

**Date : 7/26/2021 3:02:57 PM**  
**From : "Patricia Wise" pawise52@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : D4 Mobility Study**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Wise  
Lower Great Highway resident and voter

Date : 7/26/2021 1:05:14 PM

From : "Davis Leong" davis\_leong@hotmail.com

To : "Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org" Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org, "London Breed" mayorlondonbreed@sfgov.org, "Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org"

Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org, "Transportation Authority"

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, "Transportation Authority" clerk@sfcta.org

Subject : D4 Mobility Study

Greetings. I'm writing to voice my concern about the goal of the D4 Mobility Study to find "transportation solutions that would increase walking, biking and transit use in the Outer Sunset and Parkside neighborhoods".

The closing streets to traffic for the Family Neighborway Network is a danger that imperils the safety of our streets and our homes – if police, ambulances and fire engines are hampered in getting to the scene of an emergency (which could occur anywhere in the district), then you are putting transportation / recreation as more important than our personal safety. This is not an appropriate endeavor and wastes our taxpayer dollars – our personal safety should be paramount and come before any other initiative.

Dealing with the rampant crime and drug use should be dealt with before we worry about more transportation issues – if we aren't safe walking down the street or waiting for Muni (which we are proposing more of with the shuttle), then what good are all the parks in the world when we can't go out to enjoy what is there. Safety is paramount to all concerns.

The other item that seems so paradoxical is the goal of improving air quality – if you create more congestion on limited roadways (take a look at 19<sup>th</sup> avenue during commute time, on the eastbound approach to the Presidio from 25<sup>th</sup> avenue in the park, on Lincoln Way going eastbound into Kezar Drive), you are creating additional pollutants that result from idling stop and go traffic which is worse than cars moving efficiently.

The transit improvements are fine but one item which is totally ignored is that there is traffic coming from outside San Francisco to the north and to the south that are passing through SF in their cars – they won't be helped by removing roadways to cars and new shuttles. We don't help our neighborhood by creating congestion.

I would certainly hope that the Board of Supervisors fully views the needs of the entire city where personal and public safety are paramount.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**Date : 7/26/2021 12:14:01 PM**  
**From : "Rita" truffletemptations@pacbell.net**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "Patricia Arack" parack@ccsf.edu**  
**Subject : D4 mobility study**

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not accept the D4 Mobility Study for the Sunset until the recommendations for the biking prioritized streets- is further studied for its impact on small businesses. 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 extremely low. I am making an assumption that this will do away with more parking to accommodate biking lanes. No where in this study do I see the impact on small businesses that depend on close by parking for their customers. I for one will go to Stonestown or other malls that have EASY ACCESS, FREE and CONVENIENT PARKING instead of patronizing the small businesses of the Sunset.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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. You continue to ignore the 10,000 signers of a petition to reopen the Great Highway while catering to a small group of bike riders.

Do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the West Side of SF are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time for those of us who live and work on the West Side of SF be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,  
Rita Hock  
District 7

**Date : 7/26/2021 4:15:41 PM**  
**From : "Catherine Wenzler" acwenzler@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : D4 mobility study**

Hello,

To be honest you guys should be ashamed of yourselves. The study is been manipulated and does not really look at the issue. All these close streets hurt this neighborhood and for you guys to keep pushing this through is disgusting.

I don't know who it trying to keep their jobs by coming up with insane ideas, but fire them. Open the roads. No more slow streets. No one is on them period.

Thank you,

Catherine Masterson

Sent from my iPhone

**Date : 7/26/2021 7:37:39 PM**  
**From : "S Garrett" shigar16@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : District 4 Mobility Study Final Report SFCTA Mtg 7/27/2021**

As a resident of District 4, I would like to express my disapproval of any type of closure/change to the Upper Great Highway. The Great Hwy is a needed thoroughfare that takes unnecessary traffic from the residential streets of District 4.

We were told the Great Hwy was going to be temporarily closed for the sole purpose of providing safe distancing during the Covid 19 pandemic. With the ending of the pandemic, as a resident of the Lower Great Hwy, I feel it is time to fully open the Great Hwy. The obstructions of roads along both Sloat and Lincoln has created many unnecessary barriers for those living within the 2 mile stretch between 46th Ave and Lower Great Highway. If you are driving south from the Richmond District, you cannot make a right turn between Lower Great Hwy and 46th Ave. (we are forced to go several blocks out of our way to get to the Lower Great Hwy and in between) The residents along 46th Avenue are overwhelmed with being the first right hand turn. For those traveling north on 46th Ave, it is horrific trying to turn left onto Lincoln. Even Muni buses have difficulty making that left turn. I don't understand why a 3 way stop sign is not there for the safety of everyone (pedestrians, bikers and drivers). Also, 45th and Sloat is a very dangerous intersection. Too many close calls have been seen with no lane designated for turning as well as an obstructed view.

I can attest under oath that the usage of the Upper Great Hwy has decreased dramatically since early this year. It is a shame that residents are subject to vehicles winding through our streets where they make our streets less safe.

I feel our transportation system needs to be better implemented (reliability and safety are of grave concern) before any street changes are implemented. We need our vehicles out on the western part of the city. As a senior, I cannot bike to the store to get groceries. I refuse to walk alone on the streets or ride our buses as the fear of being attacked is of great concern.

There are a multitude of reasons for reopening the Great Hwy, and I have written numerous emails and made calls into various meetings and representatives expressing my concerns, but I feel my voice as well as many, many affected residents is not being heard. So much needs to be studied before any permanent changes are made. The survey you keep promoting was done without a true representation of the residents of both the Sunset and Richmond Districts. We are directly affected by your changes. Until you do a better outreach, please stop this process.

Thank you for your time,  
S Garrett  
Sunset District Resident

Sent from my iPad

**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 GOVERNMENT STINKS!

OPEN THE GREAT HIGHWAY!

**Date : 7/25/2021 9:29:14 PM**  
**From : "Craig Hanson" fishingcraig@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Open the Great Highway and GGP**

Dear Supervisors: You must reject the D4 Mobility Study and the plans for the Neighborway project regarding improvements in travel within the Sunset. If one reads the fine print in the study, it is clear that once again, as in the UGH D4 report, D4 Mobility Study has created fancy tables, graphs, and statistics that are incomplete and bike-centric and based on non-scientific samples of respondents which are extremely small.

- 1. The survey upon which all the graphs and stats are based on is an unscientific sample of ONLY 287 RESPONDENTS**, plus an online meeting of only 175 people May 23, and 2 meetings with Chinese speakers. There are 85,000 residents of the Sunset, and you are going to approve of change in the streets of the Sunset based on 287 people? I don't recall ever seeing any survey invitation, nor did anyone I know. Also, you are going to approve \$274,600 for further study of the Neighborway on a sample survey of 287 people? For a project that will ultimately cost over a million dollars? What method did D4 use to reach this extremely small sample? When was the survey conducted, from what date to what date? Where is the transparency? You have no idea what the residents of the Sunset want. This is our district. We are the People, and we are being ignored time and time again. There must be an online survey that reaches more than 287 people, and a mailed survey to all 85,000 people for our needs and wants to be known. This should be required.
- 2. The Neighborway prioritizes for bike riders nine (9) streets throughout the Sunset, too many.** Some of them are very important streets for getting around the Sunset by car, like Kirkham, Vicente, and 41<sup>st</sup> Ave. Have you asked the actual neighbors who will be affected about the "Neighborway?" D4 Mobility has not, other than a survey of 287 people, a zoom meeting, and 2 focus groups with Chinese speakers. Modifying nine streets that cover the entire sunset to prioritize biking is an excessive number based on what can only be described as incomplete statistical figures which are meaningless because of the ridiculously small samples. **The number of streets giving priority to bikes should be half of the number now proposed.**
- 3. The D4 Study ignores how the residents of the Sunset choose and/or need to travel.** On the D4 chart about existing mode share, "2.District 4 Transportation Needs" page 10, and even only based on the 287 respondents, **THE MESSAGE IS CLEAR:** Driving within D4, to the Richmond, or to San Mateo County, is the preferred, needed, and chosen mode of transportation. Only an average of 2.2% of the respondents ride bikes, but 89% choose to either drive alone or carpool. D4's own statistics show that driving is the necessary and chosen mode, yet this is ignored to create more bicycle paths for only 2.2% of the population. This makes no sense. The conclusions of this study are designed to encourage bike riding,

but even the tiny sample D4 Mobility Study managed to analyze shows that people prefer to use their cars to get around this vast district, and the use of bikes is tiny. Will modifying 9 streets be necessary for biking? I think not. D4's own findings about car use indicate that 9 streets are too many and too expensive.

**In conclusion, we demand that our supervisor, CTA, MTA, RPD all STOP the paternalistic treatment of the Sunset residents.** We are fed up with city employees, paid by our tax monies, deciding "what is best" for the voting and tax-paying members of this district and other districts who also have had little voice in these decisions. The Upper Great Highway closure and the Slow Street closures both are unwanted by many and unnecessary and have made life in the Sunset and Richmond more unsafe, difficult, and unpleasant.

True, we need to get serious about climate change NOW. We need to get rid of fossil fueled cars and get electric ones. For our health we need to walk more, and if able, ride a bike for recreation. Bike riders need to feel safe and need protected lanes on an adequate number of streets, but nine modified streets are excessive. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary changes

In general, the push to get us out of our cars in a vast district like the Sunset is unrealistic and illogical. We can't go about our work and family lives on foot or on a bicycle! You cannot and will not force people to give up their cars, no matter what you think is "best for us." Will you all please stop this magical thinking that we are all going to ride non-existent bus routes or ride a bike to 450 Sutter for a dentist appointment? Please live in reality, not fantasy.. I for one have **NEVER** seen anyone "recreating" on Kirkham, closed as a Slow Street in 16 months. Others report the same "non-sightings" of recreational users on other Slow Streets. People don't want or need them! Please open the Slow Streets now, while adjacent streets must bear the increased traffic from the closed streets which makes them more unsafe to both pedestrians and bike-riders both. Also open the Great Highway now. It is underutilized as a recreation space, especially during the week. Keeping it closed is in direct opposition to the Vision Zero project because of the increased cars in the Sunset and the Richmond creating dangerous intersections. It is unsafe for thousands of residents and commuters to keep the UGH closed. Open it now.

The Neighborway concept is an improvement to the Slow Streets complete closures (which nobody uses), as long as cars will be also allowed on these streets, but the number of streets to be prioritized for biking is excessive. Please do not accept the recommendation and the Prop K funding for the Neighborway streets until outreach has reached a reasonable number of the residents and changes are made. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary and misguided changes.



Thank you,  
Craig Hanson  
4th Generation SF  
SF Business Owner

**Date : 7/26/2021 12:51:33 PM**  
**From : "Diane Garfield" diangarf@sfsu.edu**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Opening the Upper Great Highway comments**

Supervisors:

Please do not accept the D4 Mobility Study for the Sunset:

- The number of closed streets need to be reduced (or eliminated)
- Most residents (89%) need to use their cars
- Only 2.2% bike
- Too many automobiles squeezed onto fewer streets
- Low number of survey respondents (287) which is not enough to make permanent changes that affect thousands of residents
- Do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds. We KNOW the streets are congested. We KNOW the traffic 'calming' measures are not helping
- Please do not ignore the concerns of the majority of residents. The bike coalition is simply louder and more well organized. Please listen to the people.
- Lastly, OPEN THE UPPER GREAT HIGHWAY.

Thank you,  
Diane Garfield  
1562 45<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94122

**Date : 7/26/2021 2:09:17 PM**  
**From : "aeboken" aeboken@gmail.com**  
**To : "BOS-Supervisors" bos-supervisors@sfgov.org, "BOS-Legislative Aides" bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org, "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "Edward Wright" edward.w.wright@sfgov.org**  
**Subject : OPPOSING SFCTA Agenda Item #8 Adopt District 4 Mobility Study Report**

TO: SFCTA Board members

I am urging the SFCTA Board to reject the District 4 Mobility Study Report in its current iteration.

I also question why funding for the District 4 Neighborway Network is being approved with item #5 on the SFCTA agenda of July 27, 2021 \*before\* the District 4 Mobility Study Report is approved with item #8 on the same agenda.

The District 4 Mobility Study has been widely criticized for having a number of basic flaws.

The surveys had an extremely limited response.

There were only 287 respondents to the online survey. There were only 175 attendees on the virtual town hall.

The survey results don't correlate with the demographics of the neighborhood. A large percentage of the respondents don't even live in the neighborhood.

The SFCTA needs to conduct surveys with boots on the ground once the economy has fully reopened and schools have resumed in-person learning.

Eileen Boken

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods\*

\* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

**Date : 7/26/2021 12:39:33 PM**  
**From : "Lauraine Edir" laurainemarie@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Please reopen the Great Highway**

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 extremely low.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

Lauraine Edir

**Date : 7/27/2021 6:19:37 AM**  
**From : "Jennifer Drennan" jdrennan@jeffersonesd.org**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Board Meeting**

**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 extremely low. And we have no idea what the Neighborway plans are, what the streets will look like, how many parking spaces will be lost.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

**Sincerely,**  
Jennifer Drennan  
Essential school employee  
Sunset resident  
Sunset parent

Typoed from my iPhone

**Date : 7/27/2021 6:16:09 AM**  
**From : "'J Drennan' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Board Meeting**

**Dear Supervisors:**

I'm writing today because I feel it is important for the upper Great Highway to be reopened. The reasons for the closure no longer fully apply.

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 extremely low. And we have no idea what the Neighborway plans are, what the streets will look like, how many parking spaces will be lost. Mine is one of the families who finds a car necessary for getting to work based upon where we live and how time consuming and convoluted the public transit options are. Quite frankly I don't feel particularly safe on my bike when we ride for leisure, nor is it a viable commute or grocery shopping transportation option.

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, 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. I haven't received surveys.

In addition, please do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Drennan  
2646 Vicente St. 94116

Typoed from my iPhone

**Date : 7/27/2021 2:59:53 AM**  
**From : "Stephanie Teel" stephanieteelmusic@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Board Meeting**

D4 Mobility Study

Of all the studies done that show single driver use in the Sunset, have any shown what contents are being transported in those cars? Has it ever occurred to anyone that people use their cars solo to carry groceries, sports equipment, work supplies, medical equipment, heavy bags of potting soil, etc. There are some residents that have medical problems and can't walk far or ride a bike. I for one have to carry heavy sound equipment to each of my jobs. Not something I can carry on a bicycle. And when I do ride my bike up Sloat Blvd. to do errands, I am the only bicyclist I ever see on that road. A street that was previously reconfigured to accommodate the bicycles that don't use it.

A lot of time and money continues to be wasted on useless studies that are supposedly making the City streets safer and less polluted. It's obvious to the Sunset residents that with the UGH closure that cars are driving several blocks out of their way to get to where they live as others are ignoring the the no left and no right turns signs. **SHARE THE ROAD** and open the UGH NOW. Bring back peace to the neighborhood.

Stephanie Teel



**Date : 7/26/2021 10:16:48 PM**  
**From : "Cindy Hayward" cindyhayward@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Board Meeting**

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 extremely low. And we have no idea what the Neighborway plans are, what the streets will look like, how many parking spaces will be lost.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

Cindy Hayward  
30 year Sunset resident  
15 year Sunset merchant

--

**Date : 7/26/2021 8:27:19 PM**  
**From : "Matt Ciganek" mattc@vanguardsf.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Board Meeting**

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 extremely low. And we have no idea what the Neighborway plans are, what the streets will look like, how many parking spaces will be lost.

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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

Matt Ciganek 2064 Great Highway Resident!!!!

**Date : 7/27/2021 7:26:12 AM**  
**From : "Mark V" markvarney@hotmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Board Meeting PLEASE OPEN THE GREAT HIGHWAY**

Dear Supervisors:

It is time to re-open the Great Highway. The closing of the Great Highway has hugely inconvenienced the residents of the Sunset and Richmond Districts who need to commute or otherwise traverse the western part of the city in a north/south directions. It has changed the character of the Sunset (for the worse), and has resulted in Unsafe Streets throughout the Sunset. With the blockades on Sloat and Lincoln, the many closed streets throughout the Sunset, and the construction on 19th Avenue, the whole area has become a traffic nightmare. The Great Highway is an important through fare whose reopening would relieve the traffic congestion and result in a safer Sunset District. There have always been multiple recreation alternatives in the Sunset and there is no need to keep the Great Highway closed. We have the beach, the biking and walking trails on either side of the Great Highway, and the GG Park, not to mention the many streets that are now closed to through traffic. The Great Highway should be reopened at once and the D4 Mobility Study should be rejected.

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 extremely low. And we have no idea what the Neighborway plans are, what the streets will look like, how many parking spaces will be lost.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a

zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely, Mark

**Date : 7/27/2021 7:08:30 AM**  
**From : "John Wonder" jdwonder67@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Board Meeting**

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 extremely low. And we have no idea what the Neighborway plans are, what the streets will look like, how many parking spaces will be lost.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

John Wonder  
Sunset parent  
Sunset native

**Date : 7/25/2021 11:23:50 PM**  
**From : "Michael" mhyoung510@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Meeting**

Dear Supervisors:

You must reject the D4 Mobility Study and the plans for the Neighborway project regarding improvements in travel within the Sunset. If one reads the fine print in the study, it is clear that once again, as in the UGH D4 report, D4 Mobility Study has created fancy tables, graphs, and statistics that are incomplete and bike-centric and based on non-scientific samples of respondents which are extremely small.

**1. The survey upon which all the graphs and stats are based on is an unscientific sample of ONLY 287 RESPONDENTS**, plus an online meeting of only 175 people May 23, and 2 meetings with Chinese speakers. There are 85,000 residents of the Sunset, and you are going to approve of change in the streets of the Sunset based on 287 people? I don't recall ever seeing any survey invitation, nor did anyone I know. Also, you are going to approve \$274,600 for further study of the Neighborway on a sample survey of 287 people? For a project that will ultimately cost over a million dollars? What method did D4 use to reach this extremely small sample? When was the survey conducted, from what date to what date? Where is the transparency? You have no idea what the residents of the Sunset want. This is our district. We are the People, and we are being ignored time and time again. There must be an online survey that reaches more than 287 people, and a mailed survey to all 85,000 people for our needs and wants to be known. This should be required.

**2. The Neighborway prioritizes for bike riders nine (9) streets throughout the Sunset, too many.** Some of them are very important streets for getting around the Sunset by car, like Kirkham, Vicente, and 41<sup>st</sup> Ave. Have you asked the actual neighbors who will be affected about the "Neighborway?" D4 Mobility has not, other than a survey of 287 people, a zoom meeting, and 2 focus groups with Chinese speakers. Modifying nine streets that cover the entire sunset to prioritize biking is an excessive number based on what can only be described as incomplete statistical figures which are meaningless because of the ridiculously small samples. **The number of streets giving priority to bikes should be half of the number now proposed.**

**3. The D4 Study ignores how the residents of the Sunset choose and/or need to travel.** On the D4 chart about existing mode share, "2.District 4 Transportation Needs" page 10, and even only based on the 287 respondents, **THE MESSAGE IS CLEAR:** Driving within D4, to the Richmond, or to San Mateo County, is the preferred, needed, and chosen mode of transportation. Only an average of 2.2% of the respondents ride bikes, but 89% choose to either drive alone or carpool. D4's own statistics show that driving is the necessary and chosen mode, yet this is ignored to create more bicycle paths for only 2.2% of the

population. This makes no sense. The conclusions of this study are designed to encourage bike riding, but even the tiny sample D4 Mobility Study managed to analyze shows that people prefer to use their cars to get around this vast district, and the use of bikes is tiny. Will modifying 9 streets be necessary for biking? I think not. D4's own findings about car use indicate that 9 streets are too many and too expensive.

**In conclusion, we demand that our supervisor, CTA, MTA, RPD all STOP the paternalistic treatment of the Sunset residents.** We are fed up with city employees, paid by our tax monies, deciding "what is best" for the voting and tax-paying members of this district and other districts who also have had little voice in these decisions. The Upper Great Highway closure and the Slow Street closures both are unwanted by many and unnecessary and have made life in the Sunset and Richmond more unsafe, difficult, and unpleasant.

True, we need to get serious about climate change NOW. We need to get rid of fossil fueled cars and get electric ones. For our health we need to walk more, and if able, ride a bike for recreation. Bike riders need to feel safe and need protected lanes on an adequate number of streets, but nine modified streets are excessive. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary changes

In general, the push to get us out of our cars in a vast district like the Sunset is unrealistic and illogical. We can't go about our work and family lives on foot or on a bicycle! You cannot and will not force people to give up their cars, no matter what you think is "best for us." Will you all please stop this magical thinking that we are all going to ride non-existent bus routes or ride a bike to 450 Sutter for a dentist appointment? Please live in reality, not fantasy.. I for one have **NEVER** seen anyone "recreating" on Kirkham, closed as a Slow Street in 16 months. Others report the same "non-sightings" of recreational users on other Slow Streets. People don't want or need them! Please open the Slow Streets now, while adjacent streets must bear the increased traffic from the closed streets which makes them more unsafe to both pedestrians and bike-riders both. Also open the Great Highway now. It is underutilized as a recreation space, especially during the week. Keeping it closed is in direct opposition to the Vision Zero project because of the increased cars in the Sunset and the Richmond creating dangerous intersections. It is unsafe for thousands of residents and commuters to keep the UGH closed. Open it now.

The Neighborway concept is an improvement to the Slow Streets complete closures (which nobody uses), as long as cars will be also allowed on these streets, but the number of streets to be prioritized for biking is excessive. Please do not accept the recommendation and the Prop K funding for the Neighborway streets until outreach has reached a reasonable number of the residents and changes are made. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary and misguided changes. Thank you.

Michael Young



**Date : 7/25/2021 11:05:01 PM**  
**From : "bird paradise" birdofparadise567@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public comment for July 27 SFCTA meeting**

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 extremely low.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely

Linda Chan  
Concerned residents of the Sunset

**Date : 7/25/2021 6:33:44 PM**  
**From : "Patricia Arack" parack@ccsf.edu**  
**To : "Transportation Authority" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Meeting**

July 27, 2021

Dear Supervisors: You must reject the D4 Mobility Study and the plans for the Neighborway project regarding improvements in travel within the Sunset. If one reads the fine print in the study, it is clear that once again, as in the UGH D4 report, D4 Mobility Study has created fancy tables, graphs, and statistics that are incomplete and bike-centric and based on non-scientific samples of respondents which are extremely small.

- 1. The survey upon which all the graphs and stats are based on is an unscientific sample of ONLY 287 RESPONDENTS**, plus an online meeting of only 175 people May 23, and 2 meetings with Chinese speakers. There are 85,000 residents of the Sunset, and you are going to approve of change in the streets of the Sunset based on 287 people? I don't recall ever seeing any survey invitation, nor did anyone I know. Also, you are going to approve \$274,600 for further study of the Neighborway on a sample survey of 287 people? For a project that will ultimately cost over a million dollars? What method did D4 use to reach this extremely small sample? When was the survey conducted, from what date to what date? Where is the transparency? You have no idea what the residents of the Sunset want. This is our district. We are the People, and we are being ignored time and time again. There must be an online survey that reaches more than 287 people, and a mailed survey to all 85,000 people for our needs and wants to be known. This should be required.
- 2. The Neighborway prioritizes for bike riders nine (9) streets throughout the Sunset, too many.** Some of them are very important streets for getting around the Sunset by car, like Kirkham, Vicente, and 41<sup>st</sup> Ave. Have you asked the actual neighbors who will be affected about the "Neighborway?" D4 Mobility has not, other than a survey of 287 people, a zoom meeting, and 2 focus groups with Chinese speakers. Modifying nine streets that cover the entire sunset to prioritize biking is an excessive number based on what can only be described as incomplete statistical figures which are meaningless because of the ridiculously small samples. **The number of streets giving priority to bikes should be half of the number now proposed.**
- 3. The D4 Study ignores how the residents of the Sunset choose and/or need to travel.** On the D4 chart about existing mode share, "2. District 4 Transportation Needs" page 10, and even only based on the 287 respondents, **THE MESSAGE IS CLEAR:** Driving within D4, to the Richmond, or to San Mateo County, is the preferred, needed, and chosen mode of transportation. Only an average of 2.2% of the respondents ride bikes, but 89% choose to either drive alone or carpool. D4's own statistics show that driving is the necessary and chosen mode, yet this is ignored to

create more bicycle paths for only 2.2% of the population. This makes no sense. The conclusions of this study are designed to encourage bike riding, but even the tiny sample D4 Mobility Study managed to analyze shows that people prefer to use their cars to get around this vast district, and the use of bikes is tiny. Will modifying 9 streets be necessary for biking? I think not. D4's own findings about car use indicate that 9 streets are too many and too expensive.

**In conclusion, we demand that our supervisor, CTA, MTA, RPD all STOP the paternalistic treatment of the Sunset residents.** We are fed up with city employees, paid by our tax monies, deciding "what is best" for the voting and tax-paying members of this district and other districts who also have had little voice in these decisions. The Upper Great Highway closure and the Slow Street closures both are unwanted by many and unnecessary and have made life in the Sunset and Richmond more unsafe, difficult, and unpleasant.

True, we need to get serious about climate change NOW. We need to get rid of fossil fueled cars and get electric ones. For our health we need to walk more, and if able, ride a bike for recreation. Bike riders need to feel safe and need protected lanes on an adequate number of streets, but nine modified streets are excessive. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary changes

In general, the push to get us out of our cars in a vast district like the Sunset is unrealistic and illogical. We can't go about our work and family lives on foot or on a bicycle! You cannot and will not force people to give up their cars, no matter what you think is "best for us." Will you all please stop this magical thinking that we are all going to ride non-existent bus routes or ride a bike to 450 Sutter for a dentist appointment? Please live in reality, not fantasy.. I for one have **NEVER** seen anyone "recreating" on Kirkham, closed as a Slow Street in 16 months. Others report the same "non-sightings" of recreational users on other Slow Streets. People don't want or need them! Please open the Slow Streets now, while adjacent streets must bear the increased traffic from the closed streets which makes them more unsafe to both pedestrians and bike-riders both. Also open the Great Highway now. It is underutilized as a recreation space, especially during the week. Keeping it closed is in direct opposition to the Vision Zero project because of the increased cars in the Sunset and the Richmond creating dangerous intersections. It is unsafe for thousands of residents and commuters to keep the UGH closed. Open it now.

The Neighborway concept is an improvement to the Slow Streets complete closures (which nobody uses), as long as cars will be also allowed on these streets, but the number of streets to be prioritized for biking is excessive. Please do not accept the recommendation and the Prop K funding for the Neighborway streets until outreach has reached a reasonable number of the residents and changes are made. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast

district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary and misguided changes. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia Arack, Admin.  
Concerned Residents of the Sunset  
Member, Open the Great Highway Alliance  
Member, Senior and Disability Action  
Retired Faculty, City College of San Francisco

Patricia Arack

**Date : 7/26/2021 12:50:58 PM**  
**From : "'Michael Chan' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**To : "Transportation Authority" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public comment for July 27 SFCTA meeting**

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 extremely low.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

Michael Chan  
Resident of Sunset District

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**Date : 7/26/2021 1:05:55 PM**  
**From : "'elizabeth rutzick' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for July 27th SFCTA meeting**

Dear Supervisors -

i am a 76 year old resident of the Sunset District. I grew up in the Sunset District and have lived here most of my life.

My husband and i have lived in the same house in the Outer Sunset since 1973. Our son grew up in the house we still live in.

As you can read, our roots in this district are deep.

I am writing to give my support in asking you to REJECT the D4 Mobility Study and the plans for the Neighborway project regarding improvements in travel in the Sunset district.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Rutzick

**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 7:35:41 AM**

**From : "'Daniel Nunes' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org**

**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 27JUL2021**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.  
Daniel Nunes  
Outer Richmond



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 public 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](https://www.change.org) petitions for re-opening has over 10,000 signers. That's roughly five times as 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 justify 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 : 7/27/2021 7:27:24 AM**

**From : "Marc Rabideau" marcrobideau@gmail.com**

**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 27JUL2021**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

**Date : 7/27/2021 7:19:00 AM**

**From : "Marc Rabideau" marcrabideau@gmail.com**

**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 27JUL2021**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

**Date : 7/27/2021 12:36:08 AM**  
**From : "zrants" zrants@gmail.com**  
**To : "Board of Supervisors" board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org**  
**Cc : "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" Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org,**  
**"Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org" Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org,**  
**"recpark.commission@sfgov.org" recpark.commission@sfgov.org, "Ginsburg**  
**Phil" Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org, "Breed London"**  
**MayorLondonBreed@sfgov.org, "MTABoard" mtaboard@sfmta.com,**  
**"recpark.commission@sfgov.org" recpark.commission@sfgov.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for SFCTA meeting 27JUL2021**

July 27,2021

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not accept the D4 Mobility Study for the Sunset. The team behind the D4 Mobility Study continues to publish results that are based, inaccurate, flawed studies, limited surveys, and analysis.

The D4 Mobility Report team uses random biased sampling of public opinions and statements. The D4 Mobility team appears to be purposely opaque about their methods and unresponsive to public requests for documents describing their methodology.

In spite of the fact that SFMTA is failing to achieve its Vision Zero goals, they continue to propose more projects based on failed policies. In a time when there is a demand for increased Muni service, the SFMTA prefers to spend money they claim they don't have on meaningless non-Muni related projects while ignoring the resounding request to return the lines to former levels of service and quit trying to fix the system.

A major case in point is the mess that was made to "improve" the rail system that forces riders to get off at 16th and Church to change trains by crossing a couple of wide streets. SFMTA is creating congestion and angering drivers and Muni riders by closing streets and removing parking.

Closing the Upper Great Highway to motor vehicles has created new safety concerns in an area where few accidents occurred prior to the closure. SFMTA is spending millions of dollars that could go to re-opening Muni on meaningless road bumps and other street obstacles.

Please do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies. The D4 Mobility team is not credible because they have no research integrity and continue to make recommendations untethered to reality and without public engagement. They ignore suggestions from the folks who are affected by their recommendations.

Mari Eliza  
concerned citizen

cc: Mayor and other city officials

Date : 7/27/2021 12:28:47 AM

From : "'corinne3jr' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org

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 27JUL2021

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

Corinne Charlton Barbour

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

**Date : 7/26/2021 10:41:23 PM**  
**From : "Julie" jnokeefe@gmail.com**  
**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 27JUL2021**

Dear Supervisors:<BR><BR>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 extremely low.<BR><BR>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, 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. <BR><BR>In addition, please do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.<BR><BR>Thank you.<BR>

Sent from my iPhone

**Date : 7/26/2021 9:05:46 PM**

**From : "warren trinidad" warrentrinidad@hotmail.com**

**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 27JUL2021**

Dear Supervisors:<BR><BR>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 extremely low.<BR><BR>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, 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. <BR><BR>In addition, please do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.<BR><BR>Thank you.<BR>

Sent from my iPhone



Date : 7/26/2021 9:02:36 PM

From : "nancy murphy" nancy\_murphy@hotmail.com

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 27JUL2021

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

Nancy Taforo Murphy

129 Escolta Way SF94116

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

Date : 7/26/2021 8:38:11 PM

From : "'Trinh Vinh thai' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org

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 27JUL2021

Dear Supervisors:<BR><BR>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 extremely low.<BR><BR>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, 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. <BR><BR>In addition, please do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.<BR><BR>Thank you.<BR>

Được gửi từ iPhone của tôi

**Date : 7/26/2021 8:25:07 PM**

**From : "Sherrie Rosenberg" sherrie.rosenberg@gmail.com**

**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 (BOS)" ChanStaff@sfgov.org, "Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org"  
Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org, "Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org"  
Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org, "Mar Gordon (BOS)" 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:

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Open up the Great Highway to cars so fewer cars travel through neighborhood streets increasing pollution and the possibilities of people getting hurt. Those of us who are seniors or disabled need ways to get around that are not walking or riding bicycles. So do families with children. So do commuters and tourists. Please restore MUNI lines and bring back the highway for cars.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sherrie Rosenberg

**Date : 7/26/2021 8:17:08 PM**

**From : "James Mazza" jmazza@gmail.com**

**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 27JUL2021**

Dear Supervisors:

I am a homeowner and resident of the Outer Sunset and the continued prolonged closure to through traffic on the most heavily used artery in our neighborhood is leading to more frustrated drivers on the road. I see it every single day. Today, at 5:30pm I was almost struck by a vehicle at the intersection of Lincoln and La Playa while attempting to cross the street in the crosswalk as a driver failed to stop at the intersection. I see drivers run this stop several times a day. Yesterday there was an accident involving 2 cars at this intersection. I asked one of affected drivers if the upper Great Hwy was open would he be driving up Lincoln. He said "no" he would've driven the Hwy. These stats are going unaccounted for. I constantly watch vehicles turn off Lincoln onto 48th Ave where there are 3 signs posted noting no turns off Lincoln and cones bolted into the street, but people do it all day anyways.

The really issue is that the Upper Great Hwy needs to re-open as residents were told it would. If you need to study more to figure things out, you may do so with it OPEN not closed. The whack-a-mole "calming" measures and inadequate surveys aren't addressing the problem. Broader reach to affected individuals needs to happen. Who is actually surveying the affected commuters? Of course a city-wide survey asking people if they want more park space is going to garner support for permanent closure of Upper Great Hwy! The surveys are completely biased. Safety is being ignored and the homeowners are not being considered.

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other

districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

James Mazza

Sent from my iPhone

**Date : 7/26/2021 8:04:31 PM**

**From : "Dennis Dybeck" dennisdybeck@sbcglobal.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 27JUL2021**

Dear Supervisors:<BR><BR>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 extremely low.<BR><BR>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, 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. <BR><BR>In addition, please do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.<BR><BR>Thank you.<BR>

Sent from my iPhone

Date : 7/26/2021 7:39:45 PM

From : "Mark Weinberger" msweinberger@hotmail.com

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 27JUL2021

Dear Supervisors:

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Mark S. Weinberger  
391 28th Avenue  
SF, CA 94121-1867



**Date : 7/26/2021 7:20:34 PM**

**From : "Peter Pirolli" peter.pirolli@gmail.com**

**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,  
"Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org" Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org, "Open the Great Highway"  
info@openthegreathighway.com**

**Cc : "Patricia Arack" parack@ccsf.edu, "Peter Pirolli"  
peter.pirolli@gmail.com**

**Subject : Public Comment for SFCTA meeting 27JUL2021**

Dear Supervisors:

Please do not accept the D4 Mobility Study for the Sunset. The team behind the D4 Mobility Study continues to publish results that are based on flawed methods, such as biased non-representative, and under-powered surveys, and then propose recommendations that are consequently untethered to any science or engineering.

Other public comments will complain about the small sample size (N = 287) used in the D4 survey, but my chief complaint is that the D4 Mobility Report team continues to obfuscate the sampling/recruitment methods used for their surveys. They are not described in the Report or the associated Appendices. Did they use random-address based sampling? Did they use a commercial panel service to get a sample? Did they recruit people on the street, at bus stops? Or did they just blast an email out to a convenient email list? What is troublesome is that the D4 Mobility team appears to be purposely opaque about their methods and unresponsive to requests to describe the methods in sufficient (i.e., replicable) ways.

In addition, SFMTA is failing to achieve Vision Zero goals, and should not continue to propose one poorly researched project after another and claim that the projects are somehow improving safety. The SFMTA track record shows that they do not know how to achieve Vision Zero, and letting them continue is just throwing good money after bad, and adding more unnecessary deaths to the tally. The annual fatality rates for San Francisco have not budged from pre-Vision Zero averages. SFMTA, according to their own SF-CHAMP models and field data, is creating congestion. The closure of the Upper Great Highway is creating reasonable safety concerns and pollution concerns that are well documented in the public commentary on their reports.. SFMTA is squandering Prop K money that was meant to improve transit in the city, and is failing.

Please do not approve the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies. The D4 Mobility team is not credible because they have no research integrity and continue to make recommendations untethered to reality and without proper engagement and assessment of the folks who are affected by their recommendations.

Peter Pirolli  
District 4 Resident

**Date : 7/26/2021 7:07:46 PM**  
**From : "Rob Brodman" rob@robbrodman.com**  
**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 27JUL2021**

Dear Supervisors:

This is absurd. You are taking advantage of a world wide economic shutdown pandemic, to push your zero cars agenda?

I find that authoritarian and dictatorial. Hand picking the bike collation members to base your reports on seems pretty disingenuous. Why not do a door to door study?

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

---

Rob Brodman  
415.317.1379  
[www.robbrodman.com](http://www.robbrodman.com)

**Date : 7/26/2021 7:04:30 PM**  
**From : "Doug McKirahan" ratt57@pacbell.net**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "ChanStaff (BOS)"  
chanstaff@sfgov.org, "board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org"  
board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org, "Aaron.peskin@sfgov.org"  
Aaron.peskin@sfgov.org, "hillary.ronen@sfgov.org" hillary.ronen@sfgov.org,  
"melgarstaff@sfgov.org" melgarstaff@sfgov.org**  
**Subject : Public Comment for SFCTA meeting 27JUL2021**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

I particularly object to items 5, 8 and 10 in this complete scam of a report. How long are the lies and exaggerations going to be allowed to continue?

Thank you.

Doug McKirahan

**Date : 7/26/2021 7:03:06 PM**  
**From : "Marc Rabideau" marcrabideau@gmail.com**  
**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 27JUL2021**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

**Date : 7/26/2021 6:51:22 PM**  
**From : "William Isham" ishwish00@gmail.com**  
**To : "Commission, Recpark (REC)" 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,**  
**"Supervisor Connie Chan" 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:

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

**Date : 7/26/2021 6:46:30 PM**

**From : "Patricia Wise" pawise52@gmail.com**

**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, "Mar, Gordon (BOS)"  
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" 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:

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

Patricia Wise

Lower Great Highway resident and voter

**Date : 7/26/2021 6:44:18 PM**

**From : "Tony Villa" tvobsf@gmail.com**

**To : "recpark.commission@sfgov.org" recpark.commission@sfgov.org,  
"mtaboard@sfmta.com" mtaboard@sfmta.com, "Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org"  
Phil.Ginsburg@sfgov.org, "London Breed" 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, "Mar, Gordon (BOS)" 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:

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

Anthony C Villa

**Date : 7/26/2021 6:42:28 PM**

**From : "'nina steinman' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org**

**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 27JUL2021**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored. Thank you.



**Date : 7/27/2021 7:43:43 AM**

**From : "Marc Rabideau" marcrabideau@gmail.com**

**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 27JUL2021**

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 extremely 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, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given a reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Thank you.

**Date : 7/27/2021 2:50:19 AM**

**From : "Paula Katz" paulagiants@gmail.com**

**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**

**Subject : Public Comment on District 4 Mobility Study Final Report - Item 8:  
Further community input necessary if neighborways are approved**

Hello,

My name is Paula Katz, and I live in District 4 on 44th Avenue, just a few houses south of Rivera St., which is proposed as a potential Neighborway. I just learnt about Neighborways when I read the staff's District 4 Mobility Study Draft Report yesterday. The report states on p. 22 that one of the three design treatments that can be applied to neighborways includes restricting vehicle traffic using signs or physical barriers. Figure R on p. 25 shows traffic diverters that limit vehicle traffic on a street with signs saying vehicles cannot enter the street.

I find Neighborways interesting, but I do not want a design treatment on Rivera that blocked traffic on that street and prevented me and my neighbors from driving on Rivera to get to or from Sunset Blvd., which is a major north-south thoroughfare, or to or from the Lower Great Highway. The staff report states on p. 28 that outreach feedback included concerns from District 4 residents about vehicle access on a neighborway if there are traffic diversion treatments, so other District 4 residents also do not want vehicles banned from neighborways. The report also states on p. 34 that outreach beyond immediate residents and neighbors should be conducted if vehicle restrictions are being considered as a treatment option for a corridor.

If you adopt the proposal for neighborways, I strongly urge you to instruct the staff to survey and hold open houses on the possible design treatments not only for the residents who live on the potential neighborway streets, but also the residents who live at least one block north and south of each potential neighborway. All will be affected as they drive to and from their homes if traffic restrictions are imposed. I do not want Rivera closed to cars.

Paula Katz

Date : 7/26/2021 6:25:03 PM  
From : "Judi Gorski" judigorski@gmail.com  
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org  
Cc : "Judi - gmail Gorski" judigorski@gmail.com  
Subject : Public Comment to be included as part of the permanent record for July 27 SFCTA Meeting 9:30 am

Dear SFCTA and Supervisors,

**Item #5:District 4 Neighborway Network (\$274,600).**

I offer these comments on behalf of myself and my family to object to in any way obstructing 9 of our Sunset District streets (4 east/west and 5 north/south) at the same time our once shared coastal Upper Great Highway (UGH) is closed to traffic. This closure sent an overwhelming flow of vehicles into our residential streets without first doing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Obstructing more neighborhood streets will cause more traffic dangers and more greenhouse gases from the gridlock. This closure negates Vision Zero since there were no collisions on the UGH in recent years prior to its closure (according to SFFD records, none during 2018, 2019 and 2020, and only one in 2017), but since the closure there have been many collisions in the streets near the closed highway and delays to our emergency responders. ***No streets should be obstructed while the UGH remains closed to vehicles and/or during the many years of the ongoing 19th Avenue construction which simultaneously diverts excessive traffic onto our narrow neighborhood streets and avenues.***

We object to there being no accurate project description; we don't know or understand exactly what a "neighborway" or "neighborway network" is or how one will look after it is created. Will it remove parking? Will there be blockades? The Sunset has many streets with bicycle lanes and does not need more as only 2.2% of its 85,000 residents use a bicycle as their main means of transportation. Exactly how will this \$274,600 of Prop K funds be spent? ***We the public respectfully ask for a transparent detailed description of the project and a transparent detailed projected accounting of how each dollar will be spent before any funds are approved or released.***

If the City is claiming it has an exemption from doing an EIR when it is obstructing/closing so many streets at once throughout the entire Sunset District, the Public should be able to see that exemption. The Public has not been given a copy of an exemption. ***We respectfully ask that there be an extension of time to consider Item 5 until we, the Public, see the asserted exemption from the EIR.***

At this time, please do not approve the \$274,600 for this undefined, vaguely and poorly described D4 Neighborway Network project without a demand for more clarity and transparency and public review.

Respectfully submitted,

Judi Gorski  
Resident/Voter/Taxpayer  
Member of Concerned Residents of the Sunset, Open the Great Highway Alliance

Date : 7/26/2021 6:38:19 PM  
From : "Stephen Gorski" sjgorskilaw@gmail.com  
To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org  
Cc : "sjgorskilaw@gmail.com" sjgorskilaw@gmail.com  
Subject : Public Comment to be included as part of the permanent record for the 7/27/2021 SFCTA MEETING: 9:30 a.m.

Dear SFCTA and Supervisors,

**Item #5: District 4 Neighborway Network (\$274,600).**

I offer these comments on behalf of myself and my family to object to in any way obstructing 9 of our Sunset District streets (4 east/west and 5 north/south) at the same time our once shared coastal Upper Great Highway (UGH) is closed to traffic. This closure sent an overwhelming flow of vehicles into our residential streets without first doing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Obstructing more neighborhood streets will cause more traffic dangers and more greenhouse gases from the gridlock. This closure negates Vision Zero since there were no collisions on the UGH in recent years prior to its closure (according to SFFD records, none during 2018, 2019 and 2020, and only one in 2017), but since the closure there have been many collisions in the streets near the closed highway and delays to our emergency responders. ***No streets should be obstructed while the UGH remains closed to vehicles and/or during the many years of the ongoing 19th Avenue construction which simultaneously diverts excessive traffic onto our narrow neighborhood streets and avenues.***

We object to there being no accurate project description; we don't know or understand exactly what a "neighborway" or "neighborway network" is or how one will look after it is created. Will it remove parking? Will there be blockades? The Sunset has many streets with bicycle lanes and does not need more as only 2.2% of its 85,000 residents use a bicycle as their main means of transportation. Exactly how will this \$274,600 of Prop K funds be spent? ***We the public respectfully ask for a transparent detailed description of the project and a transparent detailed projected accounting of how each dollar will be spent before any funds are approved or released.***

If the City is claiming it has an exemption from doing an EIR when it is obstructing/closing so many streets at once throughout the entire Sunset District, the Public should be able to see that exemption. The Public has not been given a copy of an exemption. ***We respectfully ask that there be an extension of time to consider Item 5 until we, the Public, see the asserted exemption from the EIR.***

At this time, please do not approve the \$274,600 for this undefined, vaguely and poorly described D4 Neighborway Network project without a demand for more clarity and transparency and public review.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen J. Gorski  
Resident/Voter/Taxpayer  
Member of Concerned Residents of the Sunset, Open the Great Highway Alliance

Sent from my iPad

**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 7:33:04 PM**  
**From : "'lucca1969@yahoo.com' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Cc : "Loreen Bernardini" lucca1969@yahoo.com, "Gordon Mar" gordon.mar@sfgov.org, "Chan, Connie (BOS)" connie.chan@sfgov.org**  
**Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21, 9:30 am**

Dear Clerk, (sorry your job must be sooooo stressful at this time, we appreciate your dedication.)

Please, add this to the ridiculous agenda to making SF harder for working families to maneuver the City. Right under 'lets charge to drive the closed streets for blue collar worker native SF families just trying to get on their feet after this pandemic"... SERIOUSLY, help family out!

It was just brought to may attention that a study outreach/online survey done consisting of ONLY 287 PEOPLE. This is in a district of 85,000 people. 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 we should be asking...WHY this effort to close streets to cars? (especially when we are trying to take our families, parents, children to school/doctors and get to WORK!) The current congestion due to UGH, GGP being closed, 19th ave, HOV lanes, the JOKE slow streets that people speed down....pedestrian safety AND MY FAMILY SAFETY IS AT STAKE. And now...SFMTA is proposing reducing service?

The SFCTA information is showing only 2.2% of people ride bikes in the Sunset, while 89% either drive alone or carpool. Please look at the photos and see NO ONE IS ON UGH during the week, make a compromise and MAKE THIS CITY ACCESSIBLE TO ALL, DISABLED, FAMILIES, AND people who can BIKE to work. help us get back to normal please!!!!

thank you

**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 : 7/27/2021 7:06:46 AM**

**From : "ROSE NEWTON" rosenewton@comcast.net**

**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**

**Subject : Public Comments to be included in the permanent record for the SFCTA Meeting 27JUL2021, 9:30 am."**

Good Morning

I am writing to request we reopen the great highway to all automobiles now.

This closure is not what the majority of the people want, your records show low use of pedestrian and cyclist as opposed to how many cars are being rerouted to the avenues. The slow street closures are just no being used by people.

only 2.2% of people ride bikes in the Sunset, while 89% either drive alone or carpool. Why are they not listening to the 89% of people? Why continually add slow streets and reduce transit?

the D4 study outreach/online survey WAS ONLY 287 PEOPLE. All the data, charts, graphs are based on only the responses of 287 people! This is in a district of 85,000 people. The study was only a small sample size and poorly distributed. The results SHOULD be meaningless and useless but they are basing the closure on this and keep referencing it again and again. Their decisions are based on this study, which is so crazy.

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 you should be asking: 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.

Reopen the GREAT HIGHWAY.

Thank you

Rosemary Newton

94116

**Date : 7/26/2021 6:45:09 PM**  
**From : "Stephen Gorski" sjgorskilaw@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Cc : "sjgorskilaw@gmail.com" sjgorskilaw@gmail.com**  
**Subject : Public comments: 7/27/2021 SFCTA MEETING@9:30 a.m.**

Hello,

I write to oppose the allocation of money on Neighborway Network and also urge rejection of the D4 Mobility Study.

First, the actions are based largely on a non-transparent survey resulting in 287 responses. 287 people will set policy for the entire Sunset District, resulting in the expenditure of millions of tax dollars?!? That is ludicrous. There has not been fair outreach to the residents of the Sunset, who will be most impacted. I am a member of multiple neighborhood groups comprised of Sunset District residents and these groups were not sought out for feedback and input. It is unknown what groups within and without of the Sunset might have been solicited for feedback, but again, there was not significant and fair outreach to the impacted community, and in any event, 287 respondents show that outreach was insufficient. Notably, even the neglect survey does show that only 2.2% of the respondents ride bikes, while 89% use automobiles. No money should be spent on a project having such a significant impact on the Sunset District and so many of its residents based on the record before us.

Speaking of the record before us, **there is no accurate project description.** It is unclear exactly which Neighborway Network streets they are talking about and how they will they look after closure — barriers at each block, no parking, bicycle lanes? 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 our neighborhood by these other events and these added street closures/obstructions will make traveling within the Sunset District even harder.

Also, closing down or obstructing roads throughout the Sunset District ordinarily would require an environmental impact report. Has a CEQA exemption been claimed, and if so, what class of exemption? No exemption documents have been made public. No action should be taken on these items until these issues are resolved.

Finally, the proposals are ill-conceived. For example, I have been told that Kirkham is one of the streets that may be slated for Neighborway Network treatment. Preliminarily, I live one-half block off Kirkham, which has been a Slow Streets closure throughout the pandemic, and once the initial novelty of the closure wore off, it has become an extremely rare event for anyone to use the roadway other than for driving or bike riding (in the already designated bike lanes). Inconvenience and forcing so many drivers to



detour out of their way for this (generating more carbon emissions) doesn't make sense. Additionally, the function of the closure is simply to push traffic onto other streets, with negligible offsetting benefit. **As to Kirkham specifically, the top alternative route when access is impaired is Judah; the street on which the highest-volume train in the system, the N, runs. Does anybody really want more cars on Judah getting in the way of and impeding the trains, and creating hazards to boarding and disembarking passengers?** There's no way that's a preferred result, which illustrates just how poorly conceived this plan is.

Accordingly, please reject the Mobility Study and the allocation of money for the Neighborway Network.

Stephen J. Gorski  
Sunset District

Sent from my iPad

Date : 7/26/2021 8:54:14 PM

From : "Judi Gorski" judigorski@gmail.com

To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org, "Shamann Walton"

shamann.walton@sfgov.org, "Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org"

Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org, "Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org" Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org,

"Dean.Preston@sfgov.org" Dean.Preston@sfgov.org,

"Matt.Haney@sfgov.org" Matt.Haney@sfgov.org,

"Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org" Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org,

"mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org" mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org,

"melgarstaff@sfgov.org" melgarstaff@sfgov.org, "Connie Chan"

connie.chan@sfgov.org, "gordon.mar@sfgov.org" gordon.mar@sfgov.org,

"catherine.stefani@sfgov.org" catherine.stefani@sfgov.org

Subject : Public Comments: SFCTA Meeting 7/27/21 9:30 am

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,

Judi Gorski  
D4 Resident for 40 years  
Voter/Taxpayer  
Member of Concerned  
Residents of the Sunset

**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 : 7/26/2021 3:07:49 PM**  
**From : "Judith Tichy" tichyjtn@gmail.com**  
**To : "Patricia Arack" parack@ccsf.edu**  
**Cc : "Transportation Authority" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Re: Public Comment for July 27 SFCTA Meeting**

Thank you so much Patricia for your letter to our Supervisors. Your insights are accurate and very well written. The closure of the Upper Great Highway has created an incredibly dangerous situation for the Lower Great Highway and other streets in our neighborhood. Frustrated drivers run stop signs and far too often speed around, crossing the double lines, cars that are slowing down for the speed bumps or just driving the speed limit. We have expressed our concerns throughout the closure but apparently the people in charge refuse to listen.

I vote and I will actively canvas against our Supervisor in the next election. Are we waiting for a horrible accident before the Upper Great Highway is reopened?

Thank you again and we will continue our efforts to correct this terrible decision.  
Judith

On Sun, Jul 25, 2021 at 6:34 PM Patricia Arack <[parack@ccsf.edu](mailto:parack@ccsf.edu)> wrote:  
July 27, 2021

Dear Supervisors: You must reject the D4 Mobility Study and the plans for the Neighborway project regarding improvements in travel within the Sunset. If one reads the fine print in the study, it is clear that once again, as in the UGH D4 report, D4 Mobility Study has created fancy tables, graphs, and statistics that are incomplete and bike-centric and based on non-scientific samples of respondents which are extremely small.

- 1. The survey upon which all the graphs and stats are based on is an unscientific sample of ONLY 287 RESPONDENTS**, plus an online meeting of only 175 people May 23, and 2 meetings with Chinese speakers. There are 85,000 residents of the Sunset, and you are going to approve of change in the streets of the Sunset based on 287 people? I don't recall ever seeing any survey invitation, nor did anyone I know. Also, you are going to approve \$274,600 for further study of the Neighborway on a sample survey of 287 people? For a project that will ultimately cost over a million dollars? What method did D4 use to reach this extremely small sample? When was the survey conducted, from what date to what date? Where is the transparency? You have no idea what the residents of the Sunset want. This is our district. We are the People, and we are being ignored time and time again. There must be an online survey that reaches more than 287 people, and a mailed survey to all 85,000 people for our needs and wants to be known. This should be required.

- 2. The Neighborway prioritizes for bike riders nine (9) streets throughout the Sunset, too many.** Some of them are very important streets for getting around the Sunset by car, like Kirkham, Vicente, and 41<sup>st</sup> Ave. Have you asked the actual neighbors who will be affected

about the "Neighborway?" D4 Mobility has not, other than a survey of 287 people, a zoom meeting, and 2 focus groups with Chinese speakers. Modifying nine streets that cover the entire sunset to prioritize biking is an excessive number based on what can only be described as incomplete statistical figures which are meaningless because of the ridiculously small samples. **The number of streets giving priority to bikes should be half of the number now proposed.**

3. **The D4 Study ignores how the residents of the Sunset choose and/or need to travel.** On the D4 chart about existing mode share, "2.District 4 Transportation Needs" page 10, and even only based on the 287 respondents, **THE MESSAGE IS CLEAR:** Driving within D4, to the Richmond, or to San Mateo County, is the preferred, needed, and chosen mode of transportation. Only an average of 2.2% of the respondents ride bikes, but 89% choose to either drive alone or carpool. D4's own statistics show that driving is the necessary and chosen mode, yet this is ignored to create more bicycle paths for only 2.2% of the population. This makes no sense. The conclusions of this study are designed to encourage bike riding, but even the tiny sample D4 Mobility Study managed to analyze shows that people prefer to use their cars to get around this vast district, and the use of bikes is tiny. Will modifying 9 streets be necessary for biking? I think not. D4's own findings about car use indicate that 9 streets are too many and too expensive.

**In conclusion, we demand that our supervisor, CTA, MTA, RPD all STOP the paternalistic treatment of the Sunset residents.** We are fed up with city employees, paid by our tax monies, deciding "what is best" for the voting and tax-paying members of this district and other districts who also have had little voice in these decisions. The Upper Great Highway closure and the Slow Street closures both are unwanted by many and unnecessary and have made life in the Sunset and Richmond more unsafe, difficult, and unpleasant.

True, we need to get serious about climate change NOW. We need to get rid of fossil fueled cars and get electric ones. For our health we need to walk more, and if able, ride a bike for recreation. Bike riders need to feel safe and need protected lanes on an adequate number of streets, but nine modified streets are excessive. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary changes

In general, the push to get us out of our cars in a vast district like the Sunset is unrealistic and illogical. We can't go about our work and family lives on foot or on a bicycle! You cannot and will not force people to give up their cars, no matter what you think is "best for us." Will you all please stop this magical thinking that we are all going to ride non-existent bus routes or ride a bike to 450 Sutter for a dentist appointment? Please live in reality, not fantasy.. I for one have **NEVER**

seen anyone "recreating" on Kirkham, closed as a Slow Street in 16 months. Others report the same "non-sightings" of recreational users on other Slow Streets. People don't want or need them! Please open the Slow Streets now, while adjacent streets must bear the increased traffic from the closed streets which makes them more unsafe to both pedestrians and bike-riders both. Also open the Great Highway now. It is underutilized as a recreation space, especially during the week. Keeping it closed is in direct opposition to the Vision Zero project because of the increased cars in the Sunset and the Richmond creating dangerous intersections. It is unsafe for thousands of residents and commuters to keep the UGH closed. Open it now.

The Neighborway concept is an improvement to the Slow Streets complete closures (which nobody uses), as long as cars will be also allowed on these streets, but the number of streets to be prioritized for biking is excessive. Please do not accept the recommendation and the Prop K funding for the Neighborway streets until outreach has reached a reasonable number of the residents and changes are made. We expect you to do the outreach that is valid and wide-ranging throughout this vast district NOW, before more money is spent on unnecessary and misguided changes. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia Arack, Admin.  
Concerned Residents of the Sunset  
Member, Open the Great Highway Alliance  
Member, Senior and Disability Action  
Retired Faculty, City College of San Francisco

Patricia Arack



**Date : 7/26/2021 8:53:49 PM**  
**From : "'CAROL' via Clerk" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Re: UGH, URGENT: SFCTA MEETING TUESDAY, 9:30, JULY 27**

On Jul 25, 2021, at 6:05 PM, Patricia Arack <[parack@ccsf.edu](mailto:parack@ccsf.edu)>  
wrote:

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 extremely low.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

Carol Faulkner  
Sunset resident

**Date : 7/25/2021 8:39:37 PM**  
**From : "Harry Wong" sp7030@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Reject the D4 Mobility Study**

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 extremely low.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being habitually ignored.

Sincerely,  
Harry Wong  
A concerned resident of the Sunset District

**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

**Date : 7/26/2021 9:22:18 PM**  
**From : "Debra Howard" deb127@sbcglobal.net**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Tuesday, July 27th CTA Board Meeting @ 9:30 AM**

I respectfully request that none of you 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. The 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 9 streets to prioritize biking does not make sense when bike usage is so extremely low.

Also, the number of survey respondents answering a form survey about transit use was only 287 for a online survey done in the spring, along with only 175 people attending a zoom meeting, 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 the study or the \$274,600 of Prop K funds for continued studies until the residents of the Sunset are given reasonable and adequate opportunity to submit their opinions and for those opinions to be analyzed. It is time that We the People of the Sunset and other districts be given due process and a hearing instead of being ignored.

Sincerely,

Debra Howard  
District 4 resident since 1987

2104 29th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94116

**Date : 7/26/2021 7:17:26 PM**  
**From : "JJ Hollingsworth" fortehouse1498@gmail.com**  
**To : "clerk@sfcta.org" clerk@sfcta.org**  
**Subject : Why only 287**

Dear SFCTA

Would you please explain why you only asked 287 people out of 80,000 Sunset residents about what they think about the Upper Great Highway closure?

You keep calling it the D4 Mobility program, but there is no way this small sample can decide things for 80,000 people.

This is nonsense born from a backroom deal. We see through it. So drop the pretense. Lawsuits are coming your way.

JJ Hollingsworth  
Sunset District resident.



San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority

Britney Milton <britney.milton@sfcta.org>

---

## Today's meeting comments

1 message

---

**Madison Clell** <madisonclell@gmail.com>  
To: clerk@sfcta.org

Tue, Jul 27, 2021 at 7:57 AM

Hello SFCTA,

I am writing regarding today's meeting and, like many, do not have time to write a better letter nor attend today's meeting.

Your D-4 study only counted 287 respondents in a district of 88,000. To base transit decisions on this - decisions made by people who do not live on the affected streets - is inexcusably flawed and grossly incompetent. These road closures directly affect the quality of our lives - you try living in a house with 2800 vehicles streaming by due to traffic 'mitigations' - and must be reversed.

Do not create 'neighbor ways.' Do not spend more money on 'studies'. Open the Great Highway. Improve ACTUAL TRANSIT and not this fantasy based off of 287 respondents during a global pandemic. Do you want to fight climate change? Yes! So do we. Then improve transit, don't shunt vehicles around a residential neighborhood.

I must point you to the letters of more eloquent writers, including Patricia Ararack and Peter Pirelli. Every word they say is on point.

Meanwhile there are 10,800 and growing people who have signed a petition to Open the Great Highway. These are people who are directly impacted by your whimsical decisions. LISTEN TO THEM. We getting more upset as these poor decisions continue to affect us and we will not back down to be heard and have our reasonable needs respected and acted upon.

Do your real job. Improve transit.  
MC

Sent from my iPad