

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 10 letters regarding File No. 210820
Date: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 9:27:15 AM
Attachments: [10 letters regarding File No. 210820.pdf](#)

Hello,

Attached are 10 letters regarding File No. 210820.

File No. 210820: Resolution urging the Municipal Transportation Agency to reinstate all transit lines and restore pre-Covid service hours by December 31, 2021, and release by August 31, 2021, a written plan for restoration of all lines and service.

Regards,

John Bullock
Board of Supervisors - Clerk's Office
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: [Dan Pucillo](#)
To: [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]; Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Restoring the J Church to its past glory.
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 12:20:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Bravo to Supervisor Preston and Supervisor Chan for their resolution urging SFMTA to reinstate pre-COVID Muni service by December 31, 2021.

As a born, raised, 78 year old male still living in The City, it is important to me that changes made to the J Church route which I have used for the last 48 years be reinstated.

I don't use the J Church as often as I once did because of my age, but creating the new transfer point does not make it safe or easy for downtown access.

Like many other seniors, my mobility has diminished over the years. The new transfer point is dangerous and the added walking is difficult on my weak knees. The added possibility of waiting and standing on another transit car does not make for an enjoyable, comfortable, or safe ride.

I feel The City has been reducing access to older residents, but this is an issue of safety. Please consider restoring the J Church to its past glory.

Thank You,

Dan Pucillo
1751 Sanchez Street

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Sue Vaughan](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 210820 RE: My public comment for Item 2 today
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 2:26:56 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

By copy of this message, I am forwarding your comments to the board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org email address, and it will be sent to the members of the Board of Supervisors.

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4445

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a virtual meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Sue Vaughan <selizabethvaughan@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 1:11 PM
To: Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: My public comment for Item 2 today

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Items 1 and 2: Supervisors, I don't know why I was not able to give public comment.

My points that I would have shared:

- 1) Let's work on some progressive ballot measures to get Muni some dedicated annual operating and service expansion funds as part of our climate emergency strategy;
- 2) Please conduct an audit of SFMTA finances;
- 3) Can anyone introduce legislation to require staff to take oaths before they give presentations to elected and appointed officeholders?
- 4) Agree with Aex Lanstberg -- I am very concerned about plans to pull down our overhead wires and replace a system that works with battery operated electric buses with materials sourced from who knows what mine pits in unknown parts of the world
- 5) Re. the 28 -- I believe it's due for full restoration to Golden Gate Bridge. That's good. Bridge is a major tourist destination. At the same time, let's work on enforcement -- getting those Ubers and Lyfts out of that Visitor Center bus stop.

Thank you.

Sue Vaughan

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); welchsf@pacbell.net
Subject: File No. 210820 FW: item 2 23 July agenda
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 2:28:38 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

By copy of this message, I am forwarding your comments to the board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org email address, and it will be sent to the members of the Board of Supervisors.

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4445

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a virtual meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Calvin Welch <welchsf@pacbell.net>
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 8:25 AM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: item 2 23 July agenda

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mr. Carroll

Could you please include the letter in the boards file on this item (#2 23 July Agenda?)

Thanks calvin welch

Supervisor Dean Preston, Chair
Government Audit and Oversight Committee
Board of Supervisors
City Hall,
July 22, 2021

In Support of Item 2, July 23 Agenda: "Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021"

On behalf of the Board of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council we urge the adoption of item 2 on today's agenda and its reference to the full Board of Supervisors for its consideration on July 27th.

Two of the six main Muni transit lines serving our neighborhood, the 21 Hayes and the 6 Parnassus, have been closed for over a year. The SFMTA has not announced when or if these lines will ever be re-opened. These lines carry a combined peak hour ridership of over 14,000 people each workday when in full operation. In effect these lines have been "abandoned" without public hearing or specific comment by the SFMTA. No plans have been announced by the SFMTA on when or how to increase the capacity of the 5, 7, 33 or 43 lines, now in partial operation, to make up for this loss of public transit.

The Constructive Abandonment of the 6 and 21 Lines Violates MUNI's "Transit Equity" Policy

Both lines are listed as key transit lines in the "equity strategy" of MUNI aimed at serving low income transit reliant San Franciscans. Indeed, both lines are in the top 15 of all Muni lines in carrying senior and disabled San Franciscans, two key populations meant to be served in MUNI's "transit equity" policy adopted in May of 2014. MUNI has announced no plans on how it proposes to restore service to these specific populations. What it has announced is that after the August service increase, excluding the 6 and 21, "98% of residents and 100% of equity neighborhoods *could* [emphasis added] be within a 1/4 mile of a Muni stop", a statement of little meaning to seniors and other with mobility issues who are supposed to be a core constituency of "transit equity".

The Constructive Abandonment of the 6 and 21 Lines contradicts Breed Administration Previously Announced Policy of Support for UCSF Expansion, A "Car Free" Kennedy Drive and "Transit Oriented Housing Development"

UCSF massive expansion at its Parnassus campus will result in a 50% increase in daily person trips to 52,000 a day with an increase of peak hour vehicle trips from currently 14,900 to 28,000 a day. The Breed administration supported that expansion based upon commitments made in the EIR of the

project to, among other things, "maintain existing bus stops on Parnassus" (mainly the 6) and to "advocate for ...increases for public transit ridership". . In addition the Breed Administration signed an MOU with UCSF in January of this year, that committed UCSF to make a "transportation contribution" "to increase the capacity and frequency of service ... of Muni lines, services and facilities provided by SFMTA that directly serve Campus community".

Does the abandonment of the 6 line undermine that contribution. The project EIR states that fully one third of the faculty and staff take public transit to the site and just over a fourth drive. Does the abandonment of the 6 line mean even more staff will drive to work?

The Breed administration, has strongly supported the permanent closing of Kennedy Drive to cars, a push led by her Recreation and Parks Department and her SFMTA. Those of us in the neighborhood, while in support of that goal, have asked just what increases in public transit are planned to ensure mobility impaired San Franciscans have access to Golden Gate Park and our neighborhood would not see a dramatic increase in car traffic as folks circle the park looking for parking. There has been no direct answer to these questions. But abandoning the 21 line, which serves the eastern edge of the Park, is certainly an answer we did not anticipate. Closing Kennedy Drive to cars and REDUCING public transit access will result in even more cars circling our neighborhood looking for parking and raises real access equity issues about the closing.

Mayor Breed has been insistent on increasing housing densities along transit corridors. Indeed, the Haight-Ashbury, historically well served by public transit, has been identified as one of the neighborhoods she would like to have residential density increased. By reducing bus and trolley lines by one third, with no plans to increase service of the remaining two thirds, undermines the entire justification for these density increases.

The HANC Board urges the passage of Item 2 and its adoption by the full Board on July 27th.

Calvin Welch
Housing and Land use Member,
Board of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Thanks

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Rachel Pettus](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File Nos. 210748 and 210820 - RE: Muni Green Division Operator Parking Elimination
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 2:29:31 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

By copy of this message, I am forwarding your comments to the board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org email address, and it will be sent to the members of the Board of Supervisors.

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4445

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a virtual meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

 Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Rachel Pettus <rachel.pettus@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2021 11:26 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Muni Green Division Operator Parking Elimination

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Why has the parking for 9163 Transit Operators at the SFMTA Green Light Rail Division been permanently eliminated for Transit Operators only while other muni workers that do not provide functions that can critically impact service continue to be allowed to park in the SFMTA parking garage on Ocean Avenue?

Due to the housing crisis, most operators can not afford to live in San Francisco and they definitely cannot afford to pay an additional \$200 a month on top of their current commute and housing costs, which the agency has poorly proposed.

A lot of operators have children who they must transport to and from school and/or childcare and due to time constraints of school and BART schedules, and safety of themselves and their children being left to navigate public transportation in San Francisco by themselves along with traveling to work from outside of San Francisco, Public Transportation is not a viable option. Walking in San Francisco during early morning and late hours is also unsafe due the rising number of assaults, robberies, and property thefts in the city.

These operators rely on this parking. It is critical due to parking constraints in the area and most critical for the operators to be able continue delivering on time service.

If parking is cut, we will see an increase in operator absences and a significant impact to service. By taking away operator parking, it is making operators choose between taking care of themselves, their children, loved ones, worrying about their safety, and coming to work.

Is the elimination of parking necessary? Parking hasn't been an issue pre-pandemic so why is SFMTA making such a poor decision that can impact Light Rail and F Line Service?

Operators are employees that have diligently worked throughout the pandemic without much protection or a vaccination and continue to jeopardize their health to provide service.

Why are we penalizing good employees that continue to risk their lives to keep the city moving.

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: ksetian@sbcglobal.net; [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File Nos. 210748 and 210820 - FW: Comments to Government Oversight Committee
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 2:31:27 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

By copy of this message, I am forwarding your comments to the board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org email address, and it will be sent to the members of the Board of Supervisors.

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4445

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a virtual meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: KATHY SETIAN <ksetian@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2021 5:07 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comments to Government Oversight Committee

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Comments to Government Oversight Committee

Regarding Restoration of Service on J-Church Line

Supervisors Preston, Chan and Mandelman,

I write in support of Supervisor Preston's and Supervisor Chan's resolution urging SFMTA to reinstate pre-COVID Muni service by December 31, 2021.

I am particularly concerned that the J-Church is now terminating at Market/Church/Duboce, and that SFMTA is proposing to make this service cut permanent. It was stated that SFMTA needed to reduce the number of trains they turn around in the subway based on pre-pandemic ridership and train frequency. For people in the neighborhoods served by the J-Church, this causes many problems:

- We would permanently need to transfer to get downtown, losing the direct service that helped make our neighborhoods attractive places to live
- Transferring at Market Street to the underground requires crossing busy streets like Market Street to get to the elevator, regardless of any surface improvements.
- There are additional impacts to seniors and people with disabilities: no escalators at Church/Market to the underground, and limited or no seating on the inbound subway for seniors/disabled because those seats are already occupied on trains from the Sunset.
- The forced transfer is also an obstacle for families with children, shoppers with bags, and people coming home from evening cultural events downtown.

SFMTA is conducting a survey, but has NOT reached out to all communities served by the J-Church, and the survey is deceptive in several ways:

- It is not until Question #9 that they ask if we want the transfer point to be made permanent. This question should be more prominent and transparent.
- They do NOT ask about the importance of having a direct line to downtown without needing to transfer, while they DO ask about the importance of not being delayed in traffic. MTA should be surveying the ridership about the relative importance of BOTH of these objectives.
- They do NOT ask how often we rode the J to go downtown before the pandemic, nor do they ask how often we plan to go downtown in the future. They only ask us to rate the quality of service since May 2021 when the transfer point was initiated.
- They obscure a dramatic service cut by labeling it "improvements" to an unwanted transfer point, and using phrases like "help the J-Church" and "benefit those who rely on Muni".

Given the decreased ridership due to many people permanently working from home either full or part-time, SFMTA should reconsider restoring direct service. At a minimum, the J streetcars should go through the subway during off-peak hours when many seniors go downtown. Additionally, if the Mayor and the Supervisors want to rejuvenate the downtown area that has been devastated by the pandemic, they should look at ways of making downtown more accessible to all.

Kathy Setian

1783 Sanchez St., SF, CA 94131

Homeowner, 50-year Muni Rider

From: [Bob Planthold](#)
To: [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Fieber, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [clerk@sfcta.org](#)
Cc: [Bob Planthold](#); [cgraf@sfexaminer.com](#); [Joe Eskenazi](#); [tim@48hills.org](#); [Rebecca Rosen Lum](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Temprano, Tom \(BOS\)](#); [Bintliff, Jacob \(BOS\)](#); [Mundy, Erin \(BOS\)](#); [Adkins, Joe \(BOS\)](#); [Mullan, Andrew \(BOS\)](#); [Donovan, Dominica \(BOS\)](#); [Abraham, Emily \(BOS\)](#); [Falzon, Frankie \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Zou, Han \(BOS\)](#); [Mahogany, Honey \(BOS\)](#); [Barnett, Monica \(BOS\)](#); [Monge, Paul \(BOS\)](#); [Beinart, Amy \(BOS\)](#); [Lerma, Santiago \(BOS\)](#); [Li-D9, Jennifer \(BOS\)](#); [Burch, Percy \(BOS\)](#); [Gallardo, Tracy \(BOS\)](#); [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#); [Evans, Abe \(BOS\)](#); [Morris, Geoffrea \(BOS\)](#); [Chung, Lauren \(BOS\)](#); [Berenson, Samuel \(BOS\)](#); [ernest.jones@sfgov.org](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: YES on Item 70 [file 210820] MTA memo IGNORES providing transit to disabled for major destinations
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 4:46:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supes.,

DO please PASS item 70, without weakening.

MTA blithely passed off a 20 July memo as fully accurate,

while separately orally stating how MTA restoration planning

included serving people with disabilities.

NOT SO!

The 20 July memo states how the 21 line is paralleled by the 5 & 5R,

as an implied justification for not yet restoring the 21 line.

Yet, the 21 line is the PRIMARY line serving St. Mary's Hospital, such that

ADA requirements to call out "major destinations" includes such hospitals as St. Mary's.

[Yes, the 33 also serves St. Mary's. but at 15 min. intervals and

primarily from lower Potrero Hill and the Inner Mission.]

NOT restoring the 21-line makes for a perilous trip from

North Beach, Chinatown, Downtown, SOMA, and Civic Center

to get downhill or struggle uphill to/ from the 5 , 5R lines--

for adults with babies in strollers and for people with mobility or balance problems.

Similarly, the analysis about not replacing the 6 line [because the 7 parallels it]

also lacks practicality.

The 7 does not directly serve UCSF Parnassus campus.

For any coming from the Inner Mission /Mission Dolores or Inner Haight area,

via 24 or 22, to Parnassus would require a transfer to the 7 and then again to the 43.

More transfers and crossing more intersections is NOT responsive to the limitations of people with disabilities.

MTA's memo ignores the reality of those in need.

Please ignore the analyses of the 20 July MTA memo.

PASS Item 70 on the 29 July agenda.

Bob Planthold

From: [Robert Feinbaum](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Item 70 - Reinstate All Transit Lines
Date: Saturday, July 24, 2021 10:47:46 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To: San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Date: JULY 24, 2021
Re: Item 70 - Reinstate All Transit Lines

SaveMUNI supports full restoration of pre-pandemic Muni service. We believe that every neighborhood deserves fast, safe, frequent transit and that removing bus or streetcar lines has a detrimental effect on the integrity of the city's transit system.

Unfortunately MTA has moved away from its mission of providing excellent transit for all of San Francisco. We reject Mr. Tumlin's "Goldilocks" analogy - there is no magical compromise that provides the perfect level of service. The only way forward for a "Transit First" city is to commit to a comprehensive, integrated network of rail and bus lines that serves the entire city with the goal of providing 5 minute service on major routes and assuring every neighborhood access to transit that its tax dollars are supporting.

Transit service is SFMTA's highest priority. If the agency has to scale back other functions in order to assure excellent service then the agency has to make the tough choices necessary to do just that. After all, great transit service is the ONLY alternative that can provide all San Franciscans with the ability to move about the city without the use of an automobile. .

From: [zrants](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Reopen the streets and return the Muni service for those who need it
Date: Saturday, July 24, 2021 12:26:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

July 24, 2021

Supervisors,

Re: Item 70 - Reinstate All Transit Lines. The public needs a reliable transit system.

Open the streets and bring back the Muni service.

We support full restoration of pre-pandemic Muni lines. We believe that every neighborhood deserves fast, safe, frequent transit and that removing bus or streetcar lines has a detrimental effect on the integrity of the city's transit system. If some areas, such as the downtown do not need the same amount of service due to decrease in use, service may be better moved elsewhere, but, the lines should remain in place.

SFMTA has moved away from its mission of providing transit for all of San Francisco. We reject Mr. Tumlin's plan to re-hire planners for an unknown future when we need to reboot the transit system today. The only way forward for a "Transit First" city is to commit to a comprehensive, integrated network of rail and bus lines that serves the entire city with the goal of providing reliable service on major routes and assuring every neighborhood access to transit is to focus spending resources on the immediate needs of the public.

Drop the focus on PR and planning. Just get the transit system up and running.

Transit service must be SFMTA's highest priority. In order to assure reliable service and win back riders, the agency has to focus on the present needs of the citizens. Drop all the consultants and non-muni projects until the Muni is running.

Mari Eliza

Concerned Citizen and Chair of CSFN Land Use and Transportation Committee

From: [anastasia Yovanopoulos](#)
To: [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides; Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support reinstating transit lines & written plan for restoration of transit lines & services.
Date: Saturday, July 24, 2021 5:34:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisor Mandelman,

As your constituent, I am alarmed that you've yet to support the BOS resolution sponsored by your colleagues Supervisors Preston and Chan **urging M T A to reinstate all transit lines and restore pre-Covid service hours by December 31, 2021, and release by August 31, 2021, a written plan for restoration of all lines and services.**

From the testimony of transit riders who depend on MUNI at the GOA special hearing on 7/23/2021, it was overwhelmingly clear that **now is the time to bring back the drivers and restore all the MUNI lines people rely on.** People need to get to their jobs and appointments without having to resort to alternative modes of transportation to get them there. Alternative modes are costly, and add to the climate crisis we are intent on solving.

It's shameful you are failing to first consider the needs of the most transit dependent constituents in your District: disabled and mobility challenged residents, and those constituents who need to get to work on time.

The "J-Church turn around" at Market Street program does not improve transit service for any J-Church MUNI riders at all. All J-Church riders including seniors and those with mobility challenges are forced to get off the MUNI car at Market Street, navigate complex traffic hurdles to get across streets, go down 2 long staircases or stand out in the elements for an uncertain amount of time.

This policy discriminates against J-Church riders with mobility problems and every other J-Church rider. We do not want have our commute interrupted by getting off the car in the middle of a trip. Those of us who rely on MUNI to get to our jobs will likely find the trip so unreliable and inconvenient that we'll abandon the idea of taking public transportation. Those of us with mobility challenges won't be able to get to our medical, dental and therapy appointments downtown, or bring groceries home from stores downtown anymore. Your constituents on fixed income can't afford to pay for cab rides and tips to and from their destinations.

SFMTA Directors at the hearing pointed to more problems than assurances that the pilot program to turn the J Church around at Market Street would have on improving MUNI service for J Church riders. **The J-Church route needs to be restored to it's**

full length from Balboa station to Embarcadero station in both directions.

Supervisor Mandelman: For the sake of all your constituents,

1. I urge you to advocate for a full service restoration of the J-Church MUNI line from Balboa to Embarcadero Station and back.
2. AND I urge you to support the aforementioned resolution.

It is not unreasonable to urge the SFMTA to restore service and provide the public with a written plan for accomplishing it.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Yovanopoulos
D 8 senior tenant

From: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Sue Vaughan](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No 210820 - RE: July 23, 2021; Government Audit and Oversight Committee, Item 2
Date: Thursday, July 22, 2021 3:32:28 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

By copy of this message, I am forwarding your comments to the board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org email address, and it will be sent to the members of the Board of Supervisors.

John Carroll
Assistant Clerk

Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-4445

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a virtual meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

 Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Sue Vaughan <selizabethvaughan@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2021 1:43 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>
Subject: July 23, 2021; Government Audit and Oversight Committee, Item 2

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Item 2, Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre-Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021 -- Support

Dear Supervisors Preston, Chan, and Mandelman,

Supervisors Chan and Preston, thank you so much for sponsoring this resolution to restore all pre-Covid service hours by the end of this year. Our city cannot recover economically without a vibrant public transportation system; nor can we reduce our greenhouse gas emissions without access to a comprehensive, appealing, and affordable system of mass transit. As to finding the resources to do this, let's consider a citywide Muni support parcel tax and/or a corporate wealth tax, similar to Prop. C from a few years ago.

Sue Vaughan
District 1

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #70 [Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre-Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021] File #210820
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 5:26:01 PM

210820

Alisa Somera

Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

**Disclosures:** *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2021 1:15 PM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org>; BOS-Administrative Aides <bos-administrative-aides@sfgov.org>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** FW: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #70 [Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre-Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021] File #210820

---

**From:** aeboken <[aeboken@gmail.com](mailto:aeboken@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2021 10:24 AM

**To:** BOS-Supervisors <[bos-supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-supervisors@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Legislative Aides <[bos-legislative\\_aides@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org)>

**Subject:** SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #70 [Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre-Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021] File #210820

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly supporting this resolution and thank the members of the Government Audit and Oversight Committee for their robust discussion of this issue.

These are the robust discussions which should be taking place at the SFMTA Board but aren't.

At one SFMTA Board meeting, Board member Brinkman stated from the dais that she saw her role on the Board as supporting staff.

The following are my public comments made at the GAO Committee.

The SFMTA Director has described the agency's current operating plan as conservative.

He also previously stated that San Francisco is more conservative than Moscow.

So, it's unclear what the SFMTA's definition of conservative is.

Based on presentations at the Capital Planning Committee and the SFMTA Revenue Bond Oversight Committee, the SFMTA and the SFCTA will propose 3 (three) ballot initiatives in 2022; the reauthorization of the Prop K sales tax, a SFMTA General Obligation Bond and a SFMTA citywide Community Benefit District/parcel tax.

Is the slow pace of restoring service linked to these potential funding sources in the same way that Muni meltdowns of the late 1990s were linked to the passage of Prop E in 1999?

Is this an intentional strategy to keep service anemic to get voters to approve something?

The slow pace of return to service on the operations side isn't matched with the capital projects side.

Over the past several years, the SFMTA staff has reported to the SFMTA Revenue Bond Oversight Committee that there are 300 (Yes, I said 3 hundred) concurrent capital projects underway.

This information is contained in the Committee's slide decks and audio recordings.

Is the SFMTA prioritizing capital projects over operations?

Eileen Boken

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods\*

\* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

**From:** [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Carroll, John \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #70 [Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre-Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021] File #210820  
**Date:** Monday, July 26, 2021 1:16:57 PM

---

For File No. 210820.

***Jocelyn Wong***

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163  
[jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org](mailto:jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2021 1:15 PM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <[bos-supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-supervisors@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Legislative Aides <[bos-legislative\\_aides@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Administrative Aides <[bos-administrative-aides@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-administrative-aides@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <[junko.laxamana@sfgov.org](mailto:junko.laxamana@sfgov.org)>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <[wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org](mailto:wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org)>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <[bos.legislation@sfgov.org](mailto:bos.legislation@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** FW: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #70 [Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre-Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021] File #210820

---

**From:** aeboken <[aeboken@gmail.com](mailto:aeboken@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2021 10:24 AM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <[bos-supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-supervisors@sfgov.org)>; BOS-Legislative Aides <[bos-legislative\\_aides@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-legislative_aides@sfgov.org)>  
**Subject:** SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #70 [Urging to Reinstate All Transit Lines to Pre-Covid Service Hours by December 31, 2021] File #210820

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly supporting this resolution and thank the members of the Government Audit and Oversight Committee for their robust discussion of this issue.



These are the robust discussions which should be taking place at the SFMTA Board but aren't.

At one SFMTA Board meeting, Board member Brinkman stated from the dais that she saw her role on the Board as supporting staff.

The following are my public comments made at the GAO Committee.

The SFMTA Director has described the agency's current operating plan as conservative.

He also previously stated that San Francisco is more conservative than Moscow.

So, it's unclear what the SFMTA's definition of conservative is.

Based on presentations at the Capital Planning Committee and the SFMTA Revenue Bond Oversight Committee, the SFMTA and the SFCTA will propose 3 (three) ballot initiatives in 2022; the reauthorization of the Prop K sales tax, a SFMTA General Obligation Bond and a SFMTA citywide Community Benefit District/parcel tax.

Is the slow pace of restoring service linked to these potential funding sources in the same way that Muni meltdowns of the late 1990s were linked to the passage of Prop E in 1999?

Is this an intentional strategy to keep service anemic to get voters to approve something?

The slow pace of return to service on the operations side isn't matched with the capital projects side.

Over the past **several years**, the SFMTA staff has reported to the SFMTA Revenue Bond Oversight Committee that there are 300 (Yes, I said 3 hundred) concurrent capital projects underway.

This information is contained in the Committee's slide decks and audio recordings.

Is the SFMTA prioritizing capital projects over operations?

Eileen Boken

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods\*

\* For identification purposes only.

