
PUBLIC COMMENTS Re: Transportation Authority Board | SFCTA -April 12, 10 am meeting - \$400,000 to bicycle facility maintenance

1 message

Judi Gorski <judigorski@gmail.com>

Sun, Apr 10, 2022 at 8:43 PM

To: clerk@sfcta.org

Cc: Judi - gmail Gorski <judigorski@gmail.com>

To:

Ms. Angela Tsao

Clerk of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority

[1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor](#)

[San Francisco, CA 94103](#)

EMAIL: clerk@sfcta.org

Re: Public Comments concerning Item 9, Allocation of \$400,000 for Bicycle Facility Maintenance from Prop K funds

Dear Clerk Tsao,

Please enter the following comments into the public record regarding my objections to Item 9 on the Agenda re Prop K funds. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Dear Commissioners:

I object to \$400,000 being allocated for Bicycle Facility Maintenance. It is excessive and a waste of taxpayers' money. Instead spend \$400,000 on what benefits the majority of taxpayers. The Great Highway has been closed down for sand removal since April 1st, 2022, but still no one has come to remove any sand in ten days. The Department of Public Works says they don't have enough money, equipment or employees available to provide the maintenance necessary to keep it consistently cleared of sand and debris at the end of each weekend when pedestrians have trampled over the dunes and median adding more sand onto the highway lanes besides what the wind deposits there.

The repainting of bicycle lanes to the tune of \$400,000 is a lower priority than funding the maintenance of the Great Highway which is used by 17,600-19,000 vehicles per day. The City should allocate adequate Prop K funds to DPW instead, specifically earmarked to resolve this ongoing issue of keeping the Great Highway cleared of sand, open, accessible and regularly maintained on a weekly schedule. Use Prop K money to maintain and repair our streets and open them back up instead of closing more of them down. Our streets are meant to be shared with everyone including drivers, not just the few bicyclists lobbying to repaint bike lanes for \$400,000. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and request.

Respectfully submitted,
Judi Gorski, D4 Resident

Public Comment regarding Item 9 April 12, 2022 meeting SFCTA

Tomasita Medál <tomasitamedal@gmail.com>

Mon,

To: San Francisco County Transit Authority <clerk@sfcta.org>, Tomasita Medál <tomasitamedal@gmail.com>

To:

Ms. Angela Tsao

Clerk of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority

1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor

San Francisco, CA 94103

EMAIL: clerk@sfcta.org

Re: Public Comments concerning Item 9, Allocation of \$400,000 for Bicycle Facility Maintenance from Prop K funds

Dear Clerk Tsao,

Please enter the following comments into the public record regarding my objections to Item 9 on the Agenda re Prop K funds. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Dear Commissioners:

I object to \$400,000 being allocated for Bicycle Facility Maintenance. It is excessive and a waste of taxpayers' money. Instead spend \$400,000 on what benefits the majority of taxpayers. You are restoring all of the discontinued MUNI lines that were discontinued during the Covid19 - related city shutdown. I know a disabled woman who has been on the waiting list for subsidized housing; her name was recently called. When she went to see the apartment for which she was now eligible, she had to turn it down because it was located on one of the MUNI lines that had been discontinued. Restore the bus stops that have been eliminated on all routes, especially Mission Street, Geary Boulevard, and Van Ness Avenue. When making policy, the priority should be to serve ALL San Francisco young people on their way downtown to their tech jobs. Eliminating bus stops is cruel to the elderly, the disabled, and caretakers with kids.

Please stop creating huge projects that are make-work projects for city contractors, but that are not necessary. Keep what we already have well staffed and well maintained. Please stop prioritizing the Bicycle Coalition wants before you serve the needs of the majority of San Franciscans. We also wish you would stop giving the Bicycle Coalition, Walk SF, SF Transit Riders, and SDA millions of dollars to lobby for bicyclists preferences while trying to enforce "make life as difficult as possible for those who need cars to get to work, school, and other duties" policies.

You have been sent 5,000 letters in opposition to the road closure of JFK Drive, yet you are persisting in moving that idea forward. Nobody who is disabled is going to use the shuttles. It is to park somewhere off-site to the park, then make one's way laboriously to a park shuttle stop, wait, then laboriously board, then unboard, then wait again for a shuttle, then have to unboard, the site parking spot. That is simply unfeasible for a person with disabilities. Why incur this agony for thousands of people when we had a good working plan in place since 2007? The only people who are tourists, and even so, they are mostly empty.

The Great Highway has been closed down for sand removal since April 1st, 2022, but still no one has come to remove any sand in ten days. The Department of Public Works says they don't have the equipment or employees available to provide the maintenance necessary to keep it consistently cleared of sand and debris at the end of each weekend when pedestrians have trampled over adding more sand onto the highway lanes besides what the wind deposits there.

The repainting of bicycle lanes to the tune of \$400,000 is a lower priority than funding the maintenance of the Great Highway which is used by 17,600-19,000 vehicles per day. The City should use Prop K funds to DPW instead, specifically earmarked to resolve this ongoing issue of keeping the Great Highway cleared of sand, open, accessible and regularly maintained on a weekly schedule. Money to maintain and repair our streets and open them back up instead of closing more of them down. Our streets are meant to be shared with everyone including drivers, not just the few who use bike lanes for \$400,000. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and request.

Respectfully submitted,

Tomasita Medál

tomasitamedal@gmail.com



SFCTA Meeting 4/12/22 - public comment

1 message

'Kathryn Van Koughnett' via Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 1:01 PM

Reply-To: Kathryn Van Koughnett <kathryn_v@yahoo.com>

To: "clerk@sfcta.org" <clerk@sfcta.org>

Hi, here is my feedback in advance of tomorrow's SFCTA meeting tomorrow at 10 am.

Dear Commissioners,

It is shocking to me that \$400,000 is being allocated for Bicycle Facility Maintenance, as it is excessive and a waste of taxpayers' money - why should this benefit only bicyclists when this money could be used in other, more productive ways.

Instead, why not spend \$400,000 on what benefits the majority of taxpayers? For example, the Great Highway has been closed down for sand removal since April 1st, 2022, but still no one has come to remove any sand in ten days. The Department of Public Works says they don't have enough money, equipment or employees available to provide the maintenance necessary to keep it consistently cleared of sand and debris at the end of each weekend when pedestrians have trampled over the dunes and median adding more sand onto the highway lanes besides what the wind deposits there.

The City should allocate adequate Prop K funds to DPW instead, specifically earmarked to resolve this ongoing issue of keeping the Great Highway cleared of sand, open, accessible and regularly maintained on a weekly schedule. Instead, maybe use Prop K money to maintain and repair our streets and open them back up instead of closing more of them down. Our streets are meant to be shared with everyone including drivers, not just the few bicyclists lobbying to repaint bike lanes for \$400,000.

Thank you,
Kathryn Van Koughnett



Clerk Tsao SFCTA meeting April 12,

1 message

'Mike Regan' via Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 1:20 PM

Reply-To: Mike Regan <myoldgoat@yahoo.com>

To: "clerk@sfcta.org" <clerk@sfcta.org>

Commissioners, I am objecting to the \$400,000 being allocated for bicycle facility maintenance. I believe that it is a waste of taxpayer's monies. This money should be transferred to DPW where it can serve to pay for sand removal on the Great Highway. Maybe even improve the bike lanes there by keeping them sand free. Just this morning I had an appointment at the VA and because the Great Highway was closed I spent an extra 1/2 hr going and an extra 20 minutes returning. This equates to an increase of 50 minutes travel time and added to the carbon foot print that you claim to want to reduce. It is unconscionable that you would rather spend funds to paint bike lanes than to remove sand that is closing a major thoroughfare in the city that 18-20,000 citizens use daily. I find it strange that you seem to be able find the time and money to aid the minority of road users (cyclist) and chose to ignore the majority of user's motorist. It seems everything you do benefits the cyclist at the expense of the motorist. I understand that cycling is one of Mr. Trumlins pet projects but it needs to stop already. You need to stop pandering to special interest groups that really should be classified as lobbyist since that is what they have turned into.

Mike Regan
D7 Resident



Prop K funds

1 message

'SHEILA STUART' via Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>
Reply-To: SHEILA STUART <sstuart466@aol.com>
To: clerk@sfcta.org

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 2:50 PM

Re: objection to \$400,000 funds for bike factory maintenance.

Dear Clerk Tsao,

Please enter the following comments into the public record regarding my objections to Item 9 on the Agenda re Prop K funds. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Dear Commissioners,

I object to \$400,000 being allocated for Bicycle Facility Maintenance. It is excessive and a waste of taxpayers' money. Instead spend \$400,000 on what benefits the majority of taxpayers. The Great Highway has been closed down for sand removal since April 1st, 2022, but still no one has come to remove any sand in ten days. The Department of Public Works says they don't have enough money, equipment or employees available to provide the maintenance necessary to keep it consistently cleared of sand and debris at the end of each weekend when pedestrians have trampled over the dunes and median adding more sand onto the highway lanes besides what the wind deposits there.

The repainting of bicycle lanes to the tune of \$400,000 is a lower priority than funding the maintenance of the Great Highway which is used by 17,600-19,000 vehicles per day. The City should allocate adequate Prop K funds to DPW instead, specifically earmarked to resolve this ongoing issue of keeping the Great Highway cleared of sand, open, accessible and regularly maintained on a weekly schedule. Use Prop K money to maintain and repair our streets and open them back up instead of closing more of them down. Our streets are meant to be shared with everyone including drivers, not just the few bicyclists lobbying to repaint bike lanes for \$400,000.

Thank you.

Sheila Stuart
609-273-4249

SFCTA Meeting - April 12, 2022 - Agenda Item #9

Jean Barish <jeanbbarish@hotmail.com>
To: "clerk@sfcta.org" <clerk@sfcta.org>
Cc: Carla Short <carla.short@sfdpw.org>

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 3:06 PM

Dear Clerk Tsao,

Please distribute the following comments to the CTA Commissioners regarding Item 9 on the April 12, 2022, San Francisco CTA Meeting Agenda. These comments are also attached above. Thank you for your assistance.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing regarding Item 9 on the April 12, 2022, San Francisco CTA Agenda. This Item allocates \$645,108 from Proposition K funds for various projects. I request that you also allocate monies from Proposition K to remove the sand that is accumulating on the Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard.

This section of the Great Highway has been closed since April 1, 2022 due to the accumulation of sand on the roadway. This problem has been exacerbated due to the closure of the highway on weekends and holidays, during which time pedestrians trample over the dunes and median, scattering a great deal of sand on the roadway. I and others have been advised by Carla Short, Interim Director, Department of Public Works, that DPW, which is responsible for cleaning the highway, does not have the funds in its budget to do this work. This funding shortage must be remedied.

The Great Highway, used by almost 20,000 vehicles per day must be maintained. It is a vital north-south roadway that commuters and others rely on. This road must remain accessible, and Prop K is an appropriate funding source to pay for maintaining this highway. While it is unfortunate that the DPW budget cannot cover the cost of this sand removal, I hope you will agree this work is essential and that Prop K monies can be used for this project.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Jean

Jean B Barish
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com
415-752-0185



Public Comment Re Sand Removal 22.04.12.docx

14K

PUBLIC COMMENT

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Meeting, April 12, 2022

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing regarding Item 9 on the April 12, 2022, San Francisco CTA Agenda, which allocates \$645,108 from Proposition K funds for various projects. In addition to funding these projects, I am writing to request that additional monies be allocated to clean the sand from the Great Highway.

The Great Highway has been closed since April 1st, 2022 due to the accumulation of sand on the roadway. This problem has been exacerbated due to the closure of the highway on weekends and holidays, during which time pedestrians trample over the dunes and median, scattering a great deal of sand on the roadway.

The Great Highway, used by almost 20,000 vehicles per day must be maintained. It is a vital north-south roadway that commuters and others rely on. This road must remain accessible, and Prop K is an appropriate funding source.

While it is unfortunate the DPW budget cannot cover the cost of this sand removal, I hope that the you will agree this work is essential and that Prop K monies can be used for this project.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Jean B Barish

Jean B Barish
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com



Item 9 prop k

Rosemary <rosenewton@comcast.net>

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 3:16 PM

To: clerk@sfcta.org

Dear Clerk Tsao

Please enter the following comments into the public record regarding my objections to Item 9 on the Agenda re Prop K funds. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Dear Commissioners,

I object to \$400,000 being allocated for Bicycle Facility Maintenance. It is excessive and a waste of taxpayers' money. Instead spend \$400,000 on what benefits the majority of taxpayers. The Great Highway has been closed down for sand removal since April 1st, 2022, but still no one has come to remove any sand in ten days. The Department of Public Works says they don't have enough money, equipment or employees available to provide the maintenance necessary to keep it consistently cleared of sand and debris at the end of each weekend when pedestrians have trampled over the dunes and median adding more sand onto the highway lanes besides what the wind deposits there.

The repainting of bicycle lanes to the tune of \$400,000 is a lower priority than funding the maintenance of the Great Highway which is used by 17,600-19,000 vehicles per day. The City should allocate adequate Prop K funds to DPW instead, specifically earmarked to resolve this ongoing issue of keeping the Great Highway cleared of sand, open, accessible and regularly maintained on a weekly schedule. Use Prop K money to maintain and repair our streets and open them back up instead of closing more of them down. Our streets are meant to be shared with everyone including drivers, not just the few bicyclists lobbying to repaint bike lanes for \$400,000. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and request.

Thank you

Rosemary Newton

Sent from my iPhone

Public Comment for SFCTA meeting April 12, 2021

Patricia Arack <parack@ccsf.edu>
To: Transportation Authority <clerk@sfcta.org>

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 3:56 PM

Dear SFCTA Commissioners:

You continue to allocate funds relating to bicyclists and the Bike Coalition, while ignoring the vast majority of San Franciscans who have to get up every morning and drive to a job, and then drive home again, or take care of family business, on crowded congested streets. Now, you are giving \$400,000 of our Prop K funds to bike facility maintenance. You have spent millions over the years to pander to the minority bike community and in the process, you have angered the majority of San Franciscans. Some Points:

1. **Corruption:** I agree 100% with Vice Chair Peskin's comments, as noted in the minutes from the March 22 meeting. The funding relationship of MTA and RPD, and CTA with the Bike Coalition is unethical. Here is a non-profit, the Bike Coalition, almost and probably wholly supported by our tax-payer dollars and which is a political player in supervisorial races (Dean Preston et. al.) and the propaganda arm of MTA and RPD. Do not think the collusion of the BC with these agencies has not gone unnoticed. There is actual email evidence of collusion between these agencies and this group that clearly show the GH survey of winter 2020 and the meeting of June 10, 2020, was engineered falsely to show that the majority of respondents favored full closure of the GH. It is reasonable to assume that this corrupt behavior continued for "surveys" of other closed streets, including JFK Drive. Sup. Preskin is concerned, as well he should be, about the funding of the BC and its inappropriate and unethical influence it has over decisions of the City over the closed streets program and elections, which has harmed many thousands of angry and voting citizens of SF.
2. **Climate Change:** The Bike Lobby and city agencies repeatedly demand that streets be closed, cars left in garages, and everyone has to ride a bike or ride on transit for the sake of reducing climate change. If that were really true, you would not be spending millions of **OUR Prop K dollars** on creating bike lanes all over town, closing roads all over town (30) which sit empty because no bikers on them (pedestrians, if there are any, use the sidewalk). Instead, you would be funding more charging stations for EVs. You would be encouraging drivers to change to EVs, by providing a financial incentive to do so. According to YOUR OWN Climate Action Plan, on page 77, the most obvious and effective manner to reduce GHG is to reduce the use of gas-powered cars, as analyzed by a Ph.D data scientist:

"It is so obvious: EVs are 81% of the potential GHG savings and bikes are 1%. Achieving 25% of the EV goal (191,700 metric tons) would be more than 100% of the rest (176,100 metric tons). The estimated costs for an EV strategy is listed at \$1M - \$10M vs the "active transportation" strategy which is \$10M - \$100M. So, 10 times as many dollars to go after something (active transit) that will have less than 1/10 the the impact on GHGs (EVS). If everybody is in EVs, then road pricing, parking pricing, etc have no impact on GHG reductions since it will be at zero. So, solve the EV problem and you save all the costs of going after the other strategies."

By your own chart, it is clear. To fight climate change, which is the most terrifying issue the world faces today along with Putin, San Francisco supervisors should face the obvious best

method to do that, and help people, who will not give up their cars because they NEED them for work and other obligations, at least have the means to get out of their gas-powered cars. The bike lobby is a minority group. If you think you need to pander to this group to the detriment of the majority lower-income residents to get relected and to have your bonds and Prop K ballot measures approved, you are mistaken.

3. **State Funds for EVs:** You have received or will receive \$1.5 million for EV related improvements (charging stations, etc.) from the state of CA, yet I have seen nothing in your allocations for anything related to promoting EV purchase or infrastructure. Why is that?
4. **JFK Drive:** It seems that the city of San Francisco will close the eastern part of JFK Drive. The results of this action will be irreversibly harmful to thousands of San Franciscans whose access to the park will be severely curtailed. Seniors, the disabled, will stop going because getting there will be too difficult and unsafe. Lower income residents from far reaches of the city will feel unable to get to the park attractions because of the difficulty with distance and parking. The museums will continue to suffer financially, and their attendance will continue to suffer. You choose instead to favor the young strong, white elites. This was obvious in your MTA "survey." 66% of respondents were white upper income residents living near the park, while 39% of SF is white, and only 15% of respondents were Chinese, while 55% of residents are the majority ethnic group. 2% of respondents were black, while 4% live in the city, and a similar disparity exists for Latinos. I would venture a guess that this was another skewed survey engineered by MTA, RPD, and the Bike Coalition to present a false conclusion that the majority of San Franciscans want JFK East closed. If the bike lobby wants a private road in the park, give them Middle Drive. Why are you giving bike riders exclusive use of the one section of JFK Drive that gives everyone safe access to the museums and other attractions in the park? How can you be so short-sighted and cruel to seniors and disabled people? How can you be so callous just for politics? Why not return to the pre-pandemic plan, where the park is closed on weekends? It has been reported that the use of JFK Drive during the work week is very sparse. Same with GH. Why can't you compromise so everyone has access, not just the favored few able-bodied people? I am a senior and disabled. I will never be able to get to the attractions in the park again, and the same is true for thousands of other disabled people. I may be able to get to the de Young, but will have to pay parking, a "disabled tax" which is no fault of the de Young and will not be able to go elsewhere along JFK Drive because I am physically unable.
5. **Working people held hostage on GH:** Since August 16, or for almost 8 months, you supervisors, the mayor, and the police have all been derelict in your duty to uphold the law. Almost every Thursday night at 6 pm, Bike Coalition identified members illegally have done their slow ride, blocking all lanes, at 2-5 miles an hour south on the GH, stopping at every red light, (which is unheard of by bikers,) holding up a mile-long row of cars of working people during their commute home, and then have illegally turned at Sloat and returned to Lincoln. Not one city official, not Sups. Chan or Mar, the Mayor, no one, not the police have done anything effective to stop this illegal action. Several Vehicle Codes are violated here. Why have you done nothing, if not for political gain, you think? If you say, "free speech," then you are as corrupt as these bikers holding up traffic. For every vote you think you will get over this, you will have lost 10.

Please carefully consider your next moves and decisions which will adversely affect many thousands of San Franciscans for the benefit of a few.

Patricia Arack
Concerned Residents of the Sunset
Open the Great Highway Alliance

This has got to stop.

'Paul Roscelli' via Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>
Reply-To: Paul Roscelli <paulroscelli@me.com>
To: Transportation Authority <clerk@sfcta.org>

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 3:58 PM

Dear SFCTA Commissioners:

You continue to allocate funds relating to bicyclists and the Bike Coalition, while ignoring the vast majority of San Franciscos who have to get up every morning and drive to a job, and then drive home again, or take care of family business, on crowded congested streets. Now, you are giving \$400,000 of our Prop K funds to bike facility maintenance. You have spent millions over the years to pander to the minority bike community and in the process, you have angered the majority of San Franciscans. Some Points:

1. **Corruption:** I agree 100% with Vice Chair Peskin's comments, as noted in the minutes from the March 22 meeting. The funding relationship of MTA and RPD, and CTA with the Bike Coalition is unethical. Here is a non-profit, the Bike Coalition, almost and probably wholly supported by our tax-payer dollars and which is a political player in supervisorial races (Dean Preston et. al.) and the propaganda arm of MTA and RPD. Do not think the collusion of the BC with these agencies has not gone unnoticed. There is actual email evidence of collusion between these agencies and this group that clearly show the GH survey of winter 2020 and the meeting of June 10, 2020, was engineered falsely to show that the majority of respondents favored full closure of the GH. It is reasonable to assume that this corrupt behavior continued for "surveys" of other closed streets, including JFK Drive. Sup. Preskin is concerned, as well he should be, about the funding of the BC and its inappropriate and unethical influence it has over decisions of the City over the closed streets program and elections, which has harmed many thousands of angry and voting citizens of SF.
2. **Climate Change:** The Bike Lobby and city agencies repeatedly demand that streets be closed, cars left in garages, and everyone has to ride a bike or ride on transit for the sake of reducing climate change. If that were really true, you would not be spending millions of **OUR Prop K dollars** on creating bike lanes all over town, closing roads all over town (30) which sit empty because no bikers on them (pedestrians, if there are any, use the sidewalk). Instead, you would be funding more charging stations for EVs. You would be encouraging drivers to change to EVs, by providing a financial incentive to do so. According to YOUR OWN Climate Action Plan, on page 77, the most obvious and effective manner to reduce GHG is to reduce the use of gas-powered cars, as analyzed by a Ph.D data scientist:

"It is so obvious: EVs are 81% of the potential GHG savings and bikes are 1%. Achieving 25% of the EV goal (191,700 metric tons) would be more than 100% of the rest (176,100 metric tons). The estimated costs for an EV strategy is listed at \$1M - \$10M vs the "active transportation" strategy which is \$10M - \$100M. So, 10 times as many dollars to go after something (active transit) that will have less than 1/10 the the impact on GHGs (EVS). If everybody is in EVs, then road pricing, parking pricing, etc have no impact on GHG reductions since it will be at zero. So, solve the EV problem and you save all the costs of going after the other strategies."

By your own chart, it is clear. To fight climate change, which is the most terrifying issue the world faces today along with Putin, San Francisco supervisors should face the obvious best method to do that, and help people, who will not give up their cars because they NEED them for work and other

obligations, at least have the means to get out of their gas-powered cars. The bike lobby is a minority group. If you think you need to pander to this group to the detriment of the majority lower-income residents to get relected and to have your bonds and Prop K ballot measures approved, you are mistaken.

3. **State Funds for EVs:** You have received or will receive \$1.5 million for EV related improvements (charging stations, etc.) from the state of CA, yet I have seen nothing in your allocations for anything related to promoting EV purchase or infrastructure. Why is that?
4. **JFK Drive:** It seems that the city of San Francisco will close the eastern part of JFK Drive. The results of this action will be irreversibly harmful to thousands of San Franciscans whose access to the park will be severely curtailed. Seniors, the disabled, will stop going because getting there will be too difficult and unsafe. Lower income residents from far reaches of the city will feel unable to get to the park attractions because of the difficulty with distance and parking. The museums will continue to suffer financially, and their attendance will continue to suffer. You choose instead to favor the young strong, white elites. This was obvious in your MTA "survey." 66% of respondents were white upper income residents living near the park, while 39% of SF is white, and only 15% of respondents were Chinese, while 55% of residents are the majority ethnic group. 2% of respondents were black, while 4% live in the city, and a similar disparity exists for Latinos. I would venture a guess that this was another skewed survey engineered by MTA, RPD, and the Bike Coalition to present a false conclusion that the majority of San Franciscans want JFK East closed. If the bike lobby wants a private road in the park, give them Middle Drive. Why are you giving bike riders exclusive use of the one section of JFK Drive that gives everyone safe access to the museums and other attractions in the park? How can you be so short-sighted and cruel to seniors and disabled people? How can you be so callous just for politics? Why not return to the pre-pandemic plan, where the park is closed on weekends? It has been reported that the use of JFK Drive during the work week is very sparse. Same with GH. Why can't you compromise so everyone has access, not just the favored few able-bodied people? I am a senior and disabled. I will never be able to get to the attractions in the park again, and the same is true for thousands of other disabled people. I may be able to get to the de Young, but will have to pay parking, a "disabled tax" which is no fault of the de Young and will not be able to go elsewhere along JFK Drive because I am physically unable.
5. **Working people held hostage on GH:** Since August 16, or for almost 8 months, you supervisors, the mayor, and the police have all been derelict in your duty to uphold the law. Almost every Thursday night at 6 pm, Bike Coalition identified members illegally have done their slow ride, blocking all lanes, at 2-5 miles an hour south on the GH, stopping at every red light, (which is unheard of by bikers,) holding up a mile-long row of cars of working people during their commute home, and then have illegally turned at Sloat and returned to Lincoln. Not one city official, not Sups. Chan or Mar, the Mayor, no one, not the police have done anything effective to stop this illegal action. Several Vehicle Codes are violated here. Why have you done nothing, if not for political gain, you think? If you say, "free speech," then you are as corrupt as these bikers holding up traffic. For every vote you think you will get over this, you will have lost 10.

Please carefully consider your next moves and decisions which will adversely affect many thousands of San Franciscans for the benefit of a few.

Paul Roscelli

Professor of Economics

Advisor Phi Theta Kappa

Canada College 4200 Farm Hill Blvd, Redwood City Ca. 94061 650 306 3414

roscelli@smccd.edu

Building 23 Room 357

Follow PTK at@

https://www.facebook.com/home.php?sk=group_138423742900430

Honors Program: <http://canadacollege.edu/honorsprogram/>

Social Science Website: <http://www.canadacollege.edu/socialsciences/>

"We are afflicted in every way, but not constrained; perplexed, but not abandoned; struck down, but not destroyed..."
2Cor. Ch.4

Public Comment for SFCTA meeting April 12, 2022

Stephen Gorski <sjgorskilaw@gmail.com>
To: clerk@sfcta.org

Mon, Apr 11, 2022 at 4:56 PM

Dear SFCTA Commissioners:

You continue to allocate funds relating to bicyclists and the Bike Coalition, while ignoring the vast majority of San Franciscans who have to get up every morning and drive to a job, and then drive home again, or take care of family business, on crowded congested streets. Now, you are giving \$400,000 of our Prop K funds to bike facility maintenance. You have spent millions over the years to pander to the minority bike community and in the process, you have angered the majority of San Franciscans. Some Points:

1. **Corruption:** I agree 100% with Vice Chair Peskin's comments, as noted in the minutes from the March 22 meeting. The funding relationship of MTA and RPD, and CTA with the Bike Coalition is unethical. Here is a non-profit, the Bike Coalition, almost and probably wholly supported by our tax-payer dollars and which is a political player in supervisorial races (Dean Preston et. al.) and the propaganda arm of MTA and RPD. Do not think the collusion of the BC with these agencies has not gone unnoticed. There is actual email evidence of collusion between these agencies and this group that clearly show the GH survey of winter 2020 and the meeting of June 10, 2020, was engineered falsely to show that the majority of respondents favored full closure of the GH. It is reasonable to assume that this corrupt behavior continued for "surveys" of other closed streets, including JFK Drive. Sup. Preskin is concerned, as well he should be, about the funding of the BC and its inappropriate and unethical influence it has over decisions of the City over the closed streets program and elections, which has harmed many thousands of angry and voting citizens of SF.
2. **Climate Change:** The Bike Lobby and city agencies repeatedly demand that streets be closed, cars left in garages, and everyone has to ride a bike or ride on transit for the sake of reducing climate change. If that were really true, you would not be spending millions of **OUR Prop K dollars** on creating bike lanes all over town, closing roads all over town (30) which sit empty because no bikers on them (pedestrians, if there are any, use the sidewalk). Instead, you would be funding more charging stations for EVs. You would be encouraging drivers to change to EVs, by providing a financial incentive to do so. According to YOUR OWN Climate Action Plan, on page 77, the most obvious and effective manner to reduce GHG is to reduce the use of gas-powered cars, as analyzed by a Ph.D data scientist:

"It is so obvious: EVs are 81% of the potential GHG savings and bikes are 1%. Achieving 25% of the EV goal (191,700 metric tons) would be more than 100% of the rest (176,100 metric tons). The estimated costs for an EV strategy is listed at \$1M - \$10M vs the "active transportation" strategy which is \$10M - \$100M. So, 10 times as many dollars to go after something (active transit) that will have less than 1/10 the the impact on GHGs (EVS). If everybody is in EVs, then road pricing, parking pricing, etc have no impact on GHG reductions since it will be at zero. So, solve the EV problem and you save all the costs of going after the other strategies."

By your own chart, it is clear. To fight climate change, which is the most terrifying issue the world faces today along with Putin, San Francisco supervisors should face the obvious best method to do that, and help people, who will not give up their cars because they NEED them for work and other

obligations, at least have the means to get out of their gas-powered cars. The bike lobby is a minority group. If you think you need to pander to this group to the detriment of the majority lower-income residents to get relected and to have your bonds and Prop K ballot measures approved, you are mistaken.

3. **State Funds for EVs:** You have received or will receive \$1.5 million for EV related improvements (charging stations, etc.) from the state of CA, yet I have seen nothing in your allocations for anything related to promoting EV purchase or infrastructure. Why is that?
4. **JFK Drive:** It seems that the city of San Francisco will close the eastern part of JFK Drive. The results of this action will be irreversibly harmful to thousands of San Franciscans whose access to the park will be severely curtailed. Seniors, the disabled, will stop going because getting there will be too difficult and unsafe. Lower income residents from far reaches of the city will feel unable to get to the park attractions because of the difficulty with distance and parking. The museums will continue to suffer financially, and their attendance will continue to suffer. You choose instead to favor the young strong, white elites. This was obvious in your MTA "survey." 66% of respondents were white upper income residents living near the park, while 39% of SF is white, and only 15% of respondents were Chinese, while 55% of residents are the majority ethnic group. 2% of respondents were black, while 4% live in the city, and a similar disparity exists for Latinos. I would venture a guess that this was another skewed survey engineered by MTA, RPD, and the Bike Coalition to present a false conclusion that the majority of San Franciscans want JFK East closed. If the bike lobby wants a private road in the park, give them Middle Drive. Why are you giving bike riders exclusive use of the one section of JFK Drive that gives everyone safe access to the museums and other attractions in the park? How can you be so short-sighted and cruel to seniors and disabled people? How can you be so callous just for politics? Why not return to the pre-pandemic plan, where the park is closed on weekends? It has been reported that the use of JFK Drive during the work week is very sparse. Same with GH. Why can't you compromise so everyone has access, not just the favored few able-bodied people? I am a senior and disabled. I will never be able to get to the attractions in the park again, and the same is true for thousands of other disabled people. I may be able to get to the de Young, but will have to pay parking, a "disabled tax" which is no fault of the de Young and will not be able to go elsewhere along JFK Drive because I am physically unable.
5. **Working people held hostage on GH:** Since August 16, or for almost 8 months, you supervisors, the mayor, and the police have all been derelict in your duty to uphold the law. Almost every Thursday night at 6 pm, Bike Coalition identified members illegally have done their slow ride, blocking all lanes, at 2-5 miles an hour south on the GH, stopping at every red light, (which is unheard of by bikers,) holding en J. Gorski, up a mile-long row of cars of working people during their commute home, and then have illegally turned at Sloat and returned to Lincoln. Not one city official, not Sups. Chan or Mar, the Mayor, no one, not the police have done anything effective to stop this illegal action. Several Vehicle Codes are violated here. Why have you done nothing, if not for political gain, you think? If you say, "free speech," then you are as corrupt as these bikers holding up traffic. For every vote you think you will get over this, you will have lost 10.

Please carefully consider your next moves and decisions which will adversely affect many thousands of San Franciscans for the benefit of a few.

Stephen J. Gorski, 46 year Sunset Resident & Voter

Concerned Residents of the Sunset
Open the Great Highway Alliance

Sent from my iPad



Fwd: PUBLIC COMMENTS Re: Transportation Authority Board | SFCTA -April 12, 10 am meeting - \$400,000 to bicycle facility maintenance

1 message

S Garrett <shigar16@gmail.com>
To: clerk@sfcta.org

Tue, Apr 12, 2022 at 3:28 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: S Garrett <shigar16@gmail.com>

Date: April 11, 2022 at 1:10:25 AM PDT

To: clerk@sfcta.org

Subject: PUBLIC COMMENTS Re: Transportation Authority Board | SFCTA -April 12, 10 am meeting - \$400,000 to bicycle facility maintenance

Dear Clerk Tsao,

Please enter the following comments into the public record regarding my objections to Item 9 on the Agenda re Prop K funds. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Dear Commissioners,

I object to \$400,000 being allocated for Bicycle Facility Maintenance. It is excessive and a waste of taxpayers' money. Instead spend \$400,000 on what benefits the majority of taxpayers. The Great Highway has been closed down for sand removal since April 1st, 2022, but still no one has come to remove any sand in ten days. The Department of Public Works says they don't have enough money, equipment or employees available to provide the maintenance necessary to keep it consistently cleared of sand and debris at the end of each weekend when pedestrians have trampled over the dunes and median adding more sand onto the highway lanes besides what the wind deposits there.

The repainting of bicycle lanes to the tune of \$400,000 is a lower priority than funding the maintenance of the Great Highway which is used by 17,600-19,000 vehicles per day. The City should allocate adequate Prop K funds to DPW instead, specifically earmarked to resolve this ongoing issue of keeping the Great Highway cleared of sand, open, accessible and regularly maintained on a weekly schedule. Use Prop K money to maintain and repair our streets and open them back up instead of closing more of them down. Our streets are meant to be shared with everyone including drivers, not just the few bicyclists lobbying to repaint bike lanes for \$400,000. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and request.

Respectfully,
S Garrett
SF Resident



San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority

Angela Tsao <angela.tsao@sfcta.org>

(no subject)

1 message

Eleanor Mannion <sashiko4872@gmail.com>
To: clerk@sfcta.org

Tue, Apr 12, 2022 at 5:32 AM

Hello, for the funding meeting today.

Please put aside funds to remove sand from the Great Highway. The loss of this transportation corridor is felt harshly by the residents in the western half of the city.

Thank you, Eleanor Mannion, Lake and 24th Ave.

Fwd: Public Comment regarding Item 9 April 12, 2022 meeting SFCTA

Mari Eliza <mari@abazaar.com>

Tue,

To: Clerk of the Transportation Authority <clerk@sfcta.org>, Rafael Mandelman <MandelmanStaff@sfgov.org>

Cc: Ronen Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>, Shamann Walton <Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org>, Safai Ahsha <Ahsha.Safai@sfgov.org>, Stefani Catherine <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>, Pesk <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>, Dean Preston <deanpreston7@gmail.com>, Haney Matt <Matt.Haney@sfgov.org>, Myrna Melgar <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>, chanstaff@sfgov.org, Gordon Mar <

April 12, 2022

Ms. Angela Tsao

Clerk of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority

[1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor](#)[San Francisco, CA 94103](#)EMAIL: clerk@sfcta.org

Supervisors, and SFCTA officials,

I just found out about this desire to paint bike lanes today and want to associate myself with the comments made by Tomasita in the letter below. We oppose on the grounds stated below.

As you know there is too much going on and any money being spent now should go to Muni and Muni service. the bike lanes have major potholes as do many streets in the city. Those all need which is getting really expensive is applied to anything on the streets.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza

zrants@gmail.com

President East Mission Improvement Association

To:

Ms. Angela Tsao

Clerk of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority

[1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor](#)[San Francisco, CA 94103](#)EMAIL: clerk@sfcta.org

Re: Public Comments concerning Item 9, Allocation of \$400,000 for Bicycle Facility Maintenance from Prop K funds

Dear Clerk Tsao,

Please enter the following comments into the public record regarding my objections to Item 9 on the Agenda re Prop K funds. Thank you for assistance in this matter.

Dear Commissioners:

I object to \$400,000 being allocated for Bicycle Facility Maintenance. It is excessive and a waste of taxpayers' money. Instead spend \$400,000 on what benefits the majority of taxpayers. You are restoring all of the discontinued MUNI lines that were discontinued during the Covid19 - related city shutdown. I know a disabled woman who has been on the waiting list for subsidized housing; her name was recently called. When she went to see the apartment for which she was now eligible, she had to turn it down because it was located on one of the MUNI lines that had been discontinued. To restore the bus stops that have been eliminated on all routes, especially Mission Street, Geary Boulevard, and Van Ness Avenue. When making policy, the priority should be to serve ALL San Francisco people on their way downtown to their tech jobs. Eliminating bus stops is cruel to the elderly, the disabled, and caretakers with kids.

Please stop creating huge projects that are make-work projects for city contractors, but that are not necessary. Keep what we already have well staffed and well maintained. Please stop prioritizing the Bicycle Coalition wants before you serve the needs of the majority of San Franciscans. We also wish you would stop giving the Bicycle Coalition, Walk SF, SF Transit Riders, and SDA millions of dollars to lobby for bicyclists preferences while trying to enforce "make life as difficult as possible for those who need cars to get to work, school, and other duties" policies.

You have been sent 5,000 letters in opposition to the road closure of JFK Drive, yet you are persisting in moving that idea forward. Nobody who is disabled is going to use the shuttles. It is to park somewhere off-site to the park, then make one's way laboriously to a park shuttle stop, wait, then laboriously board, then unboard, then wait again for a shuttle, then have to unboard, the site parking spot. That is simply unfeasible for a person with disabilities. Why incur this agony for thousands of people when we had a good working plan in place since 2007? The only people who use the shuttles are tourists, and even so, they are mostly empty.

The Great Highway has been closed down for sand removal since April 1st, 2022, but still no one has come to remove any sand in ten days. The Department of Public Works says they don't have the equipment or employees available to provide the maintenance necessary to keep it consistently cleared of sand and debris at the end of each weekend when pedestrians have trampled over adding more sand onto the highway lanes besides what the wind deposits there.

The repainting of bicycle lanes to the tune of \$400,000 is a lower priority than funding the maintenance of the Great Highway which is used by 17,600-19,000 vehicles per day. The City should use Prop K funds to DPW instead, specifically earmarked to resolve this ongoing issue of keeping the Great Highway cleared of sand, open, accessible and regularly maintained on a weekly schedule. Money to maintain and repair our streets and open them back up instead of closing more of them down. Our streets are meant to be shared with everyone including drivers, not just the few bike lanes. Repaint bike lanes for \$400,000. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and request.

Respectfully submitted,
Tomasita Medál
tomasitamedal@gmail.com