



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Commission

DATE: September 25, 2013

FR: Executive Director

RE: Cycle 2/OneBay Area Grant (OBAG) Program Project Selections and Programming Revisions, MTC Resolution Nos. 4035, Revised; and TIP Amendment 2013-04, Resolution 4075, Revised

Subsequent to the Programming and Allocations Committee's (PAC) recommendations on September 11, 2013, staff received a letter from the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM), Exhibit 1, requesting that the following two projects be withdrawn from the OneBay Area Grant (OBAG) Program and companion amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program:

- North Civic Center Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (\$650,000 federal funds)
- Local PDA Planning – Marin County Civic Center Planning (\$150,000 federal funds)

The request will allow the TAM board to reconsider these projects following the recent action by the City of San Rafael to request removal of the PDA designation from the area associated with these projects. Staff recommends that the Commission approve these revisions to allow additional time for the TAM Board to consider its program and consistency with OBAG policies and for ABAG to consider formal action to revise the PDA designations, in light of the request by San Rafael.

Lastly, since the Committee meeting, additional comments have been received regarding the approval of the Masonic Complete Streets project in San Francisco, Exhibit 2, for your consideration. This project proposes to reduce the number of lanes, reduce parking and add bicycle facilities on Masonic Avenue in San Francisco.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the attached revision to Resolution Nos. 4035, Revised and 4075, Revised regarding the San Rafael PDA.

A blue ink signature of Steve Heminger, written over a horizontal line.

Steve Heminger

Attachments:

- Exhibit 1 – Letter from Transportation Authority of Marin
- Exhibit 2 – Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project
- MTC Resolution No. 4035, Revised Attachments B-1 and B-2



September 18, 2013

781 Lincoln Avenue
Suite 160
San Rafael
California 94901

Mr. Steve Heminger, Executive Director
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Phone: 415/226-0815
Fax: 415/226-0816

Subject: De-Listing San Rafael Civic Center PDA

www.tam.ca.gov

Dear Mr. Heminger,

Belvedere
Sandra Donnell

The City of San Rafael currently has a designated Planned Priority Development Areas (PDA) within its boundary in the Civic Center Drive area. This area has potential for mixed use development and contains an upcoming SMART station, and has been the subject of a good quality station area plan and re-zoning approved for mixed use. Nonetheless, on September 16, 2013, the Council for the City of San Rafael voted to remove the PDA designation from the Civic Center PDA. Note there are areas in Marin that are currently designated PDA's and will likely remain so.

Corte Madera
Diane Furst

Fairfax
John Reed

Larkspur
Dan Hillmer

Prior to the San Rafael Council's September 16th decision, TAM had recommended programming \$150,000 of our available \$750,000 in PDA Planning Funds to the Civic Center PDA, to a bike/ped/bus transit access project connecting to the upcoming new SMART Station. Given that the PDA Planning Funds are intended to conduct planning projects in PDAs, San Rafael's decision disqualifies the Civic Center project from receiving PDA Planning Funds. TAM requests MTC not take action to program these funds.

Mill Valley
Stephanie Moulton-Peters

Novato
Eric Lucan

Ross
P. Beach Kuhl

Also programmed to the Civic Center bike/ped/transit access project was an additional \$650,000 in Marin's OBAG funds, which TAM programmed as part of Marin's PDA quota. While these funds may stay with the project, staff is uncertain at this time of that decision. TAM will take up whether it can meet the PDA quota via re-programming in a TAM board meeting later this fall.

San Anselmo
Ford Greene

San Rafael
Gary Phillips

In the meantime, TAM suggests MTC not program the \$650,000 through the Commission. We request the project and funds remain in the TIP if possible, until such time TAM decides on how best to meet the OBAG quota for PDA's.

Sausalito
Herb Weiner

Sincerely,

Tiburon
Alice Fredericks

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'D. Steinhauser'. The signature is fluid and cursive, written over the typed name and title.

Dianne Steinhauser
Executive Director

County of Marin
Susan L. Adams
Katie Rice
Kathrin Sears
Steve Kinsey
Judy Arnold

cc: Alice Fredericks, TAM Chair
Steve Kinsey, Supervisor Marin County
Nancy Mackle, City Manager City of San Rafael

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 1 of 44

Date: 9/10/2013 3:55 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 4(b) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - Programming and Allocations Committee, September 11, 2013”

Dear Ms Hughes,

Regarding the Masonic Ave project:

This is a ill conceived disastrous, short-sighted plan that clearly sounds like it was hatched by a small group of people with a single agenda.

Masonic is THE major north/west corridor in the Western part of the city. It links to Bush and Pine - another major corridor. Traffic flows - is there something wrong with that?

Outcome - more pollution generated by the traffic regularly moving/not moving at a crawl.

More car traffic spilling into neighborhood side streets.

Millions spent on such a narrow-focused project that produces a new set of problems.

This makes NO sense for this thoroughfare - is this city planning?!!! Has this been studied be a professional?

I can only see this as a nightmare for the whole city but especially for the residents in this area.

I urge you NOT to approve this.

Thank you for considering my point of view.

Cathy Cohn

Date: 9/11/2013 11:24 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 4(b) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - Programming and Allocations Committee, September 11, 2013”

Dear Committee, supervisors Weiner and Campos, the full Board of Supervisors, the Planning department, the mayor

As a long time resident that lives a block away from Masonic Avenue and an avid cyclist I can say this plan to fix Masonic is not sound on many accounts and I ask that it be sent back to the drawing board.

The MTA has concocted a simple solution to very complex problem.

To start with;

The Planning Department allowed a Target to be built in the space that housed Mervyns. They sited that no EIR was needed, a retail-to-retail use, therefore it is exempt. That might be

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 2 of 44

acceptable in some situations, but when you also factor in that on the very same street that you allowing a huge trip generator such as Target, and then allow the MTA to take away a traffic lane in both directions, then it becomes disingenuous.

It is also a lie for the reason that will be between 500- 600 parking spaces. In providing ample parking, it will bring many (driving) shoppers there. How can you offer that much parking and take away traffic lanes? It's nothing less than contradictory.

Another point is that the only traffic study the MTA did was their own; they did not use any third party traffic consulting. The traffic monitoring they conducted was in 2010, which stated that 32,000 cars a day use Masonic. What the traffic study did not explain was that in 2010, both Mervyns and the Good Guys (a former tenant of the Masonic- Geary complex) had long since been closed and so, that shopping center was not much of a trip generator. Only about half of the retail square footage was occupied.

They also did not do an in depth parking demand analysis. They did not aggregate the need of overnight parking, they did not take into consideration the density is greater and the demand is higher below Turk to Fell than it is from Turk to Geary. In the study they also did not state what time of the year the parking study was conducted. With both USF and the John Adams City College on summer schedules, the demand for student parking is considerably less June through end of August. Also the Blood Centers of the Pacific is housed right there at Turk and Masonic and from what I have been told, many of its staff do not live in San Francisco and will need to continue to drive to work and they will need parking.

We all want a safer street, but many of the recommendations this plan proposes do not guarantee safety. The cycle track has never been tested on a street like Masonic with its hills and so many driveways. Studies have indicated a raised cycle track used on streets with lots of right turns actually increases the prospect of car/ bike collisions

The suggested improvements to make the street safer are, to install a traffic signal at Ewing Terrace, Install a pedestrian countdown light at Turk & Masonic. Better visibility for pedestrians in the crosswalks, better lighting, especially along the Turk to Geary stretch. The street is also riddled with potholes, which make it unsafe at any speed for cars.

This plan should be put on hold for a period of 6 months (minimum) and let the Target open and we will then be able to access what new traffic volume and patterns we are now dealing with that the shoddy analysis the SFMTA did more than 3 years ago never took into consideration. A full independent third party study should be done on both the traffic volume and the parking demand along Masonic, broken down by sections of the street, not the East /West side breakdown the SFMTA did. It proved that the SFMTA has no idea of what the

I whole-heartedly ask that you do not push this plan forward, it is just not ready.

Vincent Pietromartire

Masonic Corridor Neighborhood Association (MCNA)

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 3 of 44

Date: 9/14/2013 3:14 PM

Subject: OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets: North South bike route needs three choices

Hello:

I live in the Haight (Broderick and Page) and want to my add my point of view to the discussion on the suggested idea of the north/south bike route be located on Masonic. What troubles me most, at this point, is that only one suggestion is being offered to accomplish this cross of San Francisco. Before any vote is even considered, there need to be two more recommendations. At that point there will be something to discuss. Yes, the bicyclists need a safe route across the City but let's see three choices first. Rather than having camps - yes or no on Masonic - let there be a meaningful discussion as a result of choices.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Ann Farris

Date: 9/16/2013 4:55 PM

Subject: Please stop the proposed cycle lane on Masonic, need parking

Please stop the proposed cycle lane on Masonic, need parking.

I live in Anza Vista on Terra Vista Avenue

The parking in our neighborhood is used by Kaiser and people visiting patients plus for local residents. USF students use the Masonic parking and will overflow into our area parking zone P.

The Masonic Cycle lane proposal will remove over 40 parking spaces from use on Masonic.

This will have a negative impact on our neighborhood parking situation.

Thank you for considering this matter

Alex Gauld

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 4 of 44

Date: 9/21/2013 7:40 AM

Subject: agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013”

I respectfully ask again that you reconsider your support of this project.. it is flawed in many ways, - the biased data that started the project. and of course that fact that it discriminates again the aged and handicapped- who do not use bicycles, Many of us baby boomers own and live in the City and do not have garages and cannot afford the \$300,00 to put in garages ... we do drive our cars to work to supplement retirement, and importantly walk, as not to lose a once found parking space and have been hit, injured and in some cases killed by bicyclists who have no regard for us. The fact that they have no insurance helps not with the medical bill incurred. I understand this project is moving forward because of the bicyclist coalition and federal funding that is available to make jobs; I appreciate these factors, and so would ask why does one group have to suffer

a loss of access when everyone's needs can be met by simply moving the project to Baker street?

Ethel Konopka

Date: 9/21/2013 9:07 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

I really wonder if government officials listen or just decide to spend money when it is shown them and someone else makes a profit. Do City Planning Graduates ever leave the classroom and live in the real world before making planning changes?

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Masonic Avenue cycle track project. This project will increase congestion on Masonic, especially during rush hour and especially with the increased traffic that will be generated by the new Target store, result in the loss of parking spaces for nearly 3/4 of a mile, increase pollution in the area, jeopardize public safety, and create a great hardship for neighborhood residents, especially those who live on or near Masonic. Also, San Francisco cannot afford to spend \$18 million on this project.

32,000 automobiles use Masonic daily, but only a small amount of cyclists. Rather than encourage cyclists to use one of the busiest north-south thoroughfares in San Francisco, they should be encouraged to use the route along nearby Baker Street, a safer route with far fewer motor vehicles.

Masonic can be improved by planting new trees, improving lighting and adding bus shelters, with much less hardship to the neighborhood and cost than the cycle track project.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 5 of 44

I am also concerned about the way the cycle track project was developed and approved. I live in the area but did not receive notice that this project was being considered, nor have I received notice of any meetings about it, including the MTA Board meeting at which it was approved.

Please stop this project ASAP, go back to the drawing board and consider a much smaller project to improve Masonic that does not involve the loss of parking spaces, the reduction of travel lanes and the outlay of \$18 million.

Thank you for considering this e-mail.

Sincerely

Cheers,
Misti

Date: 9/21/2013 9:08 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Dear transportation committee members,

I am contacting you to protest the raised bike path, particularly the elimination of all parking on Masonic Ave. I think the whole study did not consider the effect that the soon to open Target will have on the community, traffic, and how the elimination of parking, as well as the mini park at Geary and Masonic will hurt the people living on Masonic. I live behind the future park, across from the future Target, I rent a home without a garage. Once you eliminate all parking I will never be able to unload groceries, fill up my car for trips, or simply park in front of the place I live in. Due to the lack of safe parking areas (near homes not along the shopping mall streets where break-ins are easy) I will probably have to park blocks from my home on a daily basis, or I may have to rent a parking space.

I went to the final residential meeting. I got a strong impression that from the outset this project has been pushed through by the bicycle coalition, without regard for the people living on this street. The compromise option with parking retained on at least one side of Masonic should have appeased both residents and the coalition but the raised track was pushed through anyway.

Please reconsider this project, or at least do another study on its effects on the community.

Erika Ray

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 6 of 44

Date: 9/21/2013 9:48 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Dera Ms. Hughes,

Please don't fund the Masonic Avenue project. I am a resident of the area, and the stated safety improvements are based on assumptions. Mr Wiener has quoted many benefits but his statements are based on his own opinion not on hard data. The fact is that the vast majority of residents feel like the current status of Masonic Ave is suitable for our needs. The proposed changes will adversely affect the residents of this area. Masonic avenue is SAFE and there is never prolonged traffic congestion. PLEASE don't fund this project. It is a waste of tax payer money and one being pushed through by anecdotes.

Thank you.

Julian A. Castaneda

Date: 9/21/2013 10:33 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, Sept 25, 2013

Regarding the above subject and the upcoming meeting on Sept 25, 2013:

It is shocking that this project seems to be moving forward with so little research on the future REAL total use, compared to a tryout such as painting green bike lanes to see how many people really use the bike lanes and how it affects the whole neighborhood. MILLIONS of dollars will be miss-spent on a basically FLAWED plan. Some people will ride bikes and the remainder of us will be forced to tolerate an expensive construction mess, and eventually a bike lane for a small number of users, while we then have limited parking (in fact there is already very limited parking in most neighborhoods in San Francisco). In the REAL WORLD, parents take children around in a car, many of us must use our cars to shop and get around, many of us are unable to or do not choose to ride a bike.

Perhaps it is time to stop catering to and kowtowing to the young tech crowd, who may themselves, eventually decide that they want to drive cars also. Even when they bike ride, their goal seems to be to go as fast as possible, suiting their own selfish needs, looking out only for themselves. Since we are talking about SAFETY, maybe we should start with the bicyclists driving in a safer manner??? Maybe when they lose interest in the bike lane fad, the lanes will sit mostly unused, and then we can waste millions of dollars more, ripping up the mistake.

For example, today is RAINING, FOGGY, HOWLING WIND, (typical San Francisco weather), I just drove back from the neighborhood where it took a half hour to find a parking space to pick up some large items from a store (TOO large to put in a bicycle basket and schlepp back in the rain and wind). I did NOT SEE ANYONE BIKING, but saw plenty of frustrated drivers looking

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 7 of 44

for almost non-existent parking in this congested area, so they can do their errands, the unfortunate reality of trying to get around and park in this and all neighborhoods in the city, with the CONSTANT REMOVAL OF PARKING SPACES, and catering to this “special interest” group (young bike riders).

Instead of ripping up streets, there can be a bike lane on the street, TRY experimenting and also POLICE THE BIKERS, and give citations to those who drive unsafely.

I urge you NOT to proceed with this plan, and do further research on maintaining a simplistic bike lane, requiring bikers to drive safely, then evaluate again later.

Thank you,
Kathy Turnquist

Date: 9/21/2013 10:47 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

To Whom it May Concern,

Why would any city consider endangering bikers on a busy, fast, winding city street when there is a better, safer alternative, in this case, Baker St vs Masonic. Baker has less traffic, no buses and is just as graded as Masonic. I am seriously concerned about traffic congestion on Masonic, as a result of your proposal, the one street that drivers can currently rely on to cross the city fairly smoothly.

This plan needs reconsidering.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ann Papale

Date: 9/21/2013 11:00 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a)-OBAG-Masonic Avenue Complete Streets-MTC, 9/25/2013

Dear Commissioner:

I am writing to express my opposition to the structural changes and loss of parking along Masonic Avenue which are proposed.

I am both a cyclist and a driver, and while I support many of the improvements to bike infrastructure here in SF, I do not support this project at all. Masonic is one of the few north-south thoroughfares on that side of town that actually works (Divisadero is pretty, but horrible to

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 8 of 44

use since it was redone and the left-turn pockets removed.) I completely reject the idea that every single street needs to be made into a bicycle route. There are plenty of safe ways for bikes to get north and south, and cyclists should be encouraged to use those streets.

We've taken plenty of streets and slowed traffic way down to make things better for bikes, but we need a few car-preferential streets so people can actually get where they are going! And the loss of parking for folks in that neighborhood is so unnecessary.

I do bike on Masonic sometimes, and I don't think it's that bad, but it's not a street I would use (on my bike) during rush hour. Those who do are probably tempting fate, but they could just as easily go a block in either direction and find a much safer street. Bike infrastructure in SF is being treated as a "winner takes all" game in which the bike crazies are not happy until there are no streets on which cars can move efficiently, and I just think that's wrong and shortsighted.

I urge you to reject this proposal.

Sincerely,
David Troup

Date: 9/21/2013 11:51 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

PLEASE realize that there is more opposition to the Masonic Avenue project than support. SF Supervisor Scott Wiener is urging fellow members to approve the project, claiming that safety requires the loss of parking, rush-hour lane reduction and other elements of the cycle track project. It does not. If anything, congestion will be increased because of lane reduction during rush hour and parking removal.

Please consider these facts:

- Not only Masonic, but side streets also will be congested
- Target impact not analyzed; Environmental Impact Report is deficient
- Emergency response will be slowed down
- More congestion means more pollution
- Parking removal will create a major hardship
- Masonic can be made safer with better traffic signals, improved lighting, repaving, new curb ramps, better enforcement and other measures, while still retaining parking and the full amount of travel lanes
- Alternate bike route that includes Baker is less congested, has no buses, and is not steeper than Masonic
- Raised cycle track design is untested in these conditions, especially because of large number of driveways
- Inadequate/unfair notice

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 9 of 44

- There is significant opposition to the project, as evidenced by the petition

Consider us, the residents directly affected by this project. You need a more balanced, reasonable, and safe approach to Masonic Avenue project.

Judi Karwan

Date: 9/21/2013 1:18 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets

Dear MTC Members:

I'm one of an ever rarer breed in San Francisco: a middle-class working mother of three teenagers. We've stuck it out in the city despite a lot of daily challenges unknown to our peers in suburbia. The benefits of urban living are many, but there can come a tipping point. Plans like the one before you threaten the delicate balance that makes our lives manageable (some days, just barely!).

Families such as ours are forever on the go, racing from school to work to after-school programs to weekend games. We are often late and always mindful of the heavy traffic. It's stressful -- except for a few blessed thoroughfares that save our sanity. Masonic is most definitely one of them.

Don't get me wrong: We love the outdoors, recreation and most especially bicycling. We support green living and prioritizing funds for dedicated paths throughout the city. But many of us don't have the option of riding all the time, or nearly as much as we'd like. Kids come with heavy backpacks and other paraphernalia; jobs require commuting; family life involves multiple destinations and often harried scheduling.

Please, PLEASE be mindful of those of us who need to get around this beautiful city. We've carved out a few reliable routes that make all the juggling work, just barely. If you reduce or reconfigure Masonic you will be imposing a serious hardship. There are many, many streets on which to pedal in this city -- streets that are both more bucolic and less trafficked than Masonic. Why not dedicate trails through those? It seems such a simple thing and will mean SO MUCH to those of us who must navigate this congested city on a daily basis, racing to make it to child care by the pickup deadline or over to the grocery store before everyone gets home for the day.

We appreciate your service, and your sensitivity to all in making these important decisions for our community.

Best Regards,
Leslie Smartt

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 10 of 44

Date: 9/21/2013 1:24 PM

Subject: Masonic Project

I oppose the changes to the Masonic Avenue project.

John Dellar

Date: 9/21/2013 5:32 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

To whom this will concern:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Masonic Avenue cycle track project. This project will increase congestion on Masonic, especially during rush hour and especially with the increased traffic that will be generated by the new Target store, result in the loss of parking spaces for nearly 3/4 of a mile, increase pollution in the area, jeopardize public safety, and create a great hardship for neighborhood residents, especially those who live on or near Masonic. Also, San Francisco cannot afford to spend \$18 million on this project.

32,000 automobiles use Masonic daily, but only a small amount of cyclists. Rather than encourage cyclists to use one of the busiest north-south thoroughfares in San Francisco, they should be encouraged to use the route along nearby Baker Street, a safer route with far fewer motor vehicles.

Masonic can be improved by planting new trees, improving lighting and adding bus shelters, with much less hardship to the neighborhood and cost than the cycle track project.

I am also concerned about the way the cycle track project was developed and approved. I live in the area but did not receive notice that this project was being considered, nor have I received notice of any meetings about it, including the MTA Board meeting at which it was approved.

Please stop this project ASAP, go back to the drawing board and consider a much smaller project to improve Masonic that does not involve the loss of parking spaces, the reduction of travel lanes and the outlay of \$18 million.

Thank you for considering this e-mail.

Sincerely,
Keoni Chavez

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 11 of 44

Date: 9/21/2013 9:08 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9a-OBAG, Masonic Ave Complete Streets, MTC-9/25/13

Hello,

I'm writing to register my strong opposition to the above proposal for Masonic Ave. Since I cannot take off work to attend the meeting this Wednesday, the 25th, here are my thoughts on this proposal.

First of all I am shocked that you are considering, let alone have already passed on this proposal without notifying the neighbors who will be adversely affected, with no notice of the MTA board meeting at which it was approved!! What kind of community involvement is that?

Here are the primary problems with this proposal:

1. It will increase congestion on Masonic, removing close to a mile of parking spaces. So traffic lanes are reduced, parking spaces reduced, and I'm told that homeowners/residents on Masonic will no longer be able to park across their driveways! That means parking and walking quite a distance from their homes. And how the heck will homeowners be able to receive UPS packages, or any number of other service providers that will need to park in front of those homes or in their driveways?

The involved officials are NOT THINKING at all about the impact of this proposal!!

2. With parking spaces so scarce in SF, how could you possibly think it was wise to remove close to a mile of them, on both sides of the street??

3. The proposal includes bus bulbouts!! So now there will only be ONE lane of traffic in each direction as buses are constantly running up and down Masonic! Up til now, Masonic was a major thoroughfare, but I guess no longer if you have your way.

4. Homeowners on Masonic trying to get out of their driveways will now have to wait for a red light to stop the flow of traffic to get out of their driveways!!

5. And what about emergency response vehicles? They'll be stuck in the congestion that this proposal will surely create.

6. The raised cycle track is completely untested in these conditions.

7. THE target impact of this proposal HAS NOT been analyzed, which is why there is a groundswell in opposition.

Finally, if you want to make SF a bike friendly city, do so in ways that DO NOT create a hardship on everyone else. Bikers have a completely safe alternative route on Baker street, which is not steeper than Masonic.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 12 of 44

And if you want to improve Masonic, then increase the lighting, add bus shelters, and save the city the \$18 million proposed for this project.

I dearly hope you will give time and thought to my comments, and provide forums for community input before you have already passed on such disruptive and ill thought out proposals.

Thank you,
Karen Ulring

Date: 9/22/2013 12:14 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Dear Mr. Lambert,

I urge you in the **STRONGEST** terms to oppose the **Masonic Raised Cycle Track Project**, which will be **extremely disruptive** to the community for the following reasons:

- Congestion will be increased because of lane reduction during rush hour and parking removal
- Not only Masonic, but side streets also will be congested
- Target impact not analyzed; Environmental Impact Report is deficient
- Emergency response will be slowed down
- More congestion means more pollution
- Parking removal will create a major hardship
- Masonic can be made safer with better traffic signals, improved lighting, repaving, new curb ramps, better enforcement and other measures, while still retaining parking and the full amount of travel lanes
- Alternate bike route that includes Baker is less congested, has no buses, and is not steeper than Masonic
- Raised cycle track design is untested in these conditions, especially because of large number of driveways
- Inadequate/unfair notice
- There is significant opposition to the project, as evidenced by the petition

This project will be a huge setback to the community and there are much better alternatives that should be considered. Thank you for your consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,
Donna Cooper

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 13 of 44

Date: 9/22/2013 12:15 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Dear Ms. Hughes:

I urge you in the STRONGEST terms to oppose the Masonic Raised Cycle Track Project, which will be extremely disruptive to the community for the following reasons:

- Congestion will be increased because of lane reduction during rush hour and parking removal
- Not only Masonic, but side streets also will be congested
- Target impact not analyzed; Environmental Impact Report is deficient
- Emergency response will be slowed down
- More congestion means more pollution
- Parking removal will create a major hardship
- Masonic can be made safer with better traffic signals, improved lighting, repaving, new curb ramps, better enforcement and other measures, while still retaining parking and the full amount of travel lanes
- Alternate bike route that includes Baker is less congested, has no buses, and is not steeper than Masonic
- Raised cycle track design is untested in these conditions, especially because of large number of driveways
- Inadequate/unfair notice
- There is significant opposition to the project, as evidenced by the petition

This project will be a huge setback to the community and there are much better alternatives that should be considered. Thank you for your consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,
Donna Cooper

Date: 9/22/2013 8:54 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Oppose the Masonic Plan

I live two blocks from Masonic and ride the 43 and 5 bus. The proposed Masonic plan will make the sidewalks at Fulton and Masonic more congested and dangerous for walkers and MUNI riders. I can't understand how the approved plan permits bikes to ride on the sidewalk at Fulton and Masonic. This is a congested area with people getting on and off buses and walking to Lucky's or Starbucks. From Mc Allister to Fulton is a steep hill. Riders will be coming down fast to cross Fulton St, and will be riding behind the MUNI bus shelter. A disaster waiting to happen.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 14 of 44

Just look at what happens in the Panhandle with shared bike and pedestrian path. Frequently, bike riders ride fast and don't stop for pedestrians. There is a children's playground on Oak Street and to get to the playground, you must cross the pathway. I have been almost hit several times.

Parking removal will cause people to drive into my neighborhood looking for parking spaces. We have USF, John Adams, and St. Mary's hospital, we don't need additional impact into the neighborhood.

There has been inadequate notification for this project. Pasting posters on telephone poles on Masonic is not adequate notification.

Many more people are opposed to this project. Sixty people should not be allowed to make the decision for the neighborhood

Masonic can be made safer with better traffic signals, improved lighting, repaving, new curb ramps, better enforcement and other measures, while still retaining parking and the full amount of travel.

A safer and better bike route is Baker because it is less congested and has no buses.

These are the reasons, I oppose the current plan.

Lorraine Lucas

Date: 9/22/2013 10:06 AM

Subject: Impeach Supervisor Wiener? Wiener Ignores Major Public opposition to Masonic Bicycle Path

Based on Howard Chabner' email below and the vast numbers who have signed his petition to save Masonic does it make sense to impeach Supervisor Wiener?

Should the will of the 3% override the 97% who use this critical cross town artery?

Francis Ryan

From: Howard Chabner [mailto:noreply@list.moveon.org]
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 6:24 AM
To: fdryan@pacbell.net
Subject: URGENT! Metropolitan Transportation Commission meeting about Masonic â€ September 25, 2013, 9:30 AM, Oakland

Dear Save Masonic supporter:

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 15 of 44

Thank you again for helping us in our efforts to bring a balanced, reasonable, safe approach to Masonic Avenue. Unfortunately, and despite far more e-mails opposing the project than supporting it, funding for the Masonic raised cycle track project was approved by the Programming and Allocations Committee of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission on September 11, 2013. (SFMTA sought around \$10 million in federal One Bay Area Grant funds; this was approved by the MTC committee. The total project budget is around \$18 million; the remaining \$8 million is coming from other sources.)

SF Supervisor Scott Wiener, a committee member, urged fellow members to approve the project, claiming that safety requires the loss of parking, rush-hour lane reduction and other elements of the cycle track project, but without offering any good reasons for his claim or any suggestions whatsoever for mitigating the hardship and congestion.

The full Commission will meet on Wednesday, September 25 at 9:30 AM to consider funding.

This is a critical meeting! Please make your voice heard – by e-mail or in person - that the current plan is fundamentally flawed and should not be approved.

There will be an opportunity for public comment, but we are not sure how long the meeting will go on and the Masonic project is part of a large agenda item that includes many other projects, so we understand it may be difficult for you to attend the meeting. Therefore it's critical to e-mail the Committee in advance of the meeting so that your opposition will be part of the public record.

Send your e-mails to each of the following:

info@mtc.ca.gov

glambert@mtc.ca.gov

khughes@mtc.ca.gov (Ms. Hughes is Secretary to the MTC)

aworth@cityoforinda.org (Amy Rein Worth is MTC Chair)

david.campos@sfgov.org (Supervisor Campos is a member of the MTC)

scott.wiener@sfgov.org (Supervisor Wiener is a member of the MTC)

In the subject line, indicate “Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013”

Please cc us at info@savemasonic.com

Meeting location: Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Lawrence Dahms Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland (reachable by BART)

Link to meeting agenda: <http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/events/agendaView.akt?p=2113>

(see page 14 of the attachment to Agenda Item 9(a))

Go to www.savemasonic.com for a sample letter and FAQs

Points to emphasize:

Congestion will be increased because of lane reduction during rush hour and parking removal

- Not only Masonic, but side streets also will be congested
- Target impact not analyzed; Environmental Impact Report is deficient
- Emergency response will be slowed down
- More congestion means more pollution
- Parking removal will create a major hardship

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 16 of 44

- Masonic can be made safer with better traffic signals, improved lighting, repaving, new curb ramps, better enforcement and other measures, while still retaining parking and the full amount of travel lanes
- Alternate bike route that includes Baker is less congested, has no buses, and is not steeper than Masonic
- Raised cycle track design is untested in these conditions, especially because of large number of driveways
- Inadequate/unfair notice
- There is significant opposition to the project, as evidenced by the petition

Please forward this e-mail to your friends, family and neighbors who support our campaign, and post it to your Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn.

The Save Masonic campaign will continue to oppose this project regardless of the outcome of the MTC meeting.

Thank you!

Date: 9/22/2013 8:55 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Oppose the Masonic Plan

I live two blocks from Masonic and ride the 43 and 5 bus. The proposed Masonic plan will make the sidewalks at Fulton and Masonic more congested and dangerous for walkers and MUNI riders. I can't understand how the approved plan permits bikes to ride on the sidewalk at Fulton and Masonic. This is a congested area with people getting on and off buses and walking to Lucky's or Starbucks. From Mc Allister to Fulton is a steep hill. Riders will be coming down fast to cross Fulton St, and will be riding behind the MUNI bus shelter. A disaster waiting to happen.

Just look at what happens in the Panhandle with shared bike and pedestrian path. Frequently, bike riders ride fast and don't stop for pedestrians. There is a children's playground on Oak Street and to get to the playground, you must cross the pathway. I have been almost hit several times.

Parking removal will cause people to drive into my neighborhood looking for parking spaces. We have USF, John Adams, and St. Mary's hospital, we don't need additional impact into the neighborhood.

There has been inadequate notification for this project. Pasting posters on telephone poles on Masonic is not adequate notification.

Many more people are opposed to this project. Sixty people should not be allowed to make the decision for the neighborhood

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 17 of 44

Masonic can be made safer with better traffic signals, improved lighting, repaving, new curb ramps, better enforcement and other measures, while still retaining parking and the full amount of travel.

A safer and better bike route is Baker because it is less congested and has no buses.

These are the reasons, I oppose the current plan.

Lorraine Lucas

Date: 9/22/2013 9:19 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013”

I'm extremely disappointed the subcommittee has decided to ignore the residents who live near Masonic and spend millions of dollars on a project we do not want. Our petition is extremely clear and as you can see by the numbers of signature, it is well supported.

As I previously stated:

The Masonic project is an \$18 million solution seeking a problem.

Currently Masonic simply needs to be repaved. But the proposed project will eliminate all of the parking and eliminates lanes. The effect of this will be to increase congestion, not just on Masonic, but on neighboring residential streets. Not only will cars be circling blocks looking for scarce parking but more traffic will use side streets to bypass congestion on Masonic. This will be especially unfair to students of SFU who have no voice in this project but will be affected by the results.

Two weekends ago the neighborhood hosted SF's Sunday Streets program. Though I enjoy this program once a year it illustrates how cars, attempting to bypass congestion increase speed through residential neighborhoods endangering pedestrians in the area. This is especially worrying because this area has many families with children.

Finally, I'm wondering why Masonic needs a bicycle lane? There's already an existing lane on Baker Street that runs parallel to the project that extends to the Panhandle, a popular bicycle route. Baker has considerably less traffic and is much friendlier to bicyclists.

A better use of this money would be to repave Masonic with a few "speed bumps" for the stated purpose of traffic calming while remarking the bicycle lanes on Baker St to be consistent with the green bicycle markings on other streets. This would cost a fraction of the money while preserving the livability for residents and students in the area that must use cars.

Best regards,
Christian Kruse

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 18 of 44

Date: 9/22/2013 9:54 PM

Subject: MTC Meeting - September 25, 2013 - Agenda Item 9(a) - Please Disapprove OBAG/Masonic Avenue Complete Streets Project

Dear MTC Chair, Members, and Staff:

I've lived on Fell near Clayton since 1988. I cross Masonic as a pedestrian in my electric wheelchair at least twice weekly, and frequently roll along Masonic between Fell and Geary. Personally, I don't feel unsafe. I also ride along and across Masonic several times a week as a passenger in my minivan, and did so as a driver when I used to drive. In the 25 years I've lived in the neighborhood, I've probably been across and along Masonic as a pedestrian, passenger and driver at least 5,000 times.

Please disapprove the Masonic bicycle track project, also known as the Masonic Avenue Complete Streets project (the "Project"). As currently envisioned and as approved by the MTA Board and SF County Transportation Authority, the Project would be dangerous to pedestrians, drivers and cyclists; increase congestion and pollution; create a hardship for residents, visitors, businesses and employees; jeopardize public safety by slowing emergency response time; and be a poor use of \$18 million of taxpayer money. The parking loss would especially harm disabled people and seniors. Adequate studies have not been done about the Project; in particular, the EIR that MTA relies on is inadequate, incomplete and incorrect because it doesn't account for the actual conditions and details of the Project and the area. The Project is unlikely to solve the safety concerns cited as justification for it. Masonic can be improved with more limited, targeted measures. A better bike route can be created using Baker.

Neighborhood residents were not given fair advance notice about the Project and a meaningful opportunity to express their opinions, and, contrary to MTA's repeated assertions, the Project doesn't have "overwhelming community support."

Nearly 1,000 people have signed an online petition opposing the Project. Others signed a printed version with identical wording as the online petition; they didn't provide an e-mail address and therefore their names don't appear online. Also, a neighborhood merchant, Ibrahim Ahwal, gathered over 150 signatures on a hard copy petition (different from the online petition) opposing the Project. Copies of these signatures have been provided to the MTC.

See <http://petitions.moveon.org/sign/save-masonic-avenue>.

Danger. In order to cross Masonic and to access the bus stops, pedestrians will have to cross the cycle track - this will decrease pedestrian safety.

There are dozens of driveways along Masonic. The Project would increase potential conflict between cyclists and drivers pulling out of driveways. Drivers' ability to see cyclists will be limited. Also, cars pulling out of driveways on a busy street such as Masonic can only do so

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 19 of 44

when motor vehicle traffic is stopped by a red light. Some cyclists don't obey traffic signals, and vehicles could be pulling out of driveways when they don't expect any traffic, only to hit an unexpected cyclist. Because some cyclists don't use lights, this will be even more dangerous at night.

Instead of encouraging more cyclists to use Masonic, one of the busiest North-South streets in San Francisco, a safer alternative would be to create a bike route that includes the existing bike paths on Baker, which has much less volume, slower moving traffic and no buses. Many cyclists already use Baker. See http://www.savemasonic.com/alt_route.html.

Congestion Will Increase. Motor vehicle traffic on Masonic was over 32,000 vehicles daily in 2010, per MTA; bike volume was a tiny fraction. Yet the Project would eliminate the extra travel lanes at rush hour, reducing the number of travel lanes to two in each direction at all times. There is already gridlock at rush hour (for example, there is major Southbound backup on Masonic around Grove, Hayes and Fell during evening rush hour); the Project would make this even worse. And because of the bus boarding platforms, only one travel lane will be moving when buses stop to load/unload passengers. Consider how this will impact traffic when several passengers are getting on and off - vehicles will pile up behind the bus, and some will hastily and dangerously try to go around it. Conflicts among vehicles, buses and cyclists will increase. The delay and congestion will be even greater when the lift is deployed for disabled passengers, which can sometimes take several minutes.

Not only will Masonic become more congested, so will the side streets and cross streets, both because of the reduced traffic capacity of Masonic itself and because drivers will have to circle further and longer to find parking. I frequent the cafés on Hayes/Ashbury and Hayes/Central. Over many years I've spent a lot of time on Hayes, Ashbury, Clayton and Central; they are pleasant, safe and uncongested but are unlikely to remain that way if the Project is implemented.

Importantly, MTA did no analysis of the cumulative impact of the Project combined with the loss of parking on nearby Fell and Oak streets, and the reduction in travel lanes on Oak during morning rush hour, that are part of the Fell/Oak bike lane project. Moreover, MTA is planning to remove parking spaces on Central and possibly McAllister as part of a plan to improve service on the 5 Fulton bus. These cumulative impacts will further increase congestion.

With the new Target store at Masonic/Geary, traffic volume will increase significantly. The 32,000 average daily vehicle count was done in 2010, when the largest retail space in the shopping center - the space that will soon be occupied by a large Target - was vacant. But MTA admitted, in response to a Sunshine request, that it didn't do any studies on the impact of the Target on the Project. (Not only was there no study about Target's impact on the Project, there was no study about the traffic impact of Target at all. Per an e-mail dated August 31, 2011 from Jerry Robbins of MTA to other MTA staff, received in response to a Sunshine request, "There was no transportation impact study on [sic - Chabner note - "on" probably should be "or"] environmental review for Target as it was not a change of use (former retail use to new retail use).")

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 20 of 44

Target is expected to be open from 8 AM until 9 or 10 PM; these hours encompass the morning and evening rush hours.

Besides the overall increased traffic volume Target will generate on Masonic, one of the potential specific traffic impacts of Target is that, because the store has several separate, disconnected parking lots, getting from one to another requires exiting the lot and driving on the street. According to an MTA staff e-mail received in response to a Sunshine request, "We really won't know how the public will choose to park each of the lots and what issues this may raise on city streets until Target opens. ... We will have to do post opening observations and analysis." (E-mail dated August 31, 2011 from Ricardo Olea of MTA to other MTA staff.)

With increased congestion will come increased pollution.

Inconsistency between MTA's Traffic Calming Claim and Minor Impact on Traffic Level of Service Claim. MTA claims that the main cause of collisions on Masonic is motorists driving too fast. Based on this assertion, MTA claims that installing raised bicycle tracks, reducing the number of travel lanes during rush hour, installing a median strip, installing corner bulb outs, and installing bus bulb outs (boarding platforms) are traffic calming measures that will increase safety for everyone by making motorists slow down. But they also claim that the reduction in travel time would be minimal. These two claims are contradictory: if motorists will slow down enough to truly increase safety, how can that not have more than a minimal impact on travel time? If there is truly a minimal impact on travel time, then how can safety be increased significantly as a result of these measures? (The preceding discussion assumes MTA's premise and doesn't deal with the strong likelihood that collisions on Masonic are caused primarily by factors other than speed - see below for a discussion of safety measures that should be implemented.)

Parking Loss Will be a Hardship. The loss of all street parking on Masonic from Fell to Geary - at least 167 spaces - would be a major blow to the neighborhoods. Large numbers of residents, visitors, employees, businesses, students and service providers rely on street parking. The hardship would be at its worst at night, when parking is scarcest. My wife and I don't have a garage, so we know from personal experience how difficult it is to find parking in our neighborhood at night, especially on weekends. We know firsthand that all of the street parking on Masonic from Fulton to Fell is usually occupied at night.

The actual number of parking spaces lost may be more than 167 because MTA counts 20 linear feet as a parking space, but some of the parking spaces along Masonic between driveways are less than 20 feet and may not be included in the count. Also, residents of Masonic will no longer be able to park across their driveways; this loss should also be acknowledged and considered.

MTA's parking study, which was done in-house, not by an independent third-party, is fatally flawed. According to MTA documents received in response to a Sunshine request, MTA didn't study overnight or weekend parking. Also, it appears from the documents that most of the parking study was conducted on one day.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 21 of 44

The parking study (cited in the Masonic Avenue Street Redesign Study Final Report dated January 2011 - the report on which the MTA Board and the CTA based their approval of the Project) is fatally flawed in what it does cover. It aggregates data for the entire length of Masonic from Geary all the way to Fell, disaggregating only the East and West sides. But the Project area includes more than one neighborhood, each of which has different conditions. The area from McAllister to Fell is more purely residential and denser than the area North of Turk - the former has mostly multiunit residences, whereas the latter includes single-family homes with garages on Ewing Terrace and institutions that are closed at night and on the weekend, including schools and a blood bank. MTA vastly understates the parking shortage from McAllister to Fell. It's also important to recognize that removing all street parking will have a major impact even in an area that may have less than 100% utilization, because all capacity will have been removed, not merely "excess" capacity.

Regarding parking near the Target, staff e-mails provided by MTA include statements such as "The assumption is that Masonic will not be significantly impacted." [by the Target]. (Emphasis added; e-mail dated September 1, 2011 from Ricardo Olea to other MTA staff.) Also, "We really won't know how the public will choose to park each of the lots [at Target] and what issues this may raise on city streets until Target opens." (E-mail dated August 31, 2011 from Ricardo Olea to other MTA staff.)

People with mobility disabilities and seniors rely heavily on automobiles, so we would be even more impacted by the parking loss than the general public. Many people with mobility disabilities and seniors are limited in how far they can walk or roll, so the parking loss caused by the Project not only will make it harder for us to find parking, but will require us to expend more energy getting from a parking space to our home, workplace and business, and to the stores and restaurants we patronize. It's also relevant that San Francisco has fewer blue zones than legally required, and there are very few blue zones in the Project area. The parking loss will also make it more difficult for us to have home visits from therapists, caregivers, wheelchair repair companies and service providers.

The Project relies heavily on MTA's unsubstantiated assertion that the loss of at least 167 street parking spaces will have no environmental impact. No factual basis is stated for this conclusory assertion - just the "experience of San Francisco transportation planners..."

MTA claims that removing parking has no impact because, in response to fewer spaces, fewer people drive. But this claim is belied by MTA's actions throughout San Francisco in adding parking meters, expanding payment hours, imposing payment on Sundays, and increasing prices and fines, all in the name of demand management because they say demand is too great and there is a shortage of parking.

Contrary to MTA's position about Masonic and other projects involving the loss of large amounts of on-street parking, parking loss can and often does have a direct environmental impact that must be analyzed and considered. This was recognized most recently by the California Court of Appeals in *Taxpayers for Accountable School Bond Spending v. San Diego Unified School District*, 215 Cal. App. 4th 1013 (2013). The court held: "Therefore, as a general rule,

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 22 of 44

we believe CEQA considers a project's impact on parking of vehicles to be a physical impact that could constitute a significant effect on the environment."

Removing parking spaces and making existing parking deficits worse are significant impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under CEQA; *Land Value 77 v. Board of Trustees of the California State University* (2011) 193 Cal. App. 4th 675, 679-680. Traffic analysis that failed to analyze impacts caused by eliminating parking was held inadequate; *Sacramento Old City Assn. v. City Council of Sacramento* (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1028. Also, "Traffic and parking have the potential...of causing serious environmental problems;" *Sacramento Old City*. Loss of street parking "indicated that a finding of significant environmental effect was mandatory" *Friends of "B" Street v. City of Hayward* (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3rd 988, 1003.

Removing such a large number of parking spaces will create a personal hardship for many people, will increase congestion, and will have an adverse environmental impact. Yet MTA callously denies the hardship, and MTA and the SF Planning Department completely ignore the environmental impact.

Emergency Response. In an emergency, one minute of additional response time can literally be the difference between life and death. The congestion described above will slow down emergency vehicles, especially when buses are present. The bus boarding platforms will present obstacles. The five-foot wide median strip will make it impossible for emergency vehicles to drive on the opposite side of the street, as they sometimes do now for brief but critical moments, and harder to execute fast left turns.

I requested from the San Francisco Fire Department all documents reflecting analyses, investigations, reports, etc. of the impact of the Masonic project on firefighting and other emergency response. The response I received indicates that the Fire Department didn't do any analysis of the impact of the Project on firefighting and other emergency response, at least none that was memorialized in writing. It is quite likely that the Fire Department was under intense political pressure not to analyze the Project and not to raise any objections. Many firefighters stationed in the area were not even aware of the Project until they were notified by residents opposed to it.

Lack of Fair Notice and Outreach. I never received notice from MTA (nor from the Planning Department or any other City department or agency) about the Project - no notice of community workshops or any MTA Board meetings or hearings, nor of any other meetings. I learned of the MTA Board's approval from SF Gate, after it happened. I've spoken with dozens of people in my neighborhood, and almost none of them (and, on my block, literally nobody with whom I've spoken) received notice. Yet MTA claims the Project has "overwhelming community support." At a meeting at City Hall on March 13, 2013 with Ahmad El-Najjar (Supervisor Breed's Legislative Aide), James Shahamiri (an MTA engineer working on the Project) and a group of neighborhood residents opposed to the project, Mr. Shahamiri went so far as to claim that notice and outreach to the neighborhood not only were extensive and fair, but were the "gold standard" for MTA projects. His statement shocked those of us present, most or all of whom received no notice.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 23 of 44

In fact, however, MTA outreach and notice were deficient, and skewed heavily toward supporters and likely supporters. Documents received in response to a Sunshine request confirm that MTA coordinated with the SF Bicycle Coalition, Fix Masonic and other supporters in conducting outreach. One of the only people I know in my neighborhood who received notice is a member of the SF Bicycle Coalition and a strong supporter of the Project.

When pressed about who it notified, MTA retreats from its grandiose, extravagant claims, stating that it complied with legal requirements, which it says requires notifying residents within a one block radius of Masonic. Putting aside that MTA outreached selectively to supporters of the project who live much more than a block from Masonic, and putting aside deficiencies even in its claimed compliance with legal requirements, is the fact that MTA has lowered the bar. Mere compliance with the one block requirement is a much lower standard than the notice they would have had to have given in order to fairly claim “overwhelming community support,” because the community affected extends far beyond one block from Masonic. It would’ve been easy to provide mail notification to neighborhood residents who live more than one block from Masonic, and to holders of residential parking permits, but MTA chose not to do that.

If it truly believes the Project has “overwhelming community support,” MTA should agree to a nonbinding, advisory vote (with one person-one vote, and voting to be conducted by an independent third-party) by notifying all residents, in writing, within a specified area of Masonic about the Project and giving them an opportunity to vote on it. (There is precedent for such a vote - in 2004, the Department of Parking and Traffic (MTA’s predecessor) held a vote about the Page Street traffic circles. Residents opposed that project 77% to 23%.) Yet, in response to a specific request to Director of Transportation Ed Reiskin, MTA has refused to allow even a nonbinding, advisory vote.

It is wrong and undemocratic for a major project that will affect the daily lives of thousands of people for decades to come to be imposed without fair notice to those people and without providing them a meaningful opportunity to be heard before decisions are made. MTA’s actions foster cynicism, distrust and alienation from government. By disapproving a project developed and promoted in such an undemocratic way, you would be sending an important message about open government. The converse is also true.

Inconsistency between MTA’s Safest Configuration Claim and Majority Preference Claim. MTA claims that the Boulevard configuration (with all parking removed on both sides of the street) is the safest. They claim there is an unavoidable conflict between retaining parking on Masonic and making it safe, and that safety must trump parking. But on the other hand MTA repeatedly emphasizes that the Boulevard configuration was chosen because it was the most popular choice among those who attended the “community workshops.” The other main choice, which was less popular, would have retained parking on one side of the street.

But MTA never explains why safety requires the elimination of all parking – they don’t give any reasons based on traffic engineering principles. The Boulevard choice is justified by its alleged popularity. If the configuration that would have retained parking on one side of the street had

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 24 of 44

been the most popular, would MTA have agreed to it? The implication of MTA's message is yes; but if they would have agreed to it, does that mean it is equally safe (in MTA's opinion) as the configuration that eliminates all parking? If it is equally safe as the Boulevard, that undermines their argument that the Boulevard configuration is the safest. And, if it is equally safe, then why not choose it instead of the Boulevard, since it would retain half the parking and result in less hardship? Or, if MTA would have overruled that choice on the basis that it is not as safe as the Boulevard configuration, then they are wrong in their assertion that the Boulevard was chosen because it was the most popular.

Finally, if MTA would not have overruled the choice that would have retained half of the parking, even though in their professional engineering opinion it would not be as safe – in other words, if MTA is willing to have true majority rule - then they should be willing to have a vote of all those who live within a specified radius of Masonic. But MTA has refused to hold even a nonbinding, advisory vote.

A Poorly Conceived Experiment. The Project would involve a raised concrete cycle track, above street level and below sidewalk level, a type of design never before used in San Francisco or in any comparable environment in any comparable American city. In response to inquiries about use of this design in other cities, MTA staff provided a photo of a raised cycle track in Richmond, British Columbia, Canada. The photo is attached to this e-mail. As you can see, the photo is of a suburban style area with shopping malls, few driveways, a sidewalk devoid of pedestrians, and a raised concrete structure high above the sidewalk - nothing at all like Masonic. The fact that this is the closest example MTA could find indicates just how experimental and inappropriate a raised cycle track design would be for Masonic.

Other Safety Measures Should be Adopted. \$18 million is a huge amount of taxpayer money to spend on a project that has not been adequately analyzed and will have so many harmful consequences. Many of the collisions on Masonic occurred at night; lighting along Masonic should be improved. Some cars ran into fixed objects; this can be mitigated by redesigning and/or moving street furniture and signal poles. MTA should analyze whether left turns off of Masonic should be further restricted, especially at Turk (where visibility is poor because of the hill), and should consider how to improve traffic signal timing and configuration. Left turn arrows should be considered at many of the intersections, including, at some locations, permitting left turns only on the arrow. Also, the intersection of Masonic/Turk still doesn't have pedestrian countdown signals; these should have been installed years ago.

One of the two fatalities frequently cited in support of redesigning Masonic was caused by a drunk driver; the Project will not prevent deaths and injuries caused by drunk driving. (Supervisor Mar and some other proponents of the Project claim there have been seven deaths, but some of the other five were not on Masonic and the others were on Masonic North or South of the Project area; these fatalities would not have been prevented by the Project. Promoting such an inflated figure is disingenuous fear mongering, especially when done repeatedly.) It also must be recognized that many of the collisions were the fault of the pedestrian or cyclist, and that collisions will occur when people act carelessly, especially on a major thoroughfare. For example, the Project would not have prevented the tragic death of the pedestrian who jaywalked

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 25 of 44

across from the Trader Joe's, well North of the Project area. This is not to argue that Masonic can't and shouldn't be improved, but to recognize that there is a limit to what can be accomplished by street and traffic design.

The street surface of Masonic is in terrible shape and desperately needs repaving. Many of the corners in the Project area have steep, dangerous curb ramps that are in poor condition, lack textured domed warning surfaces, and are only on one side of a corner, forcing disabled pedestrians into the street. I, and perhaps others, requested new, legally required curb ramps at these intersections years ago. Some of the bus stops on Masonic need new shelters. Lighting needs to be improved along Masonic. All of these improvements should be made ASAP, and they can all be done without implementing the Project and without spending anywhere near \$18 million.

Please don't experiment with our neighborhood and our daily lives. In 2003/2004, MTA's predecessor DPT installed traffic circles along Page Street without thoroughly analyzing the particular conditions and without fair notice to the people affected. DPT engineers insisted, and insisted again and again, that these would calm traffic, but the opposite happened. Fortunately, the traffic circles were temporary, inexpensive and easy to remove. But with the Masonic Project, the collateral damage from the trial and error method won't be so easy to reverse.

Thank you for considering this e-mail.

Sincerely

Howard Chabner

Date: 9/22/2013 9:57 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Hello,

As a resident of one of the neighboring areas that will be most impacted by the Masonic Raised Cycle Track project, I am writing to express my disappointment that the Programming and Allocations Committee of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved this project despite the opposition of many neighborhood residents and businesses. I am particularly disappointed that Supervisors Weiner and Campos have decided to not listen to the will of San Francisco residents who will be most impacted by this project. I am opposed to this project as it represents wasteful government spending that panders to the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition without any overall positive benefit to the neighboring residents or businesses. There will be many adverse impacts to the project including the loss of over 165 parking spaces, creating a hardship for residents of the area, seniors, and the disabled. The project is also significantly flawed as it does not take into account the opening of the Target store this fall. The Target store will significantly slow down traffic on Masonic Avenue. As conceived, the project will increase congestion and pollution and slow down emergency response time. If traffic mitigation and

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 26 of 44

safety is really the concern, there are many less expensive, less obtrusive options that could retain the parking and all traffic lanes. These options should be considered instead of the raised cycle track.

In these times when government funding is becoming more and more scarce, there are better uses of MTC funding than on the Masonic project which serves to benefit a small vocal minority of bicyclists who want to impose their world view on the rest of us and make us pay for it. As I, a resident of the Masonic Avenue area, I do not want any of my tax dollars funding this ill-conceived project.

As of the writing of this email (9/22/13), there are 990 signatures on the Save Masonic petition so there are at least 989 other people who feel the way I do. Our voices should be heard and not discounted.

Sincerely,

My Do-Kruse

Date: 9/23/2013 1:00 AM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

I am writing to protest the changes being proposed to Masonic Avenue.

I live in Ashbury Heights and drive down Masonic to work at California and Divisadero every work-day and to drop my children off at school.

Here are some points I would like to emphasize:

- Congestion will be increased because of lane reduction during rush hour and parking removal
- Not only Masonic, but side streets also will be congested
- Target impact not analyzed; Environmental Impact Report is deficient
- Emergency response will be slowed down
- More congestion means more pollution
- Parking removal will create a major hardship
- Masonic can be made safer with better traffic signals, improved lighting, repaving, new curb ramps, better enforcement and other measures, while still retaining parking and the full amount of travel lanes
- Alternate bike route that includes Baker is less congested, has no buses, and is not steeper than Masonic
- Raised cycle track design is untested in these conditions, especially because of large number of driveways
- Inadequate/unfair notice

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 27 of 44

- There is significant opposition to the project, as evidenced by the petition

Thank you for your service to our community!

-Sabra Ballon

Date: 9/23/2013 9:04 AM

Subject: "Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013"

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing yet again, to voice my concern and opposition to the Masonic Raised Cycle Track program. I am a daily commuter to the shipyard. I am a San Francisco native, I attended public school, vote in local elections and work for the city as a public servant.

It is increasingly frustrating to feel that my worry over parking and the hardship it brings to the neighborhood is being overlooked. The loss of parking spots for nearly a mile and the ripple effect of it will be devastating to that each driver as they circle and circle simply to park near their home.

I have written once before and been told to that most individuals will use this opportunity to opt to public transportation or use a bike so this could alleviate my need for parking. I hope rather than believe that to be true. Frankly to me, that means more cars sitting on the street instead of undergoing the daily commuter turnover of parking spots.

I feel the problem with this project is it does not actually address the problem, and leaves others out to dry. To improve biker and pedestrian safety, how about these as a solution- An alternate bike route on a street not so inundated with cars, buses or rolling hills. Adding a bike lane simply adds another factor on a street already busy with pedestrians, cars and buses. Better traffic signals and lighting.

Increased enforcement of bike laws. While many bikers are safe, others break traffic laws - whether not stopping at a red light or at a stop sign - that put their safety in jeopardy. If this project is happening in the name of public safety, show me that it will work before spending \$18 million dollars and disregarding nearly 1000 of your constituents. I know there is a middle ground that can be reached to insure our neighborhood is safe but please, let's take the time to find it.

Thank you for considering this email.

Sincerely,
Maria Cownan

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 28 of 44

Date: 9/23/2013 10:12 AM

Subject: MTC Meeting - September 25, 2013 - Agenda Item 9(a) - Please Disapprove OBAG/Masonic Avenue Complete Streets Project

Dear MTC Chair, Members, and Staff:

Please disapprove the Masonic bicycle track project, also known as the Masonic Avenue Complete Streets project (the "Project"). As currently envisioned and as approved by the MTA Board and SF County Transportation Authority, the Project would be dangerous to pedestrians, drivers and cyclists; increase congestion and pollution; create a hardship for residents, visitors, businesses and employees; jeopardize public safety by slowing emergency response time; and be a poor use of \$18 million of taxpayer money. The parking loss would especially harm working families, seniors and people with disabilities.

Please take a few minutes to view this video that was taken at a recent community meeting: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=bZzF5XIlwpE

Neighborhood residents were not given fair advance notice about the Project and a meaningful opportunity to express their opinions, and, contrary to MTA's repeated assertions, the Project doesn't have "overwhelming community support."

Adequate studies have not been done about the Project; in particular, the EIR that MTA relies on is inadequate, incomplete and incorrect because it doesn't account for the actual conditions and details of the Project and the area. The Project is unlikely to solve the safety concerns cited as justification for it. Masonic can be improved with more limited, targeted measures. A better bike route can be created using Baker.

Nearly 1,000 people have signed an online petition opposing the Project. Others signed a printed version with identical wording as the online petition; they didn't provide an e-mail address and therefore their names don't appear online. Also, a neighborhood merchant, Ibrahim Ahwal, gathered over 150 signatures on a hard copy petition (different from the online petition) opposing the Project. Copies of these signatures have been provided to the MTC.

See <http://petitions.moveon.org/sign/save-masonic-avenue>.

Danger. In order to cross Masonic and to access the bus stops, pedestrians will have to cross the cycle track - this will decrease pedestrian safety.

There are dozens of driveways along Masonic. The Project would increase potential conflict between cyclists and drivers pulling out of driveways. Drivers' ability to see cyclists will be limited. Also, cars pulling out of driveways on a busy street such as Masonic can only do so when motor vehicle traffic is stopped by a red light. Some cyclists don't obey traffic signals, and vehicles could be pulling out of driveways when they don't expect any traffic, only to hit an unexpected cyclist. Because some cyclists don't use lights, this will be even more dangerous at night.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 29 of 44

Instead of encouraging more cyclists to use Masonic, one of the busiest North-South streets in San Francisco, a safer alternative would be to create a bike route that includes the existing bike paths on Baker, which has much less volume, slower moving traffic and no buses. Many cyclists already use Baker. See http://www.savemasonic.com/alt_route.html.

Congestion Will Increase. Motor vehicle traffic on Masonic was over 32,000 vehicles daily in 2010, per MTA; bike volume was a tiny fraction. Yet the Project would eliminate the extra travel lanes at rush hour, reducing the number of travel lanes to two in each direction at all times. There is already gridlock at rush hour (for example, there is major Southbound backup on Masonic around Grove, Hayes and Fell during evening rush hour); the Project would make this even worse. And because of the bus boarding platforms, only one travel lane will be moving when buses stop to load/unload passengers. Consider how this will impact traffic when several passengers are getting on and off - vehicles will pile up behind the bus, and some will hastily and dangerously try to go around it. Conflicts among vehicles, buses and cyclists will increase. The delay and congestion will be even greater when the lift is deployed for disabled passengers, which can sometimes take several minutes.

Not only will Masonic become more congested, so will the side streets and cross streets, both because of the reduced traffic capacity of Masonic itself and because drivers will have to circle further and longer to find parking. I frequent the cafés on Hayes/Ashbury and Hayes/Central. Over many years I've spent a lot of time on Hayes, Ashbury, Clayton and Central; they are pleasant, safe and uncongested but are unlikely to remain that way if the Project is implemented.

Importantly, MTA did no analysis of the cumulative impact of the Project combined with the loss of parking on nearby Fell and Oak streets, and the reduction in travel lanes on Oak during morning rush hour, that are part of the Fell/Oak bike lane project. Moreover, MTA is planning to remove parking spaces on Central and possibly McAllister as part of a plan to improve service on the 5 Fulton bus. These cumulative impacts will further increase congestion.

With the new Target store at Masonic/Geary, traffic volume will increase significantly. The 32,000 average daily vehicle count was done in 2010, when the largest retail space in the shopping center - the space that will soon be occupied by a large Target - was vacant. But MTA admitted, in response to a Sunshine request, that it didn't do any studies on the impact of the Target on the Project. (Not only was there no study about Target's impact on the Project, there was no study about the traffic impact of Target at all. Per an e-mail dated August 31, 2011 from Jerry Robbins of MTA to other MTA staff, received in response to a Sunshine request, "There was no transportation impact study on [sic - Chabner note - "on" probably should be "or"] environmental review for Target as it was not a change of use (former retail use to new retail use).")

Target is expected to be open from 8 AM until 9 or 10 PM; these hours encompass the morning and evening rush hours.

Besides the overall increased traffic volume Target will generate on Masonic, one of the potential specific traffic impacts of Target is that, because the store has several separate,

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 30 of 44

disconnected parking lots, getting from one to another requires exiting the lot and driving on the street. According to an MTA staff e-mail received in response to a Sunshine request, "We really won't know how the public will choose to park each of the lots and what issues this may raise on city streets until Target opens. ... We will have to do post opening observations and analysis." (E-mail dated August 31, 2011 from Ricardo Olea of MTA to other MTA staff.)

With increased congestion will come increased pollution.

Inconsistency between MTA's Traffic Calming Claim and Minor Impact on Traffic Level of Service Claim. MTA claims that the main cause of collisions on Masonic is motorists driving too fast. Based on this assertion, MTA claims that installing raised bicycle tracks, reducing the number of travel lanes during rush hour, installing a median strip, installing corner bulb outs, and installing bus bulb outs (boarding platforms) are traffic calming measures that will increase safety for everyone by making motorists slow down. But they also claim that the reduction in travel time would be minimal. These two claims are contradictory: if motorists will slow down enough to truly increase safety, how can that not have more than a minimal impact on travel time? If there is truly a minimal impact on travel time, then how can safety be increased significantly as a result of these measures? (The preceding discussion assumes MTA's premise and doesn't deal with the strong likelihood that collisions on Masonic are caused primarily by factors other than speed - see below for a discussion of safety measures that should be implemented.)

Parking Loss Will be a Hardship. The loss of all street parking on Masonic from Fell to Geary - at least 167 spaces - would be a major blow to the neighborhoods. Large numbers of residents, visitors, employees, businesses, students and service providers rely on street parking. The hardship would be at its worst at night, when parking is scarcest. My wife and I don't have a garage, so we know from personal experience how difficult it is to find parking in our neighborhood at night, especially on weekends. We know firsthand that all of the street parking on Masonic from Fulton to Fell is usually occupied at night.

The actual number of parking spaces lost may be more than 167 because MTA counts 20 linear feet as a parking space, but some of the parking spaces along Masonic between driveways are less than 20 feet and may not be included in the count. Also, residents of Masonic will no longer be able to park across their driveways; this loss should also be acknowledged and considered.

MTA's parking study, which was done in-house, not by an independent third-party, is fatally flawed. According to MTA documents received in response to a Sunshine request, MTA didn't study overnight or weekend parking. Also, it appears from the documents that most of the parking study was conducted on one day.

The parking study (cited in the Masonic Avenue Street Redesign Study Final Report dated January 2011 - the report on which the MTA Board and the CTA based their approval of the Project) is fatally flawed in what it does cover. It aggregates data for the entire length of Masonic from Geary all the way to Fell, disaggregating only the East and West sides. But the Project area includes more than one neighborhood, each of which has different conditions. The area from

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 31 of 44

McAllister to Fell is more purely residential and denser than the area North of Turk - the former has mostly multiunit residences, whereas the latter includes single-family homes with garages on Ewing Terrace and institutions that are closed at night and on the weekend, including schools and a blood bank. MTA vastly understates the parking shortage from McAllister to Fell. It's also important to recognize that removing all street parking will have a major impact even in an area that may have less than 100% utilization, because all capacity will have been removed, not merely "excess" capacity.

Regarding parking near the Target, staff e-mails provided by MTA include statements such as "The assumption is that Masonic will not be significantly impacted." [by the Target]. (Emphasis added; e-mail dated September 1, 2011 from Ricardo Olea to other MTA staff.) Also, "We really won't know how the public will choose to park each of the lots [at Target] and what issues this may raise on city streets until Target opens." (E-mail dated August 31, 2011 from Ricardo Olea to other MTA staff.)

People with mobility disabilities and seniors rely heavily on automobiles, so we would be even more impacted by the parking loss than the general public. Many people with mobility disabilities and seniors are limited in how far they can walk or roll, so the parking loss caused by the Project not only will make it harder for us to find parking, but will require us to expend more energy getting from a parking space to our home, workplace and business, and to the stores and restaurants we patronize. It's also relevant that San Francisco has fewer blue zones than legally required, and there are very few blue zones in the Project area. The parking loss will also make it more difficult for us to have home visits from therapists, caregivers, wheelchair repair companies and service providers.

The Project relies heavily on MTA's unsubstantiated assertion that the loss of at least 167 street parking spaces will have no environmental impact. No factual basis is stated for this conclusory assertion - just the "experience of San Francisco transportation planners...".

MTA claims that removing parking has no impact because, in response to fewer spaces, fewer people drive. But this claim is belied by MTA's actions throughout San Francisco in adding parking meters, expanding payment hours, imposing payment on Sundays, and increasing prices and fines, all in the name of demand management because they say demand is too great and there is a shortage of parking.

Contrary to MTA's position about Masonic and other projects involving the loss of large amounts of on-street parking, parking loss can and often does have a direct environmental impact that must be analyzed and considered. This was recognized most recently by the California Court of Appeals in *Taxpayers for Accountable School Bond Spending v. San Diego Unified School District*, 215 Cal. App. 4th 1013 (2013). The court held: "Therefore, as a general rule, we believe CEQA considers a project's impact on parking of vehicles to be a physical impact that could constitute a significant effect on the environment."

Removing parking spaces and making existing parking deficits worse are significant impacts that must be analyzed and mitigated under CEQA; *Land Value 77 v. Board of Trustees of the*

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 32 of 44

California State University (2011) 193 Cal. App. 4th 675, 679-680. Traffic analysis that failed to analyze impacts caused by eliminating parking was held inadequate; Sacramento Old City Assn. v. City Council of Sacramento (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1028. Also, "Traffic and parking have the potential...of causing serious environmental problems;" Sacramento Old City. Loss of street parking "indicated that a finding of significant environmental effect was mandatory" Friends of "B" Street v. City of Hayward (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3rd 988, 1003.

Removing such a large number of parking spaces will create a personal hardship for many people, will increase congestion, and will have an adverse environmental impact. Yet MTA callously denies the hardship, and MTA and the SF Planning Department completely ignore the environmental impact.

Emergency Response. In an emergency, one minute of additional response time can literally be the difference between life and death. The congestion described above will slow down emergency vehicles, especially when buses are present. The bus boarding platforms will present obstacles. The five-foot wide median strip will make it impossible for emergency vehicles to drive on the opposite side of the street, as they sometimes do now for brief but critical moments, and harder to execute fast left turns.

I requested from the San Francisco Fire Department all documents reflecting analyses, investigations, reports, etc. of the impact of the Masonic project on firefighting and other emergency response. The response I received indicates that the Fire Department didn't do any analysis of the impact of the Project on firefighting and other emergency response, at least none that was memorialized in writing. It is quite likely that the Fire Department was under intense political pressure not to analyze the Project and not to raise any objections. Many firefighters stationed in the area were not even aware of the Project until they were notified by residents opposed to it.

Lack of Fair Notice and Outreach. I never received notice from MTA (nor from the Planning Department or any other City department or agency) about the Project - no notice of community workshops or any MTA Board meetings or hearings, nor of any other meetings. I learned of the MTA Board's approval from SF Gate, after it happened. I've spoken with dozens of people in my neighborhood, and almost none of them (and, on my block, literally nobody with whom I've spoken) received notice. Yet MTA claims the Project has "overwhelming community support." At a meeting at City Hall on March 13, 2013 with Ahmad El-Najjar (Supervisor Breed's Legislative Aide), James Shahamiri (an MTA engineer working on the Project) and a group of neighborhood residents opposed to the project, Mr. Shahamiri went so far as to claim that notice and outreach to the neighborhood not only were extensive and fair, but were the "gold standard" for MTA projects. His statement shocked those of us present, most or all of whom received no notice.

In fact, however, MTA outreach and notice were deficient, and skewed heavily toward supporters and likely supporters. Documents received in response to a Sunshine request confirm that MTA coordinated with the SF Bicycle Coalition, Fix Masonic and other supporters in

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 33 of 44

conducting outreach. One of the only people I know in my neighborhood who received notice is a member of the SF Bicycle Coalition and a strong supporter of the Project.

When pressed about who it notified, MTA retreats from its grandiose, extravagant claims, stating that it complied with legal requirements, which it says requires notifying residents within a one block radius of Masonic. Putting aside that MTA outreached selectively to supporters of the project who live much more than a block from Masonic, and putting aside deficiencies even in its claimed compliance with legal requirements, is the fact that MTA has lowered the bar. Mere compliance with the one block requirement is a much lower standard than the notice they would have had to have given in order to fairly claim “overwhelming community support,” because the community affected extends far beyond one block from Masonic. It would’ve been easy to provide mail notification to neighborhood residents who live more than one block from Masonic, and to holders of residential parking permits, but MTA chose not to do that.

If it truly believes the Project has “overwhelming community support,” MTA should agree to a nonbinding, advisory vote (with one person-one vote, and voting to be conducted by an independent third-party) by notifying all residents, in writing, within a specified area of Masonic about the Project and giving them an opportunity to vote on it. (There is precedent for such a vote - in 2004, the Department of Parking and Traffic (MTA’s predecessor) held a vote about the Page Street traffic circles. Residents opposed that project 77% to 23%.) Yet, in response to a specific request to Director of Transportation Ed Reiskin, MTA has refused to allow even a nonbinding, advisory vote.

It is wrong and undemocratic for a major project that will affect the daily lives of thousands of people for decades to come to be imposed without fair notice to those people and without providing them a meaningful opportunity to be heard before decisions are made. MTA’s actions foster cynicism, distrust and alienation from government. By disapproving a project developed and promoted in such an undemocratic way, you would be sending an important message about open government. The converse is also true.

Inconsistency between MTA’s Safest Configuration Claim and Majority Preference Claim. MTA claims that the Boulevard configuration (with all parking removed on both sides of the street) is the safest. They claim there is an unavoidable conflict between retaining parking on Masonic and making it safe, and that safety must trump parking. But on the other hand MTA repeatedly emphasizes that the Boulevard configuration was chosen because it was the most popular choice among those who attended the “community workshops.” The other main choice, which was less popular, would have retained parking on one side of the street.

But MTA never explains why safety requires the elimination of all parking – they don’t give any reasons based on traffic engineering principles. The Boulevard choice is justified by its alleged popularity. If the configuration that would have retained parking on one side of the street had been the most popular, would MTA have agreed to it? The implication of MTA’s message is yes; but if they would have agreed to it, does that mean it is equally safe (in MTA’s opinion) as the configuration that eliminates all parking? If it is equally safe as the Boulevard, that undermines their argument that the Boulevard configuration is the safest. And, if it is equally safe, then why

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 34 of 44

not choose it instead of the Boulevard, since it would retain half the parking and result in less hardship? Or, if MTA would have overruled that choice on the basis that it is not as safe as the Boulevard configuration, then they are wrong in their assertion that the Boulevard was chosen because it was the most popular.

Finally, if MTA would not have overruled the choice that would have retained half of the parking, even though in their professional engineering opinion it would not be as safe – in other words, if MTA is willing to have true majority rule - then they should be willing to have a vote of all those who live within a specified radius of Masonic. But MTA has refused to hold even a nonbinding, advisory vote.

A Poorly Conceived Experiment. The Project would involve a raised concrete cycle track, above street level and below sidewalk level, a type of design never before used in San Francisco or in any comparable environment in any comparable American city. In response to inquiries about use of this design in other cities, MTA staff provided a photo of a raised cycle track in Richmond, British Columbia, Canada. The photo is attached to this e-mail. As you can see, the photo is of a suburban style area with shopping malls, few driveways, a sidewalk devoid of pedestrians, and a raised concrete structure high above the sidewalk - nothing at all like Masonic. The fact that this is the closest example MTA could find indicates just how experimental and inappropriate a raised cycle track design would be for Masonic.

Other Safety Measures Should be Adopted. \$18 million is a huge amount of taxpayer money to spend on a project that has not been adequately analyzed and will have so many harmful consequences. Many of the collisions on Masonic occurred at night; lighting along Masonic should be improved. Some cars ran into fixed objects; this can be mitigated by redesigning and/or moving street furniture and signal poles. MTA should analyze whether left turns off of Masonic should be further restricted, especially at Turk (where visibility is poor because of the hill), and should consider how to improve traffic signal timing and configuration. Left turn arrows should be considered at many of the intersections, including, at some locations, permitting left turns only on the arrow. Also, the intersection of Masonic/Turk still doesn't have pedestrian countdown signals; these should have been installed years ago.

One of the two fatalities frequently cited in support of redesigning Masonic was caused by a drunk driver; the Project will not prevent deaths and injuries caused by drunk driving. (Supervisor Mar and some other proponents of the Project claim there have been seven deaths, but some of the other five were not on Masonic and the others were on Masonic North or South of the Project area; these fatalities would not have been prevented by the Project. Promoting such an inflated figure is disingenuous fear mongering, especially when done repeatedly.) It also must be recognized that many of the collisions were the fault of the pedestrian or cyclist, and that collisions will occur when people act carelessly, especially on a major thoroughfare. For example, the Project would not have prevented the tragic death of the pedestrian who jaywalked across from the Trader Joe's, well North of the Project area. This is not to argue that Masonic can't and shouldn't be improved, but to recognize that there is a limit to what can be accomplished by street and traffic design.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 35 of 44

The street surface of Masonic is in terrible shape and desperately needs repaving. Many of the corners in the Project area have steep, dangerous curb ramps that are in poor condition, lack textured domed warning surfaces, and are only on one side of a corner, forcing disabled pedestrians into the street. I, and perhaps others, requested new, legally required curb ramps at these intersections years ago. Some of the bus stops on Masonic need new shelters. Lighting needs to be improved along Masonic. All of these improvements should be made ASAP, and they can all be done without implementing the Project and without spending anywhere near \$18 million.

Please don't experiment with our neighborhood and our daily lives. In 2003/2004, MTA's predecessor DPT installed traffic circles along Page Street without thoroughly analyzing the particular conditions and without fair notice to the people affected. DPT engineers insisted, and insisted again and again, that these would calm traffic, but the opposite happened. Fortunately, the traffic circles were temporary, inexpensive and easy to remove. But with the Masonic Project, the collateral damage from the trial and error method won't be so easy to reverse.

Thank you.

Robert Francis

Date: 9/23/2013 10:40 AM

Subject: 9/25 Agenda item 9(a) Stop OBAG funds for Masonic Avenue

Dear Metropolitan Transportation Commission,

Please do not approve the Masonic Avenue Complete Streets Project as part of OBAG funds. The project is poorly planned by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency(SFMTA). It will aggravate transportation for all users.

1) SFMTA data shows that 32,000 vehicles, 13,000 bus #43 riders, over 1,000 pedestrians daily use Masonic Ave. During 90 minutes of afternoon rush hour traffic SFMTA counted 31 bicycles traveling in the north and south direction on Masonic Ave.

Would AC Transit, SamTrans and other transportation agencies spend millions of dollars adding a bus line only to have 31 passengers during 90 minutes of afternoon rush hour traffic?

2) Baker Street is parallel to Masonic Ave. with less than 10% of Masonic Ave. traffic. It would be a good alternative instead of forcing bicyclists on a busy, major arterial road.

3) SFMTA has not properly addressed the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, people with disabilities. They will place the raised bicycle track on the sidewalk behind the bus shelter.

Pedestrians need to step over the bicycle track, walk 10 feet before reaching the curb at the intersection. Bus #43 riders must step over the bicycle track to reach the bus shelter. Riders who get off the bus must step over the bicycle track to reach the sidewalk.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 36 of 44

This design is not safe for anyone. It invites accidents to happen on a regular basis between pedestrians and bicyclists.

Please stop a bad project from becoming a living nightmare for all residents, pedestrians, vehicles, bus riders that daily use Masonic Ave.

Sincerely,
Daniel Tomasevich
San Francisco

Date: 9/23/2013 12:47 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25,2013

Dear MTC Chair, Members and Staff

My name is Marian Casey and I have lived at 227 Masonic Avenue since 1999. I am opposed to the Boulevard Option for Masonic Avenue.

I attended the three workshops that the MTA held for re-designing Masonic Avenue. The Boulevard option was selected at the third meeting. One hundred and nine people filled out forms rating the Boulevard and Gateway options for Masonic Avenue. Sixty one of the forms were from people directly affected by the options, and not all of them were in favor of the Boulevard option.

I have been involved in putting flyers on cars on Masonic to let drivers know about the MTA and Board of Supervisors decision to approve the Boulevard option. There is a petition on Move On that has been signed by over 990 people who oppose the Boulevard option, most of whom didn't know that this decision had been made. Many of the people have left thoughtful comments and many of the signees said they were also avid bicyclists. As of yet, no one who drives on Masonic as a commuter has any idea that the commuter lane is going to be eliminated.

There are many safety options that haven't been implemented on Masonic Avenue. There are no pedestrian countdown lights on Masonic and Turk. Speeding could be controlled by red light cameras. And a new traffic signal at Masonic and McAllister would slow down traffic on this most hilly portion of Masonic.

I am also concerned about the cost of the Boulevard option. I feel that it is excessive. If the MTA and the Board of Supervisors are going ahead with eliminating all parking and the commuter lanes on Masonic, there is a much less expensive option. All that would be necessary would be to paint the curb lanes green and change all the traffic signs to reflect the exclusive use of the curb lanes for bicyclists. Masonic Avenue is a busy and vital thoroughfare and it doesn't need beautification. It is used by emergency vehicles and students and homeowners and shoppers and commuters and it does it very well considering the amount of uses it serves.

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 37 of 44

Sincerely yours
Marian Casey

*Note: The list of 986 petitioners can be found on the handout table during the 9/25/2013 Commission meeting.

Date: 9/23/2013 1:36 PM

Subject: MTC 9/25 meeting Agenda item 9a, Please stop OBAG funding for Masonic Ave

Dear Metropolitan Transportation Commission,

Enclosed* is the list of 986 petitioners who are opposed to the Masonic Avenue Complete Streets Project submitted for One Bay Area Grant(OBAG) funds, agenda item 9a on the Sept.25, 2013 MTC meeting. The petitioner's names are broken down into three pdf files. The two larger files each contain 400 names, the smaller file contains 186 names.

The petition is ongoing. Since the generation of these enclosed files, 7 people have signed the petition. Bringing the current running total of 993 petitioners opposing the Masonic Avenue project.

1) According to San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency(SFMTA) data daily there are about 33,000 vehicles, 13,000 bus #43 riders, over 1,000 pedestrians that use Masonic Avenue. Aug. 2010 SFMTA counted 31 bicyclists going north, south on Masonic Avenue during 90 minutes of rush hour traffic.

Project cost is \$18 million.

Would SamTrans, AC Transit, MUNI, ... and any other transportation agency spend millions of dollars to add a bus line only to service 31 passengers during 90 minutes of rush hour traffic?

2) SFMTA approved the Masonic Avenue Complete Streets Project based on approximately 80 supporters from a survey. Now that residents are more informed of the project there is a different outcome. For every supporter of the plan there are 12 residents that are opposed to the plan.

Please stop the OBAG funds for the Masonic Avenue project. The far reaching negative impacts will make it a nightmare for all residents that use Masonic Avenue on a daily basis.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Howard Chabner

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 38 of 44

Date: 9/23/2013 6:51 PM

Subject: Opposition to Masonic Avenue project

Dear Mayor Lee, Supervisors, MTA Board members, Mr. Reiskin, MTC:

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the highly short-sighted Masonic Avenue cycle-track project. I live two blocks from Masonic and use that street nearly every day.

This project will increase congestion on Masonic, especially during rush hour (those extra lanes are a godsend and completely necessary!) and especially with the increased traffic that will be generated by the new Target store (which local residents are already very worried about, with good reason). It will result in the loss of parking spaces for nearly 3/4 of a mile, jeopardize public safety, and create a great hardship for neighborhood residents, especially those who live on or near Masonic. The proposed construction schedule alone will wreak havoc on several neighborhoods and on all of those commuters who use the Geary/Masonic/Fell artery to get to and from their downtown jobs. San Francisco does not need to and cannot afford to spend \$18 million on this project.

I rarely see cyclists on Masonic, which is a steep hill with fast commuter traffic. Rather than encourage cyclists to use one of the busiest north-south thoroughfares in San Francisco, they should be encouraged to use the route along nearby Baker Street, a safer route with far fewer motor vehicles.

I'm also concerned about the way the cycle track project was developed and approved. Although I live two blocks away, I didn't receive notice that this project was being considered, nor have I received notice of any meetings about it, including the MTA Board meeting at which it was approved.

Please stop this project ASAP, go back to the drawing board and consider a much smaller project to improve Masonic that does not involve the loss of parking spaces, the reduction of travel lanes (it's shocking to me that this is even being considered!), the creation of horrible congestion problems during and after construction, and the outlay of \$18 million.

I appreciate your attention to this request and the requests of hundreds of residents who did not get a chance to weigh in on this proposal.

Sincerely,
Melissa Stein

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 39 of 44

Date: 9/23/2013 8:33 PM

Subject: Re: Agenda Item 9(a) - OBAG - Masonic Avenue Complete Streets -MTC Meeting
September 25, 2013

Dear Ms. Hughes,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Masonic Avenue cycle track project. This project will increase congestion on Masonic, especially during rush hour and especially with the increased traffic that will be generated by the new Target store, result in the loss of parking spaces for nearly 3/4 of a mile, increase pollution in the area, jeopardize public safety, and create a great hardship for neighborhood residents, especially those who live on or near Masonic. Also, San Francisco cannot afford to spend \$18 million on this project.

It is estimated that 32,000 automobiles use Masonic daily, but only a small amount of cyclists. Rather than encourage cyclists to use one of the busiest north-south thoroughfares in San Francisco, they should be encouraged to use the route along nearby Baker Street, a safer route with far fewer motor vehicles.

I drive and bus on Masonic and this loss of lanes will cause more congestion not only on Masonic, but the side streets. This roaming of traffic will cause an increase in the pollution in the area not a decrease.

I understand neither the Police Department nor Fire Department was consulted in the planning of this project. Recently the Fire Department spoke out against bulb outs which will hinder their ability to use their equipment in a safe and efficient manner. Congestion and lane loss will decrease rapid response time to the neighborhood.

Another issue is the entrance of Target to this area which will add significantly to the local traffic pattern. Why not do an EIR when Target is in place and get some true figures before making such a major change.

Masonic can be improved by planting new trees, improving lighting and adding bus shelters, with much less hardship to the neighborhood and cost than the cycle track project.

Please stop this project ASAP, go back to the drawing board and consider a much smaller project to improve Masonic that does not involve the loss of parking spaces, the reduction of travel lanes, increased congestion, and the outlay of \$18 million.

Thank you for considering my e-mail.

Barbara Addeo

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 40 of 44

Date: 9/23/2013 11:57 PM

Subject: AgendaItem9(a)-OBAG-MasonicAvenueCompleteStreets-MTC September25, 2013”

I write to express my objection to what I feel is a great misuse or waste of taxpayer money in the plans for redesign of the Masonic Street corridor. It seems ill conceived to place bicycle lanes on a street which carries such heavy traffic and is one of the only north south corridors to relieve the nearly impossible congestion on Divisadero Street. As a homeowner living on Page Street within two blocks of Masonic, my tenants and I frequently use Masonic Street and are very familiar with the congestion on it at peak drive times.

The addition of bicycle lanes will server to make any turns onto and off of Masonic exceptionally dangerous and difficult. The danger of having to negotiate cyclists and pedestrians in such a heavily traveled corridor which provides access to San Francisco University as well as to the shops which include the busiest Trader Joe's in the city and the soon to open Target make a bicycle lane on this street a very hazardous decision.

It would be far wiser, in my opinion, to consider a bicycle lane on Scott Street or some other street where the traffic flow is considerably lower and easily connects to the "wiggle".

I appreciate your consideration of my opinion as expressed here. I hope you will reconsider any allocation of funds to this endeavor until more research has been completed and more a more active solicitation of opinions from property owners and residents of the adjacent residential and commercial neighborhoods. You need ask for input in an actively solicitous manner instead of springing decisions on projects with such wide ranging impact on those of us who live and have vested interest in this project.

This is a terrible waste of funding when we face so many much greater needs in our city. Bike lanes are a luxury and a very contentious attempt to appear "green" while the leaders of our city capitulate time and again to allowing over development of property and much greater density of population than will ever be manageable without significant investment in public transportation. While cycling is to be encouraged...the current trend in dedicated lanes makes driving an exercise nearly impossible with the scope of lane movement, cross traffic, dedicated bus lanes, dedicated turn lanes, pedestrians, and cyclists who frequently are blatantly inattentive to traffic laws.

As a property owner in the adjacent neighborhood it is simply infuriating to be ignored by the process of this project through approvals without giving due consideration to the property owners in the adjacent neighborhoods who are most greatly affected by it. I am quite certain all of us will be living with a horrendously congested corridor as a result of this badly conceived project.

Sincerely Yours,
Paul S. Daniels

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 41 of 44

Date: 9/24/2013 2:13 PM

Subject: Agenda Item 9(a) – OBAG – Masonic Avenue Complete Streets - MTC, September 25, 2013

Please deny funding of the Masonic Avenue Complete Streets.

Everyone, including myself, is in favor of safer streets. However, this project will not improve safety on Masonic Avenue.

The major focus of this project is the addition of a raised cycle track along dozens of driveways on Masonic Avenue. This will create a safety hazard for drivers who need to back out of their driveways and the bicyclists who are fast-moving and not highly visible to those drivers. This is not a safe place to put a raised cycle track.

The accidents that have occurred on Masonic Avenue would not have been prevented by a raised cycle track. If anything the proposed cycle track will increase, not decrease, accidents on Masonic Avenue.

Please support safer streets by funding projects which are properly designed to improve conditions. The Masonic Avenue Complete Streets is not such a project. Please vote NO on this project.

Thank you.
Stephanie Chang

Date: 9/24/2013 2:35 PM

Subject: Save Masonic

Dear Mayor Lee, Supervisors, MTA Board members, Mr. Reiskin, MTC:

I am writing to express my strong opposition and total bewilderment to the Masonic Avenue cycle track project. I live in Cole Valley and Masonic is my major north-south artery across town. It is unbelievably jam packed every morning and afternoon during rush hours even with the extra lane. I can't imagine whose idea it was to take away an already existing lane to accommodate bicycles which could use another street. I only heard about this project through an e-mail from a friend, not the City or my supervisor. This congestion will only get worse when Target opens.

Please stop this ill-conceived project immediately and, if the the idea is to beautify Masonic, consider a smaller project that does not mean losing parking, extra driving lanes and \$18 million.

Thank you for reading my e-mail and thinking about it.
Sincerely,
Susan Margolis

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 42 of 44

Date: 9/24/2013 3:28 PM

Subject: Bicycle Comments] Agenda item 9A

I wish I could attend the meeting tomorrow Wednesday but work does not permit me time. I would appreciate you reading the trail of emails I have exchanged with the staff of the S.F.B.O.S. member whose district this Masonic Ave includes. I think the few are definitely benefiting at the expense of the many on this project.

I would ask you to consider my perspective that you as Commissioners have a Fiduciary responsibility to the people of the State. The money you have proposed to fund this project is obscene in my opinion given the small number of people who stand to benefit from the project. It may seem like my opinion but I think if you look at the statistics provided by the Supervisors aide, the statistics do back my perspective:

1) Fact: (Please see the 2 attachments from the aide to the Supervisor below). There have been very few incidents of bike/car accidents on this busy North South corridor. A big reason for this is bikes have way better routes logistically than ever going on Masonic. Bike don't use the Street because it is hilly and there are 3 other Streets within a block or two that are bike friendly in every way.

2) Masonic Ave always has been a major automobile corridor for the residents who live in the West part of town to reach the downtown area. We need to use common sense and see that many hundred if not thousands of cars use this route everyday because it is the only three lane north south corridor within 1 mile either direction. So we are going to accommodate the wants of maybe 20 or 50 bikes daily (I can guarantee you not 50 because as I said the road is steep and out of the way) at the real inconvenience of close to 1000 if not more commuters in the morning and the evening ?

I would appreciate your responses. Also please let me know how many time you have driven in or around Masonic Ave at rush hour in the a.m. or p.m.

Thanks.

Joe Kelly

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: FW: Bicycle Comments

From: "Johnston, Conor" <conor.johnston@sfgov.org>

Date: Tue, September 24, 2013 11:21 am

To: "joe@kellyandiribarren.com" <joe@kellyandiribarren.com>

I'm sorry you feel that way.

From: joe@kellyandiribarren.com [mailto:joe@kellyandiribarren.com]

Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 11:08 PM

To: Johnston, Conor

Subject: RE: FW: Bicycle Comments

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 43 of 44

I hate to seem so cold but really ? The information you sent me solidifies my perspective. That perspective is this project is way to much money being spent to serve the needs of way to few people. There is not a problem on Masonic between bikes and cars. As I mentioned earlier very few bikes use Masonic because there are other north south Streets within a block or three that are much more biker friendly in all aspects.

additionally I mentioned in my original message I expect more out of elected officials than to pander to the squeaky wheels. The common good is by no means being satisfied on this issue. Did you notice that all but one these poor souls was in there 20's ? I would love to have you check back with these bike enthusiasts when they hit 40 and have families. Your original message said it is for the good of kids and pedestrians. Please ! This is a classic pander to a group of people that quite frankly does not deserve 1/10 the time and 1/1000 the money they are sucking out of the system. The young lady killed crossing the street is sad but one death is by no means a reason to spend \$18 million (Please note she was not even in the area the work will be done) to inconvenience thousands of commuters on a daily basis. Were are they to go now ? Speed down some side street that all the bikers are really on !!!

I really do feel bad for these people killed all over town but outside the drunk driver at 10;30 p.m. none of these accidents occurred in the work zone. If there were 15 accidents between bikes and cars in the work zone o.k. do something. I would still like to discuss this with the Supervisor so let her know I am waiting for her call. Thanks.

Joe Kelly

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: FW: Bicycle Comments

From: "Johnston, Conor"

Date: Mon, September 23, 2013 12:11 pm

To: "joe@kellyandiribarren.com" <joe@kellyandiribarren.com>

This article covers it well: <http://sf.streetsblog.org/2012/05/07/suzanne-monaco-25-killed-by-driver-crossing-masonic-near-euclid/>

This one's a broader look: <https://medium.com/p/1456bbd017d9>

Conor Johnston

Office of Supervisor London Breed

415-554-6783

From: joe@kellyandiribarren.com [mailto:joe@kellyandiribarren.com]

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2013 6:22 PM

To: Johnston, Conor

Subject: RE: FW: Bicycle Comments

I appreciate your response. Please tell me what kind of accidents you are referring to ? I have driven that route for a long time. Please expand on the serious accidents that have occurred. Who or what was involved in these accidents. You use terms like kids and pedestrian but I have to say I never see kids there and I am really curious were the accidents occur ? To be blunt but this is a city and that street is a main corridor. People need to be careful.

Again please send me some details or refer me to a web site that expands on this notion that there have been numerous incidents that warrants this major change. Thanks.

Joe Kelly

----- Original Message -----

September 25, 2013

Exhibit 2 - Additional Comments Regarding Masonic Complete Streets Project

Page 44 of 44

Subject: FW: Bicycle Comments

From: "Johnston, Conor" <conor.johnston@sfgov.org>

Date: Fri, September 20, 2013 4:43 pm

To: "joe@kellyandiribarren.com" <joe@kellyandiribarren.com>

Cc: "Breed, London" <london.breed@sfgov.org>

Thank you for the email, Joe. My name is Conor Johnston; I am a legislative aide for Supervisor Breed.

We know the Masonic project is very controversial, and Supervisor Breed takes your concerns very seriously.

The truth is this corridor is fundamentally dangerous in its current design. Doing nothing will continue to put residents, transit riders, motorists, kids, pedestrians, and bicyclists at danger. In the interest of public safety, Supervisor Breed chooses to move forward with this project. But in doing so, she will absolutely address your concerns and work to mitigate any negative impacts of the project.

The Masonic project is not about bike lanes. It's about making this corridor safer for everyone. There have been several serious accidents recently and neighbors along the route pushed for changes to make it safer. Something has to be done to make it safer.

The majority of the project's cost, \$10 of the \$18 million, is being funded by the federal government. The rest is bond money from the MTA.

This is about safety for all modes of transit, not just bikes.

Conor Johnston

From: joe@kellyandiribarren.com [mailto:joe@kellyandiribarren.com]

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2013 1:34 PM

Subject: Bicycle Comments

Hi, I stopped into your office the other day to ask you please see what you can do about blocking the crazy idea about putting \$18,000,000 into Masonic St. for bikes and pedestrians. I beg of you to stop this. You see what happens with the Bicycle Nazi's. They are out of control and they represent about 3% of our society.

The pedestrian access on Masonic is fine. Bicycles do not ever use Masonic. There are 5 other Streets going North to South that are easier and already have bike lanes. You are a better civil servant letting the money go even if another representative swoops it up for some pork barrel project. The wasteful use of public funds will not be on your back. Stand up for the super majority(Non bicyclists who have other things in life to do rather than push for bike lanes all over town, selfishly at the expensive of the super majority of the citizens) spend our funds wisely. Act as if it were your own !! What you tweeted about bicyclist is 100% on the money.

I would appreciate your time .Please call. Thanks.

Joe Kelly

Attachment B-1

MTC Res. No. 4035, Attachment B-1
 Adopted: 05/17/12-C
 Revised: 10/24/12-C
 11/28/12-C 12/19/12-C
 01/23/13-C 02/27/13-C
 05/22/13-C 09/25/13-C

Cycle 2
 Regional Programs Project List
 FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
 September 2013

Regional Programs Project List

Project Category and Title	County	Implementing Agency	Total STP/CMAQ	Total Other RTIP/TAP/TFCA	Total Cycle 2
CYCLE 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS			\$435,187,000	\$40,000,000	\$475,187,000
1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (PL)					
ABAG Planning	Region-Wide	ABAG	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
BCDC Planning	Region-Wide	BCDC	\$1,341,000	\$0	\$1,341,000
MTC Planning	Region-Wide	MTC	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (PL)			TOTAL: \$6,687,000	\$0	\$6,687,000
2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)					
Clipper® Fare Media Collection	Region-Wide	MTC	\$21,400,000	\$0	\$21,400,000
511 - Traveler Information	Region-Wide	MTC	\$48,770,000	\$0	\$48,770,000
SUBTOTAL			\$70,170,000	\$0	\$70,170,000
Incident Management Program	Region-Wide	MTC/SAFE	\$10,840,000	\$0	\$10,840,000
FSP/Call Box Program	Region-Wide	MTC/SAFE	\$14,290,000	\$0	\$14,290,000
SUBTOTAL			\$25,130,000	\$0	\$25,130,000
2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)			TOTAL: \$95,300,000	\$0	\$95,300,000
3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)					
Regional Performance Initiatives Implementation	Region-Wide	MTC	\$5,750,000	\$0	\$5,750,000
Regional Performance Initiatives Corridor Implementation	Region-Wide	MTC	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$6,000,000
Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$7,000,000	\$0	\$7,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$18,750,000	\$0	\$18,750,000
Ramp Metering and TOS Elements					
FPI - ALA I-580: SJ Co. Line to Vasco & Foothill to Crow Canyon	Alameda	Caltrans	\$0	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000
FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Loveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 2	Contra Costa	Caltrans	\$11,800,000	\$0	\$11,800,000
FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Loveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 1	Contra Costa	MTC/SAFE	\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
FPI - Various Corridors Caltrans PE and Right of Way	Region-Wide	Caltrans	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000
FPI - SCL US 101: SBT Co. Line to SR 85	Santa Clara	Caltrans	\$29,700,000	\$0	\$29,700,000
FPI - SOL I-80: I-505 to Yolo Co. Line.	Solano	Caltrans	\$0	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$43,250,000	\$34,000,000	\$77,250,000
3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)			TOTAL: \$62,000,000	\$34,000,000	\$96,000,000
4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)					
Pavement Management Program (PMP)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$1,200,000
Pavement Technical Advisory Program (PTAP)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$6,000,000
4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)			TOTAL: \$7,200,000	\$0	\$7,200,000
5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION					
Regional PDA Planning and Implementation					
PDA Planning - ABAG	Region-Wide	ABAG	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000
Regional PDA Planning	Region-Wide	MTC	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$8,000,000
Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH)	Various	TBD	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
Local PDA Planning					
Local PDA Planning - Alameda	Alameda	ACTC	\$3,905,000	\$0	\$3,905,000
Local PDA Planning - Contra Costa	Contra Costa	CCTA	\$2,745,000	\$0	\$2,745,000
Local PDA Planning - Marin	Marin	TAM	\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
Local PDA Planning - Marin County Civic Center Planning	Marin	Marin County	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local PDA Planning - City of Napa	Napa	Napa	\$275,000	\$0	\$275,000
Local PDA Planning - American Canyon	Napa	American Canyon	\$475,000	\$0	\$475,000
Local PDA Planning - San Francisco	San Francisco	SF City/County	\$2,380,000	\$0	\$2,380,000
Local PDA Planning - San Mateo	San Mateo	SMCCAG	\$1,608,000	\$0	\$1,608,000
Local PDA Planning - Santa Clara	Santa Clara	VTA	\$5,349,000	\$0	\$5,349,000
Local PDA Planning - Solano	Solano	STA	\$1,066,000	\$0	\$1,066,000
Local PDA Planning - Sonoma	Sonoma	SCTA	\$1,447,000	\$0	\$1,447,000
SUBTOTAL			\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION			TOTAL: \$40,000,000	\$0	\$40,000,000
6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)					
Climate Strategies	TBD	TBD	\$14,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$20,000,000
6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)			TOTAL: \$14,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$20,000,000
7. REGIONAL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (RSRTS)					
<i>Specific projects TBD by CMAs</i>					
RSRTS - Alameda County Safe Routes to School Program	Alameda	ACTC	\$4,293,000	\$0	\$4,293,000
<u>Vista Grande St Pedestrian/SRTS Improvements</u>	<u>Contra Costa</u>	<u>Danville</u>	<u>\$157,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$157,000</u>
<u>Happy Valley Road Walkway SRTS Improvements</u>	<u>Contra Costa</u>	<u>Lafayette</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
<u>Moraga Road SRTS Bicycle / Pedestrian Improvements</u>	<u>Contra Costa</u>	<u>Moraga</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>

Attachment B-2

MTC Resolution No. 4035, Attachment B-2
 Adopted: 05/17/12-C
 Revised: 10/24/12-C
 12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C
 05/22/13-C 09/25/13-C

Cycle 2 OBAG Project List FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16 September 2013

OBAG Program Project List

Project Category and Title	Implementing Agency	Total STP/CMAQ	Total Other RTIP-TAP	Total Cycle 2
CYCLE 2 COUNTY OBAG PROGRAMMING		\$301,964,000	\$18,036,000	\$320,000,000
<u>San Ramon Valley Blvd Preservation</u>	<u>San Ramon</u>	<u>\$291,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$291,000</u>
<u>Walnut Creek North Main Street Preservation</u>	<u>Walnut Creek</u>	<u>\$655,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$655,000</u>
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY TOTAL:		\$42,820,000	\$2,384,000	\$45,204,000
MARIN COUNTY				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Marin CMA</i>	TBD	\$2,099,000	\$707,000	\$2,806,000
CMA Base Planning Activities - Marin	TAM	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - Marin	TAM	\$418,000	\$0	\$418,000
Central Marin Ferry Bike/Ped Connection	<u>TAM</u>	<u>\$1,500,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,500,000</u>
<u>North Civic Center Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements</u>	<u>Marin County</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>Bolinas Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Intersection Imps.</u>	<u>Ross</u>	<u>\$274,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$274,000</u>
<u>San Rafael Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>San Rafael</u>	<u>\$457,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$457,000</u>
<u>San Rafael Transit Center Pedestrian Access Imps.</u>	<u>San Rafael</u>	<u>\$1,900,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,900,000</u>
MARIN COUNTY TOTAL:		\$9,321,000	\$707,000	\$10,028,000
NAPA COUNTY				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Napa - NCTPA</i>	TBD	\$794,000	\$0	\$794,000
CMA Base Planning Activities - Napa	NCTPA	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
Eucalyptus Drive Complete Streets	American Canyon	\$723,000	\$431,000	\$1,154,000
Napa City North/South Bike Connection	Napa (City)	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000
California Avenue Roundabouts	Napa (City)	\$1,740,000	\$0	\$1,740,000
NAPA COUNTY TOTAL:		\$6,230,000	\$431,000	\$6,661,000
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY				
<i>Specific projects TBD by San Francisco CMA</i>	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$0
CMA Base Planning Activities - San Francisco	SFCTA	\$2,795,000	\$0	\$2,795,000
CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - San Francisco	SFCTA	\$773,000	\$0	\$773,000
<u>Longfellow Safe Routes to School</u>	<u>SF DPW</u>	<u>\$670,307</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$670,307</u>
<u>ER Taylor Safe Routes to School</u>	<u>SF DPW</u>	<u>\$519,631</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$519,631</u>
<u>Chinatown Broadway Complete Streets Phase IV</u>	<u>SF DPW</u>	<u>\$5,320,536</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$5,320,536</u>
<u>Mansell Corridor Complete Streets</u>	<u>SFCTA</u>	<u>\$1,762,239</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,762,239</u>
<u>Masonic Avenue Complete Streets</u>	<u>SFMTA</u>	<u>\$8,317,539</u>	<u>\$1,910,000</u>	<u>\$10,227,539</u>
<u>Second Street Complete Streets</u>	<u>SFMTA</u>	<u>\$10,515,748</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$10,515,748</u>
<u>Transbay Center Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps.</u>	<u>TJPA</u>	<u>\$6,000,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$6,000,000</u>
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TOTAL:		\$36,674,000	\$1,910,000	\$38,584,000
SAN MATEO COUNTY				
<i>Specific projects TBD by San Mateo CMA</i>	TBD	\$0	\$1,991,000	\$1,991,000
CMA Base Planning Activities - San Mateo	SMCCAG	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - San Mateo	SMCCAG	\$672,000	\$0	\$672,000
<u>PDA Planning Augmentation - San Mateo</u>	<u>SMCCAG</u>	<u>\$164,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$164,000</u>
US 101 / Broadway Interchange Bike/Ped Imps	Caltrans	\$3,613,000	\$0	\$3,613,000
<u>Atherton Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>Atherton</u>	<u>\$285,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$285,000</u>
San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement Bike/Ped Imps	Pacifica	\$1,141,000	\$0	\$1,141,000
Pacifica Linda Mar Blvd Preservation	Pacifica	\$431,000	\$0	\$431,000
Crestview Drive Pavement Rehabilitation	San Carlos	\$412,000	\$0	\$412,000
<u>Belmont Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>Belmont</u>	<u>\$534,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$534,000</u>
<u>Ralston Road Pedestrian Improvements</u>	<u>Belmont</u>	<u>\$250,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$250,000</u>
<u>Old County Road Bike and Pedestrian Imps</u>	<u>Belmont</u>	<u>\$270,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$270,000</u>
<u>Carolan Avenue Complete Streets and Road Diet</u>	<u>Burlingame</u>	<u>\$986,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$986,000</u>
<u>Daly City Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>Daly City</u>	<u>\$562,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$562,000</u>
<u>John Daly Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps.</u>	<u>Daly City</u>	<u>\$1,000,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,000,000</u>
<u>Bay Road Bike and Ped Imps. Phase II and III</u>	<u>East Palo Alto</u>	<u>\$1,000,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,000,000</u>
<u>Menlo Park Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>Menlo Park</u>	<u>\$427,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$427,000</u>
<u>Menlo Park Various Streets Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps</u>	<u>Menlo Park</u>	<u>\$797,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$797,000</u>
<u>Millbrae Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>Millbrae</u>	<u>\$445,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$445,000</u>
<u>Palmetto Avenue Streetscape</u>	<u>Pacifica</u>	<u>\$1,000,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$1,000,000</u>
<u>Portola Valley Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>Portola Valley</u>	<u>\$224,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$224,000</u>
<u>Redwood City Various Streets and Roads Preservation</u>	<u>Redwood City</u>	<u>\$548,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$548,000</u>