

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: YES to Items 60 [file 200903] and 68 [file 201000]
Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2020 8:12:40 AM
Attachments: [MTA CEQA continuancertf.rtf](#)

From: zrants <zrants@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2020 8:56 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Fewer, Sandra (BOS) <sandra.fewer@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: YES to Items 60 [file 200903] and 68 [file 201000]

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

September 28, 2020

President Norman Yee and Members San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

re: Support for either a continuance or support for MTA CEQA appeals as described on Items 60-68 on the September 29. Board of Supervisors Agenda.

PROCEDURAL OBJECTIONS:

BOS FILE 200903"Temporary Emergency Transit Lanes"

BOS FILE 200987 "Panhandle Social Distancing and Safety Project"

BOS FILE 201000 MTA "Emergency Temporary Street Changes Program"

BOS FILE 201024 "Slow Streets -Phase 3"

Reasons for continuance were sent in a letter last week that I will attached below for reference. I believe that the only ways to regain the trust of the public is to treat them and their time with respect you anticipate from them. I will make no rude remarks against people and I hope to receive the same treatment from you.

Procedural problems with the way the CEQA appeals are being packaged into a single appeal were on my list of concerns before I read Mary Miles letter. Even a non-legal professional can see problems with combining multiple appeals in this manner. Not only are the MTA CEQA appeals being bundled in a non-conforming manner, but, there are other non-transit CEQA appeals that are been treated in a similar manner.

We understand the stress everyone is under and the desire to run through what some consider routine objections with haste, but any erratic procedural actions may not look so good if the cases are taken to a higher level at a later date, therefore, we request a continuance on these cases to allow more time to unwrap the complicated issues that are vexing the public.

File 200903: Proposed MTA's Transportation Recovery Plan: COVID-19 Emergency Temporary Transit Lanes and Bikeways Project, **re: the closure of Twin Peaks to motor vehicles appears to have been somewhat relaxed if we believe the reports we see in the media. The streets will be re-opened to motor vehicles from 6-10PM. This is the sort of compromise we should be seeing more often. We don't need winners and losers we need people united around common goals. The number one goal should be peace right now.**

File 200987: Municipal Transportation Agency's Panhandle Social Distancing and Safety project:

This project should be subject to the normal public approval process before it is implemented, yet no proper procedure is evident. Feel Street is a major east west artery that connects neighborhoods. There are extensive bike paths inside the parks, but, the major issue we have is the lack of public involvement in the decision-making process. Perhaps there is room for compromise here as well.

File 200987: Statutory exemption from CEQA is claimed by the Planning Department under COVID-19 related emergencies. Yet, some of the projects claiming to be emergencies looks more like pilot projects, as they were announced and developed prior to the pandemic, and they are financed in a manner more reminiscent of a pilot project. We note that the end date for the emergencies extends four months after the emergency, and steps to make some of these changes more permanent are already being discussed. It appears that the Planning and the SFMTA are attempting to create some kind of hybrid between emergency program and pilot project and the public is left out of the entire process.

File 201024: "Slow Streets -Phase 3" Which of the many CEQA claims are being made with regard to the Slow Streets programs? Is this an emergency or a pilot project? How does one tell the difference between one closed street and another?

Not sure which program this one fits but, one of the worst problems the SFMTA has created for everyone is the mess at Church and Market Street. This was mentioned earlier as an example of a planned program that was hastily re-packaged as an emergency to make the trains run faster by re-routing some of the lines. Passengers are forced to transfer between buses trains to make the trains faster. As we all know, the trains are not working now so why is this program that everyone objects to still in place?

By forcing cars off of Church Street, and not allowing anyone to cross Market, and forcing pedestrians to transfer in the middle of market street, the SFMTA has created a nightmare for everyone and managed to close more struggling businesses. I am reiterating what you all know as a reminder that the public blames you for their problems. It may not be your fault, but, if you fail to listen and do what you can to return Market and Church to the public they may retaliate when you ask them for more money.

Please consider a continuance of these matters or accept the appeals and give the public the voice they desperately need right now.

Sincerely,

Mari Eliza

September 24, 2020

Supervisors,

re: Shortened Public Response Time creates a Headache for Everyone.

Yesterday, the public requested a two week or longer continuance to properly prepare for multiple MTA CEQA appeals. As you know we were only granted a week. This hardly seems fair and shows little respect for the public the city officials are elected to serve and staff is hired to support.

We have heard a lot of concern over wasted MTA and government staff time. Where is the concern for the public's time? Where is the support for the public's voice as jobs and security are threatened by changes that confuse and disrupt their lives? The last thing we need is more changes.

The timing and number of appeals filed immediately after MTA plans are approved are directly linked to the shortened response time the public has to file an appeal. The best way to curtail the appeals and save everyone's time is to extend the time limit to file an appeal.

City agencies have months or years to plan their

approach to our futures, but the public has very little time to react when the plans revealed, and even less as they unfold. If we had longer to review and analyze the projects, or, if there were a reliable method to mitigate the damage other than filing an appeal, you might file less appeals.

Why not extend the MTA CEQA appeal time? Allowing a 6 month window of opportunity to give the public time to see how the project works before filing a CEQA complaint. Give businesses 6 months to gather data on the effects the changes have on their businesses before filing an appeal.

Alternately, the rigid requirements and filing limitations under Ordinance 180098, should also be relaxed and explained better in the media. In some cases that method of managing curb space may result in better solutions for everyone. But, we are not there yet. It is up to the Board of Supervisors to amend the ordinance or create better avenues for the public to seek relief from SFMTA projects that results in loss of business or other problems. How, for instance, does the public request the return of a bus stop or a bus route?

The public does not trust MTA to follow their own plans. All businesses look to the the red lanes on Mission Street were not included in the original test zones. The SFMTA put them in anyway, along with forced turns

that killed a thriving commercial community.

Each time we turn around and see plans to remove another bus stop, parking space, or plant an unwanted rental bike stand on our streets, our only option is to file an appeal. So we do.

In November the voters who oppose the SFMTA will have the option to vote against further funding of the public transit systems. Accepting higher cost on anything will not be popular among the recently unemployed and underemployed who are barely able to pay the rent.

Please show some respect for the public request for at least a two week continuance, and consider how this board may allow the public either more time to file MTA CEQA appeals, or establish a new method for fixing the most vexing miscalculations that anger the neighbors and kill the businesses.

Mari