

Commuter Buses in Noe Valley

Thomas Schuttish <schuttishtr@sbcglobal.net> To: cac@sfcta.org

Mon, May 22, 2023 at 3:43 PM

The buses are a factor in the loss of affordability of housing in Noe Valley in the past decade.

I can think of several projects near bus stops where multi-unit buildings have been emptied of residents, remodeled and either sold or rented at much higher prices.

Additionally the buses are an "amenity" used to market high-end remodels of single family homes throughout the neighborhood and act to incentivize high-end Alterations that are really Demolitions because of proximity to "tech buses".

Noe Valley and the Mission District, which Noe Valley has historically been a part of, should not have become the expensive bedroom community for the Peninsula.

The buses are a factor in creating the housing problem in Noe Valley and the Mission District.

Plus the buses seem to have violated many of the agreements made with the MTA throughout the years based on the fines imposed as presented in the power point.

Thank you. Sincerely, Georgia Schuttish Noe Valley Resident



Commuter shuttle buses are not legally permitted to operate in public bus stops.

Sue Vaughan <selizabethvaughan@gmail.com>

Wed, May 24, 2023 at 1:18 PM

To: cac@sfcta.org Bcc: clerk@sfcta.org

Dear CAC members,

It is a violation of the California Vehicle Code for any but transit vehicles (public buses and taxis) and sometimes school buses to operate in the public bus stops. It is a lie for the anyone from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to tell you that non-transit vehicles or, in some cases, school buses, can operate in public bus stops legally. They cannot. That is a violation of the California Vehicle Code, 22500.i, which states:

22500. A person shall not stop, park, or leave standing any vehicle whether attended or unattended, except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic or in compliance with the directions of a peace officer or official traffic control device, in any of the following places:

(i) Except as provided under Section 22500.5 [school buses], alongside curb space authorized for the loading and unloading of passengers of a bus engaged as a common carrier in local transportation when indicated by a sign or red paint on the curb erected or painted by local authorities pursuant to an ordinance.

Buses are defined in the by the California Vehicle Code. Don't let anyone tell you that because commuter shuttles are buses that the law permits them to operate in public bus stops. They are not transit, and while transit vehicles may be buses, not all transit vehicles are buses:

VEHICLE CODE - VEH

DIVISION 1. WORDS AND PHRASES DEFINED [100 - 681] (Division 1 enacted by Stats. 1959, Ch. 3.)

- 233. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), a "bus" is any vehicle, including a trailer bus, designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than 15 persons including the driver.
- (b) A vehicle designed, used, or maintained for carrying more than 10 persons, including the driver, which is used to transport persons for compensation or profit, or is used by any nonprofit organization or group, is also a bus.
- (c) This section does not alter the definition of a school bus, school pupil activity bus, general public paratransit vehicle, farm labor vehicle, or youth bus.
- (d) A vanpool vehicle is not a bus.

(Amended by Stats. 1994, Ch. 675, Sec. 1. Effective January 1, 1995.)

VEHICLE CODE - VEH

DIVISION 1. WORDS AND PHRASES DEFINED [100 - 681] (Division 1 enacted by Stats. 1959, Ch. 3.)

642. A "transit bus" is any bus owned or operated by a publicly owned or operated transit system, or operated under contract with a publicly owned or operated transit system, and used to provide to the general public, regularly scheduled transportation for which a fare is charged. A general public paratransit vehicle is not a transit bus.

(Added by Stats. 1989, Ch. 1136, Sec. 2. Operative July 1, 1990, by Sec. 9 of Ch. 1136.)

When the pilot program was first started in 2014, a Tea Party Republican assembly member from Huntington Beach introduced legislation at the state level to amend the vehicle code to make it legal for tech shuttle buses to operate in San Francisco public bus stops. That legislation, AB61, was never heard in committee, perhaps because people in San Francisco got organized and opposed the privatization of our public bus stops.

Please note the list of organizations the came out in opposition to the privatization of our bus stops in 2015:

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO

AFSCME Council 57 Amalgamated Transit Union Bernal Heights Democratic Club

California Alliance for Retired Americans

California Council of the Blind

D5 Action FDR Democratic Club of San Francisco

Gray Panthers of San Francisco Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club

Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Pacific Felt Factory Potrero Hill Democratic Club San Francisco Green Party San Francisco Latino Democratic Club San Francisco

Senior and Disability Action

San Francisco Tomorrow SaveMuni California State Council of the Services

Employees International Union Transport Workers Union Local 250-A

UNITE HERE Local 2

Upper Noe Neighbors

Please note that there are 882 vehicles with placards -- get-out-of-jail-free-cards. That is about the number of rubber-tire vehicles in the entire Muni fleet. But recall that these tech shuttles only operate during concentrated hours and in particular neighborhoods that are highly desirable to well-compensated technology employees. No assessment has been done of the impact of the availability of these tech shuttles on the cost of living because the SFMTA refused to do an EIR in 2014 when it was adopting the program and the Board of Supervisors voted against an appeal of the absence of an EIR (no votes, opposing the appeal that would have required an EIR: London Breed, David Chiu, Malia Cohen, Mark Farrell, Jane Kim, Katy Tang, Scott Wiener, Leland Yee; those voting in support of the appeal: John Avalos and David Campos. Eric Mar was absent).

Our public transit agencies are heading towards fiscal cliffs. It was a mistake in the early 2010s for Mayor Ed Lee to permit Uber and Lyft to come into San Francisco and compete with our public transit (which includes taxis) and a mistake for our politicians to allow the tech shuttles to break the law. They are directly competing with our public transit -- but for an exclusive, well-compensated sector of the population. What's going to happen if Muni is forced to cut service? Will other private services whose fares are not regulated and who are not required by federal law to serve every demographic equitably also demand access to public bus stops?

Sue Vaughan



Commuter shuttle buses are not legally permitted to operate in public bus stops.

Sue Vaughan <selizabethvaughan@gmail.com> To: cac@sfcta.org, "Steve Stamos, Clerk of the Board" <clerk@sfcta.org> Wed, May 24, 2023 at 2:01 PM

Dear CAC members,

Let me clarify:

22500.i does restrict public bus stops to transit vehicles and school buses. School buses are permitted to operate in public bus stops.

Private buses are not permitted to operate in public bus stops.

Sue Vaughan [Quoted text hidden]



Public Comment on Private Commuter Buses, Item 12 for the 5/24/23 SFCTA CAC Meeting

Paula Katz <paulagiants@gmail.com> To: cac@sfcta.org

Tue, May 23, 2023 at 3:50 PM

Hello Members of the SFCTA CAC.

My name is Paula Katz, and I am a San Francisco resident in District 4.

The private commuter buses should be assessed an operational tax to operate in San Francisco.

The private commuter buses symbolyze the widening social didvide, are not accessible, and are of no benefit to most San Francisco residents. They are an essential tool for companies based 30 to 40 miles away to court employees with a WiFi boosting perk. San Francisco and Silicon Valley are inter-connected, cojoined twins sharing the same heart: one foot in Silicon Valley with Venture Capital Firms, and the other in San Francisco where young employees can enjoy a vibrant social life with our fantastic restaurants, museums, and entertainment.

In 2014, 750 buses transported 37,000 employees 25 million miles per year with the Bay Area to Silicon Valley at a \$249,000 operating cost per bus. This Door-to-Door, Culture of Convenience deteriorates the environment. Only the elite have a nice commute. By November 2020, the private fleet grew to 1,020, the seventh largest bus system in the Bay Area. This discouraged public transportation officials and sapped political energy, thus outsourcing a regional public transportation revolution to Private buses.

San Francisco is the Silicon Valley bedroom community, resulting in steep escalating rents near bus stops, thus linking the housing shortage and rising inequality.

In effect, the private commuter buses are large taxi cabs with employees working while on the public road space. They operate untaxed. However a \$250,00 Taxi Medallion must be acquired to operate a Taxi on San Francisco Streets. The private commuter buses also should be assessed an operational tax to operate in San Francisco.

Thank you.

Paula Katz



Fw: Item 12 SFCTA

'Edward Mason' via CAC <cac@sfcta.org> Reply-To: Edward Mason <zabredala3@yahoo.com> To: SFCTA CAC <cac@sfcta.org>

Wed, May 24, 2023 at 4:02 PM

Public Comment for Commuter Shuttle. Thank you, Ed Mason

Subject: Item 12 SFCTA

Almost 20 years ago the commuter buses disregarded all regulations, doubled parked and occupied MUNI bus stops. Rental advertisements stressed "close to tech stop" raising the monthly rents.

There was no environmental impact report during the Commuter Bus Pilot Program. Exhaust, loud engine and air conditioning noise, idling and unproductive shuttle bus dead heading increasing fuel consumption, Double Parking, Staging and Idling for a time point departure blocking traffic lanes and impeding Muni were not considered.

Wide turns into opposing traffic create "intersection stalemate" and traffic/Muni delay. Operation on 3 ton restricted streets violates traffic laws.

On site Enforcement was about 2 hours per day by a Parking Control Officer. Now one Mobility Inspector (previously a Taxi Inspector) is on site about 45 minutes on Thursdays, one day a week. Citations and revenue are down.

Storer 442 has been observed and reported since September 2021 and continues to operate without a permit along with other non permitted buses.

Proposition 218 applies to Below the Line property tax bill for government services. This cost neutrality has been applied to the \$8.60 stop fee charge rather than calculating the culture of convivence cost of carbon that is offloaded on San Francisco residents. The Non Point Source Damage at 24th and Castro to the pavement and Continental Crosswalk is extensive. The Rail Slapping at 24th and Church was replaced in four years. 100 buses were authorized in the AM. A Conga line of 42 buses between 7 - 8am congested the 24 Street neighborhood.

The dedicated exclusive free white zone pick up location has escaped the possessory tax for the market rate value. MTA is loosing potential revenue and should charge market rate value.

WE ALL PAY FOR COMMUTER BUS OPERATIONS. The estimated yearly \$250,000 Charter costs per bus is a tax deductible expense.

* Lowers corporate net taxable income thus reducing tax paid paid by corporation

* Less corporate tax paid increases National and State debt we the residents have to pay.

Companies refuse to share buses to a common general destination for fear of employee poaching. Another cost of environmental inefficiency we all pay for.

Current Low ridership of 4 Thousand vs almost 13 Thousand FY 19 should transfer to under utilized CalTrain for the environmental consideration. Their culture of convivence and the cost of carbon to ride near empty Commuter buses is offloaded on others.

Otherwise the Commuter Bus Taxi Cab should be assessed a TAXI MEDALLION FEE of \$250,000 to operate on the streets of San Francisco.



Fwd: RE Item 12: SFMTA Commuter Shuttle Bus Program

SFCTA Info <info@sfcta.org> To: Clerk of the Transportation Authority <clerk@sfcta.org> Wed, May 24, 2023 at 4:18 PM

San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Office: 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org



sfcta.org | sign up for our newsletter

----- Forwarded message ------

From: anastasia Yovanopoulos <shashacooks@yahoo.com>

Date: Wed, May 24, 2023 at 11:33 AM

Subject: RE Item 12: SFMTA Commuter Shuttle Bus Program

To: info@sfcta.org <info@sfcta.org>

My comment re: Item 12: SFMTA Commuter Shuttle Bus Program

I reside at 24th/Dolores Street along the corporate shuttle bus route. In the p.m. passengers are dropped off the corporate shuttle buses just steps from my apartment.

Neighborhood rents have gone up exponentially because landlords can ask the techies, who like living in the city and having the perk of free transportation to and from work, to pay exorbitant amounts of money for rent.

The corporations, who are providing the transportation for their employees, get to write off the cost of the buses from their taxes. They have \$0 in expenses for the bus program, because it is all tax deductible. Meanwhile, ordinary San Franciscans cannot afford high rents that landlords can extract from tech workers, and as a consequence of the invasion of tech workers who are using San Francisco as their bedroom community, there is a shortage of affordable housing for the city's residents-which creates a great issue of displacement of our low income, senior, disabled and BIPOC communities.

Corporate buses inflict major wear & tear to our streets, and our city bears the cost of repairing them. Corporate entities bear no responsibility for the cost of repairs.

The realities of polluted air, traffic congestion, and transit delays the over-sized corporate buses that have commandeered our neighborhood streets cannot be overlooked or underestimated

It's time for these corporate entities to stop getting away with a free ride. Our economy has been thrown out of wack, by catering to corporate giants, who give nothing in return.

Sincerely, Anastasia Yovanopoulos District #8 tenant