayer
Member of Concerned
Residents of the Sunset

Sent from my iPad

Date : 7/27/2021 6:55:45 AM
From : "Mark Anderson" andersmjsf@gmail.com
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org
Cc : "Caitriona Anderson" caitriona.anderson@icloud.com
Subject : Transportation Authority Board Meeting this morning

Hello,

I am a resident of the Outer Richmond. I wish that you recognize my objection to items 5,8 and 10 at today's meeting.

The residents of the Richmond need access to all our roads for the mobility of the entire community. The city already provides plenty of open spaces for recreation.

While I live in the Outer Richmond, my family and others desperately need access to roads for DRIVING in the Sunset for access to other areas of the city and further south. According to SFCTA, only 2% of people ride bikes in the Sunset while 89% either drive alone or carpool. Please listen to the needs of 89% of people!!

Thank you,

Mark Anderson