

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

DIVISION: Finance & Information Technology

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) at its meeting on April 7, 2009, held a public hearing regarding the proposed declaration of fiscal emergency under California Public Resources Code section 21080.32 and California Environmental Quality Act implementing guidelines, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations section 15285. This document contains responses to public comments received at the April 7, 2009 meeting and through April 10, 2009 concerning that proposed declaration. It is recommended that the Board of Directors adopt a resolution finding that a fiscal emergency exists caused by the failure of the Agency to adequately fund agency programs, facilities, and operations.

SUMMARY:

- The Proposed Amended Operating Budget for 2009-2010 projects a \$128.9 million deficit. There are various options that were discussed by the SFMTA Board of Directors at its meetings on the March 17, 2009 and April 7, 2009 to address this deficit including a reduction in transit service and increases to various fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service.
- Reductions in transit service and increases to fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service are subject to the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides a statutory exemption from environmental review for the reduction or elimination of transit service and increases to fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service if implemented as a result of a declared fiscal emergency caused by the failure of the revenues to adequately fund an agency’s programs, facilities, and operations.
- A “fiscal emergency” means that the agency is projected to have negative working capital within one year from the date that the agency makes the finding that a fiscal emergency exists. An analysis of the working capital for SFMTA concludes that the conditions exist for the declaration of a “fiscal emergency.” A finding by the SFMTA Board that a fiscal emergency exists does not automatically result in implementation of service reductions or changes to fees, rates, or fares. Any such decisions must be separately approved by the SFMTA Board.
- In accordance with the regulatory requirements, on April 7, 2009, the SFMTA Board of Directors held a public hearing to receive public testimony regarding the proposed declaration of a fiscal emergency. At the April 7, 2009 public hearing and through April 10, 2009, oral and written public comments were received. The relevant regulations require a response to the comments and suggestions made by the public within 30 days at a regular public meeting.
- Responses to comments and suggestions made by the public are included in this calendar item.
- It is requested that the SFMTA Board of Directors find that a fiscal emergency exists for 2009-2010 under California Public Resources Code section 21080.32 and California Environmental Quality Act implementing guidelines, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations section 15285.

ENCLOSURES:

1. Resolution

APPROVALS:

DEPUTY OF DIVISION
PREPARING ITEM

FINANCE

DIRECTOR

SECRETARY

DATE

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

ADOPTED RESOLUTION BE RETURNED TO Sonali Bose

ASSIGNED SFMTAB CALENDAR DATE: _____

PAGE 2

Purpose

To address the SFMTA 2009-2010 Proposed Amended Operating Budget deficit of \$128.9 million which includes service reductions and increases to fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service. These options are subject to CEQA unless a statutory exemption exists. California Public Resources Code Section 21080.32 provides a statutory exemption that a reduction or elimination of transit service and increases to fares, fees, fines, rates, and charges that support transit service can be implemented as a result of a declared “fiscal emergency” caused by the failure of the revenues to adequately fund Agency programs, facilities, and operations without further environmental review. The Agency is required to hold a public hearing and respond to comments and suggestions made by the public prior to declaring that a “fiscal emergency” exists. The purpose of this item is to respond to the oral and written comments made by the public before the SFMTA Board of Directors considers declaring a fiscal emergency under California Public Resources Code section 21080.32.

Goal

Approval of the proposed resolution will support the following SFMTA Strategic Plan goals:

- Goal 3 - External Affairs/Community Relations
To improve the customer experience, community value and enhance the image of the SFMTA.
- Goal 4 -Financial Capacity
To ensure financial stability and effective resource utilization

Description

On March 17, 2009, the SFMTA Board of Directors reviewed the Amended Proposed Operating Budget for 2009-2010 including a projected \$128.9 million deficit as outlined below:

Revenues	2009-2010 Approved Budget (\$M)	2009-2010 Projection as of Feb 2009 (\$M)	2009-2010 Projected Surplus / (Deficit) (\$M)	Description
State/Regional Funds	134.6	79.8	(54.8)	State Budget Eliminated Transit Assistance Funding (\$42.8M), TDA Sales Tax and AB1107 from MTC (\$11.5M), Gas Tax (\$0.5M)
General Fund	252.4	228.1	(24.3)	Less General Fund Baseline Available due to declining General Fund revenues
Advertising	16.2	13.8	(6.2)	Advertising market declines

Revenues	2009-2010 Approved Budget (\$M)	2009-2010 Projection as of Feb 2009 (\$M)	2009-2010 Projected Surplus / (Deficit) (\$M)	Description
Parking Citations	103.8	97.8	(6.0)	Reduced citations from street sweeping schedule changes plus Courthouse fee increase to State
Garage Revenues	33.6	29.9	(3.7)	Reflects anticipated reduction in garage revenues due to declining patronage and economic conditions
Parking Meters	44.3	41.3	(3.0)	Variable pricing projections from SFpark adjusted back to original assumption
Interest	5.6	4.8	(0.8)	Lower Interest rates
Fund Balance *	36.4	42.3	5.9	Use of additional fund balance
Taxi Services	0.0	2.2	2.2	Addition of Taxi Services
Transit Fares	163.4	164.3	0.9	Increased collection of Cable Car fares
Other Revenues	22.6	22.6	0.0	No changes projected at this time
TOTAL	\$816.7	\$726.9	(\$89.8)	

* As of March 1, 2009, the fund balance in the SFMTA funds was \$58.7 million in operating funds and -\$10 million in capital/restricted funds, totaling \$48 million. \$42.3 million of the operating fund balance is included in the 2009-2010 Amended Operating budget.

Expenditures	2009-2010 Approved Budget	2009-2010 Projection as of Feb 2009	2009-2010 Projected (Deficit)	Description
Salaries & Benefits	496.4	521.5	(25.1)	\$6.6M increase due to retirement benefits as a result of the passage of Proposition B in June 2008. Increase adjustment of \$14M in overtime based on actual usage. Increased additional benefits and salary adjustments of \$4.5M – unemployment insurance, position changes.
Services from City Departments	68.4	80.2	(11.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SF Police Department \$7M • SF General Hospital \$3M • 311 Call Center \$2.2M • Tax Collector’s Office \$0.5M • Telecommunications Department \$0.5M • Risk Manager’s Office \$0.4M • Planning Department \$0.3M • Department of Human Resources (\$1.2M) • Various other adjustments known at this time
Taxi Services	0.0	2.2	2.2	Addition of Taxi Services
Other Line items	251.9	251.9	0	No changes projected to other various expenditures at this time
TOTAL	\$816.7	\$855.8	(\$39.1)	

	FY 2009-2010 Approved Budget	2009-2010 Projection as of Feb 2009	FY 2009-2010 (Deficit)
Revenues	\$816.7	\$726.9	(\$89.8)
Expenditures	\$816.7	\$855.8	(\$39.1)
Total FY 2009-2010 Projected (Deficit)			(\$128.9)

To address this deficit, the SFMTA Board of Directors is considering various options including service reductions and increases to fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service. Reductions in transit service and increases to fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service are considered “projects” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and typically require an evaluation of any potential environmental impact, unless a statutory exemption applies. CEQA provides a statutory exemption from environmental review for the reduction or elimination of public transit service or to initiate or increase fees, rates, or charges that support transit service as a result of a declared “fiscal emergency.” (California Public Resources Code section 21080.32; 14 Code of California Regulations section 15285.)

A “fiscal emergency” means that the agency is projected to have “negative working capital” within one year from the date that the agency makes the finding that a fiscal emergency exists. In calculating the available working capital, a transit agency adds together all unrestricted cash, unrestricted short-term investments, and unrestricted short-term accounts receivable and then subtracts unrestricted accounts payable. Employee retirement funds, including Internal Revenue Code Section 457 deferred compensation plans and Section 401(k) plans, health insurance reserves, bond payment reserves, workers’ compensation reserves, and insurance reserves, are excluded from this calculation.

Calculation of Working Capital (millions)

	2009-2010 Full Year	2009-2010 10 months
Sources		
Unrestricted Net Assets (Cash) *		
Projected Fund Balance (\$58.7 available at the end of Fiscal Year less \$42.3 included in 2009-2010 Operating Budget)	\$16.4	\$16.4
Subtotal: Unrestricted Net Assets	\$16.4	\$16.4
Unrestricted Short-Term Investments	\$0	\$0
Unrestricted Accounts Receivables		
Revenues (see above table)	\$726.9	\$605.8
Less Funds Restricted for Paratransit from Grants	(\$14.2)	(\$11.8)
Subtotal: Accounts Receivables	\$712.7	\$594.0
Total Sources	\$729.1	\$610.4
Uses		
Unrestricted Accounts Payables		

	2009-2010 Full Year	2009-2010 10 months
Expenditures (see above table)	\$855.8	\$713.2
Less Expenditures funded from Grants for Paratransit	(\$14.2)	(\$11.8)
Subtotal: Accounts Receivables	\$841.6	\$701.4
Total Uses	\$841.6	\$701.4
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)	(\$112.5)	(\$91.0)

- Unrestricted Fund Balance is determined by subtracting total current liabilities from total current assets excluding grants which are restricted

The analysis of SFMTA’s working capital shows negative working capital of \$112.5 million at the end of 2009-2010 and \$91.0 million at the end of April 2010. The analysis excludes restricted revenues and restricted expenditures. Therefore, grant funds and related expenditures are not included in the analysis. Capital projects, special revenue funds and Paratransit revenues and expenditures are likewise excluded.

Once the above analysis is completed and the agency believes that a “fiscal emergency” declaration is warranted, the agency is required to hold a public hearing and respond to comments and suggestions made by the public prior to declaring that a fiscal emergency exists. The SFMTA held a public hearing on April 7, 2009. During the public hearing, the reason for the declaration of a “fiscal emergency” was summarized and SFMTA received public testimony. Within 30 days after the public hearing, SFMTA is required to respond to comments received from the public. Once SFMTA has responded to these comments, the SFMTA Board may declare that a “fiscal emergency” exists. It is important to note that a declaration of “fiscal emergency” does not by itself implement service reductions or changes to fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service.

Responses to comments and suggestions made by the public at the April 7, 2009 public hearing through April 10, 2009 are set forth in this document. This fulfills the requirement of responding to public comments within 30 days at a regularly scheduled public meeting. Therefore, at its April 21, 2009 Board meeting, the SFMTA Board of Directors may declare that a fiscal emergency exists.

Responses to Public Comments

This document serves as the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) formal response to comments received from the public regarding the declaration of a fiscal emergency on April 7, 2009. Several members of the public have expressed and/or submitted similar comments of which are collectively listed with a single response below. The comments are separated into three sections as follows: 1) general comments; 2) specific comments on service modifications; and 3) specific comments on user charges.

1) General Comments

- **Do not Declare a Fiscal Emergency**

Commenter: Irwin Lum, Rafael Cabrera, David Pilpel

Response: Under the formula established by the California Public Resources Code, the Agency is projected to have negative working capital within one year, and therefore the financial conditions do exist to support declaration of a fiscal emergency. The declaration of a fiscal emergency is therefore a policy matter before the Board of Directors as it considers possible service reductions and increases to charges, including fares, that support transit service.

- **Negative working capital must be shown within One Year of the Declaration**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: Yes, the calculations show that at the end of 2009-2010 the negative working capital is approximately \$112 million and at the end of April 2010 the negative working capital is projected at \$91 million.

- **Comment: Fiscal emergency exemption from CEQA is available only to publicly owned transit agencies and, as part of a City Department, Muni may not be eligible.**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: As a consolidated transportation department, the SFMTA receives funds from a variety of sources to support transit service. SFMTA believes it is eligible to rely on the "fiscal emergency" CEQA exemption for increases in fees, rates or charges as its revenues support public transit and, to the same extent as any other publicly owned transit agency, for reductions or elimination of public transit service. We anticipate concurrence from the San Francisco Planning Department. CEQA review of increases to taxi-related fees is not being satisfied by the fiscal emergency determination. The San Francisco Planning Department has issued a categorical exemption in connection with these charges.

- **SFMTA cannot use the "fiscal emergency" CEQA exemption to make service modifications that do not reduce or eliminate service**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: All service modifications proposed for approval at this time are designed to achieve cost-savings by reducing the overall service level. In some cases, a portion of a

bus route is proposed to be discontinued. This may require a change in the location of the route terminus, including the addition of a terminal loop at a new location. Such a modification is a necessary and logical result of eliminating or reducing the level of service on that route. In addition, where a route or route segment is eliminated, it may be necessary to adjust that route or a related route in order to avoid eliminating critical service connections. Again, these changes are a necessary and logical result of eliminating or reducing service on a route or route segment, and the primary purpose of such an adjustment is to accomplish the underlying discontinuation of service.

- **Why Wasn't This Fiscal Emergency Anticipated**

Commenter: Michael Kinsley, Patricia Cady, Shawna Richard

Response: Similarly to other private and public organizations across the globe, the Agency has and continues to be impacted by the rapid economic decline over the past year. When the Agency developed its two-year budget early 2008, the degree of the economic downturn, as well as the State legislative act to eliminate transportation funds were unknown as were the results of the November 2008 election which had an impact on the Agency's labor expenditures. Currently, the SFMTA is attempting to balance the original 2009-2010 budget approved in April 2008.

- **Reduce the Pay of SFMTA Employees**

Commenter: Steve Vaccaro, Kevin Weaver, Laurie Beatty, Frank Zepeda, George Polony, Susan Wheeler, Barbara Bocci

Response: Several of SFMTA's collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) are part of the overall City's CBAs of which wages are determined. Section 8A.104 of the City Charter, in relevant part, states that "for any job classification that exists both as a service-critical classification in the Agency and elsewhere in City service, the base wage rate negotiated by the Agency for that classification shall not be less than the wage rate set in the Citywide memorandum of understanding for that classification." Additionally, the Transit Worker salaries are set by the Charter, section A8.404(b), in relevant part, which states that their salaries "shall not be less than the average of the two highest wage schedules so certified by the civil service commission for each such classification" compared to two highest wage scheduled of comparable transit agencies in the United States. The pay for managers, however, is set by the SFMTA.

- **Reduce Management**

Commenter: Gretchen Beck, J. P., Maureen Sharkey, Chris Meiering, Dan Edwards

Response: The SFMTA has included management positions within the list of the proposed 370 positions slated for elimination. The Agency currently has 111 filled management positions out of a total staffing complement of more than 5,000 employees representing 2.2% of the total workforce.

- **Encourage The State From Cutting Transit Funds**

Commenter: Steve Vaccaro

PAGE 8

The SFMTA appreciates this comment and is working with the California Transit Association, a transit-industry based organization that represents State transit agencies to develop a strategy for State funding. It is expected that this strategy will be implemented in the immediate future.

- **Ticket Double Parked Cars**

Commenter: Steve Vaccaro

Response: The SFMTA actively cites double parked cars and will continue to do so.

- **Raise Advertising Rates**

Commenter: Steve Vaccaro

Response: The SFMTA's advertising agreements are managed by contractors who set rates based on market conditions. Additionally, the SFMTA's ability to advertise is limited by City regulations as well as customer preferences.

- **Place ads on the NextMuni schedule pages served by Web and to Phones**

Commenter: Josh Litwin

Response: The SFMTA does not own NextMuni but provides this service through a contractor.

- **Keep Going With The Progress, Do Not Let The System Degrade**

Commenter: Gregory Wong

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and the options to address the 2009-2010 deficit were proposed based on this premise.

- **Reduce Claims Payout**

Commenter: John Cummings, Shaun White

Responses: The SFMTA recognizes the importance of claim reduction payout. Thus, the Agency has leveraged a comprehensive safety awareness campaign. Additionally, the SFMTA recently hired a Chief Safety Officer who reports directly to the Executive Director/CEO further underscoring the importance of this effort.

- **Make It Easier to Pay, Replace the Antiquated Fare Collection System**

Commenter: Andy Cox, Melissa Sautter

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and is in the process of procuring change machines, funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, as well as rehabilitating the Agency's current fareboxes. Additionally, the Agency will be fully implementing TransLink®, a transit smart card fare payment program, in the coming months after the completion of the pilot program which will allow the purchase of fare media any time during the month. BART is expected to implement TransLink® as well in the next year. Finally, the SFMTA is working on a transportation smart card which will allow customers to pay for transit, parking (on- and off-street) and taxis.

- **Reduce Personnel and Spending Instead of User Charges**

Commenter: David Ferguson, Kevin Weaver, R T,

Response: For 2009-2010, the SFMTA will be reducing spending by nearly \$70 million to help address the \$128.9 million deficit. Unfortunately, addressing the remaining \$50 million requires increases reductions in transit service as well as increase in charges across all the Agency's transportation modes – transit, parking and taxis.

- **Concern About the Funds Voted for Use for Muni is Being Used Correctly**

Commenter: Gertraud Albert, Gretchen Beck, Emmet McDonagh, Sharon R. Meyer

Response: In November 2007, San Francisco voters approved allocating additional general fund revenues estimated to total \$27 million to the SFMTA. The \$27 million is currently unavailable for Muni service improvements as Agency expenses, such as payment to other City Departments, i.e., “work orders” supporting SFMTA business operations, have increased.

- **Adequate Notice of the Public Hearing on the Fiscal Emergency proposal was not adequate**

Commenter: Mary Miles, David Pilpel

Response: SFMTA followed all applicable laws in providing notice for the fiscal emergency hearing.

- **Consider an Increase to the Gas Tax**

Commenter: Timothy Wickland

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and is working with the California Transit Association, a transit-industry based organization that represents State transit agencies to develop a strategy for State funding. It is expected that this strategy will be implemented in the immediate future and may include an increase to the gas tax.

- **Consider Hiring Part Time Operators**

Commenter: Frank Zepeda, David Pilpel

Response: The SFMTA is currently exploring the feasibility of incorporating part-time transit operators to ensure ample staffing is available to meet Muni service delivery objectives.

- **Cut Costs By Reducing The Number Of Transit Operators On Non-Driving Status**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: All City and County of San Francisco employees, including transit operators, are legally entitled to certain types of leave. To the extent that leaves are discretionary, the SFMTA has a vigorous return to work program.

- **No Layoff to Front Line Positions**

Commenter: Frank Zepeda

Response: The SFMTA is proposing to eliminate 370 vacant positions. Layoffs are

contingent upon the SFMTA Board of Directors’ actions regarding the proposed service modifications as less front line positions will be needed should there be a reduction in service delivery.

- **Are all of the 2009-2010 jobs going to be eliminated for this year and next year**

Commenter: Randy L Jones

Response: The 370 positions are eliminated for 2009-2010. The SFMTA will begin developing the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 operating budget in the latter part of 2009.

- **Cost Recovery Fees should be Recalculated Annually**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: The SFMTA calculates cost recovery fees every two years given the two-year budget process.

- **Suggest Charging Everyone Who Lives In S.F. For A Monthly Fastpass**

Commenter: Michelle Brant

Response: The SFMTA will assess the legal implications under state and local law raised by this comment.

- **Comment: What Level of Disclosure would be Required to Financial Agencies regarding the “fiscal emergency”**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: The declaration of “fiscal emergency” allows the SFMTA to balance the 2009-2010 budget through service modifications and fare increases which will demonstrate financial accountability and responsibility to financial agencies.

2) Specific Comments On Service Modifications

On April 7, 2009, three service modification proposals were presented to the SFMTA Board of Directors along with other options to close the Agency’s budget deficit. The comments summarized below refer to these three service modification proposals. Many of the comments expressed concerns related to potential service eliminations. While we regret having to consider any service reductions, we have worked to develop proposals that have the smallest impact possible on the fewest number of customers

The service modification options developed in response to the SFMTA’s budget deficit do not represent the implementation of the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP). However, the proposed modifications have been informed by the data collected and the extensive public input received during the TEP planning phase. This extensive technical data and analysis helped staff make informed and precise decisions about these service changes and how to provide the best possible service within limited resources.

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
----------------	------------------------	-------	--------	----------

PAGE 11

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
F	Susan Wheeler	The F is nearly impossible to board after 5 p.m.; it does not stop; poor replacement for the 10-Townsend.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, 10-Townsend service would be eliminated north of Broadway. No changes to the F-line are proposed at this time, but additional access to the North Point corridor is provided by routes 9X/9BX and 47. We concur with the concern about F-line crowding, and are working on longer-term solution, including rehabilitating additional streetcars, which would allow us to operate more p.m. peak F-line service.
N #1	Jamie Whitaker	Alternative is to run every other N-Judah train past Embarcadero Station to Caltrain and/or start the E-Embarcadero street car service on the weekends.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this suggestion, but does not believe it will offer significant cost savings. Additionally, we do not yet have sufficient operable street cars to run regular E-Embarcadero service. The T-Third line has capacity on weekends to carry existing N-Judah customers between Embarcadero Station and Caltrain.
N #2	Michael & Vivian Anthony; Jerry Dott; Irving Q. Waldorf; Rebekah	Opposes discontinuance of N-Judah on The Embarcadero, to South Beach and/or to AT&T Park; T-Third line is insufficient. Opposes elimination of N-Judah service on weekends; T-Third line is unreliable and residents of Rincon Hill need metro service on weekends.	1,2,3	No changes are proposed for the weekday N-Judah service. On weekends, consideration is being given to providing additional Ballpark shuttles and/or N-Judah service during weekend ballgames. Service on non-ballgame days will be monitored to ensure T-Third Street service is sufficient.
N #3	Emmet McDonagh	Encourage people to walk to the ballpark in order to reduce overcrowding during ballgames.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment. We have observed a decrease in transit demand to the ballpark since it opened, reflecting an increasing number of people walking to ballgames. We will continue to encourage people to avail themselves of the many choices to get to the ballpark, including walking.
N #4	David Pilpel, Melissa Sautter	Supports the change.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
N #5	Troy Blair	The N-Judah runs too infrequently to cover its service area.	NA	Although it is our most frequent rail line, the N-Judah would benefit from more service. Unfortunately, given the current budget constraints we do not have resources at this time to make this change.
J-M	Jalin Chen	Opposes extension of the J and shortening of the M; will inconvenience people living between SFSU and Balboa BART; will also cost money and cause nuisance to areas where new tracks must be added.	NA	This is a TEP proposal, but is not being considered as part of the proposed service reductions being considered by the SFMTA Board of Directors for FY2009-2010.

PAGE 12

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
5	Jerry Dott	Willing to accept temporary price increases with no reductions in service to the N-Judah, 5-Fulton, and 38-Geary.	1,2,3	The service changes on the N-Judah, 5-Fulton and 38-Geary were designed to maintain or improve service on the trunk portion of the routes. N-Judah service would only be affected on weekends on The Embarcadero; 38-Geary service would only be affected between 33rd Avenue and Ocean Beach; and peak period capacity would be increased on the 5-Fulton east of 6th Avenue.
1 #1	Anonymous comment received via email;	Opposes the reduction/discontinuance of service.	1,2,3	No service reduction is being proposed on the heavily used portion of the 1-California west of Drumm Street. The segment recommended for elimination from Clay/Drumm streets to Howard/Beale streets has low ridership and detracts from the reliability of the overall service.
1 #2	David Pilpel	Supports eliminating service south of Sacramento.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
1 #3	Melissa Sautter	Supports reducing service on weekends.	1, 2, 3	No changes are proposed on the 1-California weekend service. However, many of the proposed service reductions would affect both weekday and weekend service.
2 #1	David Pilpel; Anonymous comment received via email; Linda Thomas	Opposes the reduction/discontinuance of service.	1,2,3	The proposals provide 5 minute service on Sutter Street which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand. In the outer Richmond, ridership from the 2-Clement will be distributed between the 38-Geary, 38L-Geary Limited and 1-California routes. Additional capacity will be provided in the Geary Corridor when resources become available.
2 #2	Gary Parent; Joel Sheppard; Mary Wu; Herbert Weiner	Opposes discontinuance of 2-Clement service; 38-Geary will become overcrowded, and is not adequate for wheelchair users, or for the elderly.	1,2,3	The proposals provide 5 minute service on Sutter Street, which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand. In the outer Richmond, ridership from the 2-Clement will be distributed between the 38-Geary, 38L-Geary Limited and 1-California routes. Additional capacity will be provided in the Geary Corridor when resources become available.
2 #3	Jim Uomini	Suggests ending the 2-Clement at Park Presidio and Geary to allow transfer to 38/38L.	2, 3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.

PAGE 13

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
3 #1	David Pilpel; Anonymous comment received via email; Linda Thomas; Adam Cole; Christian Lowe; Barbara Bocci; Sharon Meyer, Gertrude Albert	Opposes the reduction/discontinuance of service.	3	Without the 3, there are only about 200 customers (384 daily boardings) who would no longer have direct service to the Post/Sutter corridor, and only one intersection (Jackson/Baker) would lose all service. The proposals provide 5 minute service on Sutter and Post streets, which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand. Additional capacity will be provided in the Geary Corridor when resources become available.
3 #2	Gary Parent; Joel Sheppard	Opposes discontinuance of 3- Jackson service; 38-Geary is not adequate for wheelchair users.	3	Under Option 3, the 3-Jackson would be discontinued but the 4-Sutter would be modified to operate all-day between Presidio/California and downtown. The proposals provide 5 minute service on Sutter Street, which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand. Additional capacity will be provided in the Geary Corridor when resources become available.
3 #3	Noel W. Kirshenbaum	Opposes discontinuance of 3- Jackson; Route 3 serves many schools and customers.	3	Schools along Jackson will still be served within SFMTA's quarter-mile service goal by the 24-Divisadero and the 43-Masonic. Without the 3-Jackson, there are only about 200 customers (384 daily boardings) who would no longer have direct service to the Post/Sutter corridor, and only one intersection (Jackson and Baker) would lose all service.
3 #4	Herbert Weiner; Paul Wermer	Oppose discontinuance of 3-Jackson; connections to other routes are poor and safety along 2-Clement and 38- Geary at night is bad. Seriously ill/frail will be forced to walk further distances and creates physical hardship. Muni proposals are life- threatening.	3	Most customers will continue to be served within SFMTA's quarter-mile standard by the 24-Divisadero and 43-Masonic buses. Only one intersection (Jackson and Baker) would lose all service.

PAGE 14

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
3 #5	Michelle Brandt; Linda Aldrich; Judith Taylor	Opposes discontinuance of 3-Jackson service, walk from 1-California is far and hilly.	3	Customers would not have to walk to the 1-California under this proposal. Connections can be made to the 24-Divisadero or the 43-Masonic. Without the 3-Jackson, there are only about 200 customers (384 daily boardings) who would no longer have direct service to the Post/Sutter corridor, and only one intersection (Jackson and Baker) would lose all service. The proposals provide 5 minute service on Sutter and Post streets, which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand.
3 #6	Paul Wermer, Nora Gibson, Kelly Connelly	Requested that Muni facilitate a meeting with 3-Jackson riders in order to come up with a plan for providing service on Jackson.	3	Staff will follow up to accommodate this meeting request.
3 #7	Nora Gibson	Opposes the discontinuance of 3-Jackson; cutting the 3-Jackson is not in line with the City's Transit First policy.	3	While we regret having to consider any service reductions, our current operating deficit necessitates these proposals. Without the 3-Jackson, there are only about 200 customers (384 daily boardings) who would no longer have direct service to the Post/Sutter corridor, and only one intersection (Jackson and Baker) would lose all service. The proposals provide 5 minute service on Sutter and Post streets, which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand. Additional capacity will be provided in the Geary Corridor when resources become available.
4 #1	Anonymous comment received via email	Opposes the reduction/discontinuance of service.	1,2,3	The 4-Sutter only operates during peak hours. The proposals that discontinue the 4 still provide 5 minute peak period service on Sutter and Post streets east of Fillmore, which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand. All stops along the 4-Sutter's route will continue to be served.
4 #2	Joel Sheppard; Anonymous comment received via email;	Opposes reduction/discontinuance of 4-Sutter; 38-Geary will become dangerously overcrowded.	1,2,3	The 4-Sutter only operates during peak hours. The proposals that discontinue the 4-Sutter still provide 5 minute peak period service on Sutter and Post streets east of Fillmore, which we believe is adequate to accommodate demand. All stops along the 4-Sutter's route will continue to be served. Additional capacity will be provided in the Geary Corridor when resources become available.

PAGE 15

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
4 #3	David Pilpel	Suggest eliminating service west of Presidio Ave and reducing span of service.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this suggestion; however the 4-Sutter cannot be turned at Presidio/California if the 3-Jackson continues to use this terminal. With respect to span of service, current 4-Sutter only operates during peak periods.
5 #1	Gerald Dott, Jr.; Dirk Hoekstra	Opposes reduction of 5-Fulton service to Ocean Beach in the Richmond.	3	Capacity on the 5-Fulton between 6th Avenue and Downtown would be increased in this proposal to address current crowding and additional customers moving from the 21-Hayes between 6th and Stanyan. In the p.m. peak Richmond customers would see similar service to today. In the a.m. peak Richmond service would run every 7 to 10 min versus 5 min today. This is consistent with passenger demand, but crowding of buses will be carefully monitored if this change is put into effect.
5 #2	Gerald Dott, Jr.	Supports retention of 5-Fulton Owl service.	NA	No changes to 5-Fulton Owl services are proposed at this time.
5 #3	David Pilpel	Supports in concept but suggests pursuing independent of 21-Hayes proposal.	3	The SFMTA appreciates this suggestion. This will be considered as a variation on current proposals.
5 #4	Jerry Dodd	Opposes all changes to the 5, including elimination evening service.	3	No changes to 5-Fulton midday or evening service are proposed.
6	Anonymous comment received via email	Opposes the reduction/discontinuance of service.	NA	No reductions or discontinuances of 6-Parnassus service are proposed at this time. In Options 1 and 2 peak period frequencies would improve from every 10 min to every 9 min.
7 #1	Jean Ellis-Jones	Opposed to eliminating the 7-Haight; the route is needed for local stops.	1,2,3	Under this proposal, all local stops currently made by the 7-Haight are covered by other routes. The 71L-Haight/Noreiga Limited makes local stops west of Masonic and the 6-Parnassus makes local stops east of Masonic on Haight Street.
7 #2	Lou Lesperence, Troy Blair	Supports eliminating the 7-Haight.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
6, 7, 71	Troy Blair	Regarding the 6, 7, and 71, weekend service runs too infrequently, does not factor in the number of tourists traveling to the Haight.	NA	Changes to weekend service on Haight Street are not being proposed. (Only the 6 and 71 routes operate on weekends; the 7-Haight operates weekday peak periods only.)

PAGE 16

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
10 #1	Renee Tan	Opposes reducing frequency of the 10-Townsend from Potrero Hill; Route 10 is extremely crowded already when the bus is late.	2,3	The proposal to retain 50% of the present service to and from 17th and De Haro was developed as an alternative to eliminating service entirely. When resources again become available, SFMTA plans to increase and extend this or similar service.
10 #2	Mary Beth Brodbine; Robin Chen; Christina Curci; Katie Lee; Mrs. John MacKay; Don Russell	Oppose eliminating 10-Townsend service north of Broadway. The bus is crowded on North Point, does not have low ridership. The 30X will be the only bus left (from northern Russian Hill/Ghirardelli area) that wouldn't require a transfer, but it is already overcrowded. The 10-Townsend is the only convenient way for people to get to work at Lombard/Sansome. TEP numbers do not show that Route 10's ridership is primarily people trying to get to the Financial District; also, ridership will not be decreased due to fare hike. 10-Townsend is the only convenient way for people at the Wharf to get to the Financial District for work.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, the portion of the 10-Townsend proposed for elimination north of Broadway will continue to be served by the 47-Van Ness along North Point Street and by parallel service on the F-line along The Embarcadero. We are working on longer-term solutions, including rehabilitating additional streetcars, which would allow us to operate more p.m. peak F-line service.
10 #3	Dane Hansen	Opposes cutting 10-Townsend service north of Broadway; it is the only route up Sansome and also connects tourists to Pier 39.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, the portion of the 10-Townsend proposed for elimination north of Broadway will continue to be served by the 47-Van Ness along North Point Street and by parallel service on the F-Van Ness along The Embarcadero. Both the 47 and F-line make direct connections with the 39-Coit.
10 #4	David Pilpel	Opposes the change; suggests new south-of-Market routing and through-routing with present 53-Southern Heights.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, the 10-Townsend is proposed for elimination north of Broadway. This area will continue to be served by the 47-Van Ness along North Point Street and by parallel service on the F-line along The Embarcadero. With respect to the overall rerouting proposed south-of-Market and through-routing with the portion of the 53-Southern Heights east of Potrero, this appears to be a service modification outside the range of the present fiscally driven discussion, and does not appear likely to generate cost savings.
10 #5	Laura Duede, Laura Kenney, Erika Oppen	Opposes cutting 10-Townsend service north of Broadway; many people on North Point take the 10 to the BART, Caltrain, and Transbay Terminal; the F is not a good substitute.	2,3	Because it is not cost effective to provide direct service to/from all destinations, many trips on the Muni system require a transfer. However, customers traveling from North Point Street to Caltrain can avoid a transfer by using the 47-Van Ness.

PAGE 17

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
12 #1	Michael Townsend	Opposes discontinuance of 12-Folsom/Pacific along The Embarcadero; will double his commute time from Russian Hill.	2,3	Segments of the 12-Folsom/Pacific along The Embarcadero and west of Van Ness Avenue are being proposed for elimination due to low ridership under Options 2 and 3. Service along The Embarcadero will continue to be provided by the F-line, and the portion of the 12-Folsom/Pacific proposed for elimination west of Van Ness Avenue will be served by a modified 10-Townsend. Capacity of the 41-Union between Russian Hill and Howard/Main streets is proposed to be increased by the use of articulated buses, and may offer an alternative.
12 #2	Ron Fell	Does not understand reduction in 12-Folsom/Pacific service to The Embarcadero; service should be increased instead (from an apparent resident at Folsom/Embarcadero).	2,3	Boardings and alightings along The Embarcadero segment of the 12-Folsom/Pacific are modest and returning the route to Second Street appears both shorter and quicker, which will mean better service for most 12-Folsom/Pacific customers. This was also a way to emphasize the most important segments of the 10 and 12 by overlapping routes.
12 #3	Diana Molina	Opposes reduction in 12-Folsom/Pacific service to Embarcadero; would greatly inconvenience those coming from the Inner Mission.	2,3	While the 12-Folsom/Pacific carries about 6,930 daily passenger boardings, it only carries about 440 daily passenger boardings along the segments proposed for elimination under Options 2 and 3. The cost per passenger to serve customers along the segments proposed for elimination is about 4 times higher than the Muni system average. Mission and Potrero routes make direct connections between the Inner Mission and The Embarcadero.
12 #4	David Pilpel	Supports in part.	2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
12 #5	David Pilpel	Suggests retaining branch service to Jackson and Fillmore.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, the proposed changes would extend the 10-Townsend to cover the portion of the 12-Folsom/Pacific eliminated west of Van Ness Avenue. We anticipate that customers boarding the existing 12-Folsom/Pacific west of Van Ness Avenue are more likely to have destinations near Downtown and the Caltrain Station than within the Mission District.
14	Anonymous comment received via email;	Supports leaving the 14 the way it is.	2,3	No changes to the 14-Mission are under consideration.

PAGE 18

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
16AX #1	Kimberly Chun, Gail Chun	Opposes discontinuance of 16AX; the 16AX has more daily passenger boardings than other routes, such as the 31AX/BX.	2,3	Under Option 1, no changes to the 16AX are proposed. While the 16AX has more daily passenger boardings than the 31AX or 31BX, there are less than 150 boardings on the segments proposed for elimination and the cost per passenger is more than 3 times the system average. Under Options 2 and 3, the 16BX would be extended to Great Highway and the a.m. peak period frequency would be increased from 9 to 7 minutes.
16AX #2	David Pilpel	Supports the change.	2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
16BX	David Pilpel	Supports the change.	2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
17 #1	Don Baker; Wendy Tobias	Oppose reducing 17-Parkmerced service; people ride later than 8:00 or 8:30 p.m.; residents and students need service after 8:30 p.m.	3	The 17-Parkmerced only carries about 120 daily passenger boardings after 8:30 p.m. The cost per passenger to serve customers after 8:30 p.m. is about 2.5 times higher than the Muni system average. A modified proposal which would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
17 #2	David Pilpel	Eliminate Buckingham Way routing.	NA	This appears to be a service modification outside the range of the present fiscally driven discussion, and is therefore inappropriate for consideration at this time, as it does not appear likely to generate cost savings.
18 #1	Spencer Lord	Do not add bus traffic on routes 18 or 38 to 33rd Avenue, use 25th instead.	2,3	Under Option 1, no changes to the 18-46th Avenue or 38-Geary are proposed, but 2- Clement buses would be removed from 33rd Avenue. Under Options 2 and 3, during the day, the 18-46th Avenue and a portion of the 38- Geary buses would operate on 33rd Avenue, but the present 2-Clement buses would not. Late at night, the 38-Owl would no longer operate on 33rd Avenue as it now does.
18 #2	Jason Chu	Opposes routing 18-46 th Avenue onto 33rd; redundant service.	2,3	Under Option 1, no changes to the 18-46th Avenue or 38-Geary are proposed, but 2- Clement buses would be removed from 33rd Avenue. Under Options 2 and 3, during the day, the 18-46th Avenue and a portion of the 38- Geary buses would operate on 33rd Avenue, but the present 2-Clement buses would not. Late at night, the 38-Owl would no longer operate on 33rd Avenue as it now does.

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
18 #3	David Pilpel; Gaetana Caldwell- Smith; Robert (No Last Name Given); Aaron Kitashima	Opposes the change due to lack of alternative service to the Cliff House and Land's End. Opposes changing the route because it is currently very quick and efficient.	2,3	While the 18-46th Avenue carries about 3,410 daily passenger boardings, it only carries about 80 daily passenger boardings along the segments proposed for elimination under Options 2 and 3. The cost per passenger to serve customers along the segments proposed for elimination is more than 4 times higher than the Muni system average.
19 #1	David Pilpel	Supports the change.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
19 #2	Lin Doyle; Herbert Weiner	Oppose reducing 19-Polk service during midday; many elderly and disabled customers rely on it. Seriously ill/frail will be forced to walk further distances and creates physical hardship. Muni proposals are life-threatening. (Mr. Weiner actually refers to the "19-Parkmerced.")	1,2,3	Customers would not walk further distances as a result of this proposal as the current route would continue to have all day service. The proposal for the 19-Polk would reduce the midday frequency along portions of the route, but increase it along other portions, including Potrero Hill and the Bayview.
19 #3	Josh Litwin	Enjoy frequent peak service of 19-Polk, but isn't necessary.		The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
20 #1	Howard Wong	Opposes discontinuance of 20-Columbus; will cause large net decrease in transit to North Beach and the waterfront.	1,2,3	20-Columbus ridership averages only 854 passenger boardings per day, at an excessive cost per passenger for service in this dense part of the City. The SFMTA hopes to reintroduce Columbus Avenue service at a later date as proposed by the TEP, but is unable to do so under current fiscal constraints.
20 #2	Ryan Turri, Dorothy Danielsen	Opposes discontinuance of 20-Columbus no alternative route between SOMA and Financial District to North Beach in the afternoon; low ridership but still important.	1,2,3	The 30-Stockton and 41-Union provide alternative service between SoMa and North Beach. The SFMTA hopes to reintroduce Columbus Avenue service at a later date as proposed by the TEP, but is unable to do so under current fiscal constraints.
20 #3	David Pilpel	Supports the change.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
21	David Pilpel	Opposes the change; making turn and terminal on Hayes or Shrader will be difficult.	3	We believe a viable terminal for the 21-Hayes in the vicinity of the Hayes/Stanyan/Fulton/Shrader block can be provided. If we are unable to do so, this proposal would not be implemented.
24	Anonymous comment received via email;	Supports leaving the 24-Divisadero the way it is.	NA	No major changes are being proposed to the 24-Divisadero.

PAGE 20

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
26 #1	Eric Johnson, Herbert Weiner	Opposes the discontinuance of 26-Valencia service to Balboa Park and Glen Park BART, with particular concern about accessible connections. Muni proposals are life-threatening for seriously ill/disabled people.	1,2,3	Most of the 26-Valencia operates parallel to other Muni services, in particular the 14-Mission, 49-Van Ness/Mission and the J-Church. This proposal includes rerouting the 36-Teresita to serve the hilly portion of Chenery Street that is currently served by the 26-Valencia and is isolated from other Muni services. At Glen Park BART, the 36-Teresita would provide accessible connections to the 23, 44 and 52 routes, as well as to BART.
26 #2	David Pilpel	Supports 26 discontinuance, with alternate proposal for 36. (See 36.)	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
26 #3	Heidi-Jane Schwabe	Opposes any changes to the 26-Valencia.	1,2,3	Most of the 26-Valencia operates parallel to other Muni services, in particular the 14-Mission, 49-Van Ness/Mission and the J-Church. This proposal includes rerouting the 36-Teresita to serve the hilly portion of Chenery Street that is currently served by the 26-Valencia and is isolated from other Muni services. At Glen Park BART, the 36-Teresita would provide accessible connections to the 23, 44 and 52 routes, as well as to BART.
26 #4	Harry Pariser	Opposes the change; the 26-Valencia is an essential route.	1,2,3	Most of the 26-Valencia operates parallel to other Muni services, in particular the 14-Mission, 49-Van Ness/Mission and the J-Church. This proposal includes rerouting the 36-Teresita to serve the hilly portion of Chenery Street that is currently served by the 26-Valencia and is isolated from other Muni services. At Glen Park BART, the 36-Teresita would provide accessible connections to the 23, 44 and 52 routes, as well as to BART.
26 #5	Anonymous comment received via email;	Supports the change; the 26-Valencia is duplicative of routes 14 and 49.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
27 #1	Lisa Puryear; plus anonymous comment received via email.	Opposes the reduction/discontinuance of service.	3	Under Option 3, the proposed changes would include augmenting the parallel 9-San Bruno service on Potrero Avenue. Providing this augmented service on the 9-San Bruno is more cost effective than operation of the 27-Bryant.
27 #2	Matthew Priest	Extend to Potrero Center.	3	This is likely to reduce the cost savings from this proposal. However, when the actual schedule is developed, it may be possible to extend service south of 8th Street.

PAGE 21

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
38	Spencer Lord	Do not add bus traffic on routes 18 or 38 to 33rd Avenue.	2,3	Under Option 1, no changes to the 18-46th Avenue or 38-Geary are proposed, but 2-Clement buses would be removed from 33rd Avenue. Under Options 2 and 3, during the day, the 18-46th Avenue and a portion of the 38-Geary buses would operate on 33rd Avenue, but the present 2-Clement buses would not. Late at night, the 38-Owl would no longer operate on 33rd Avenue as it now does.
29 #1	Michael Lamperd	Opposes eliminating the 29-Sunset north of Baker Beach; wonders whether PresidiGo will honor his monthly pass.	1,2,3	There is no charge to ride the PresidiGo shuttle buses. SFMTA intends to work with the National Park Service and Presidio Trust to improve connections with the shuttles if this proposal is pursued.
29 #2	David Pilpel; Harry Pariser	Oppose curtailing the 29-Sunset; dialogue and publicity about PresidiGo route and schedule are needed; the Presidio shuttle does not provide adequate substitute service.	1,2,3	SFMTA will pursue coordination with the National Park Service and Presidio Trust concerning PresidiGo shuttle operation.
31	David Pilpel	Supports the change.	3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
33	Barry Toronto	Suggests ending the 33-Stanyan at 16th and Mission; Route 33 duplicates 22-Fillmore service	NA	Options to curtail the 33-Stanyan were considered, but not recommended at this time because of the often expressed need to retain a crosstown service to SF General Hospital, and the long-term objective under the TEP to operate the 33-Stanyan to Third Street.
35 #1	Edward Kamrin, Edie Harris	Opposes ending evening service at 8:30 p.m.	3	In order to reduce costs, service on most lightly utilized community service routes is proposed to end at 8:30 p.m. under Option 3. While the 35-Eureka carries about 730 daily passenger boardings, it only carries about 70 daily passenger boardings after 8:30 p.m. The cost per passenger to serve customers after 8:30 p.m. is about 3 times higher than the Muni system average. A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
35 #2	Bryan Burkhardt	The 35-Eureka is currently running empty 99 percent of the time and is way oversized for the street.	3	Based on current passenger activity, 35-Eureka service could be reduced. Based on the TEP recommendations, the SFMTA also plans to replace the buses now in use on route 35 with smaller vehicles, but this will not happen immediately.

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
36 #1	Ken MacInnis	We rely on the 36-Teresita for the only bus service to Mt Sutro / Clarendon Woods and the Midtown Terrace neighborhood. Opposes reduction in 36-Teresita service; service often fails to show up and should be increased, not decreased.	1,2,3	We believe 30-minute frequencies can accommodate customer demand on the 36-Teresita. We acknowledge the increased importance of reliable service, and affirm our commitment to continue improving service reliability even in current circumstances.
36 #2	David Pilpel	Supports a variation that would route 36-Teresita via Balboa Park, operate 20-minute frequency.	1,2,3	Most 36-Teresita customers use the route to access BART, and that the Glen Park BART Station serves them more directly than the Balboa Park Station. The 43-Masonic would still connect Forest Hill to City College. This suggestion also appears likely to require at least one additional coach.
36 #3	Peter Ehrlich, Anonymous	Opposes plan to increase 36-Teresita to 30 minutes.	3	We believe 30-minute frequencies can accommodate customer demand on the 36-Teresita. We acknowledge the increased importance of reliable service, and affirm our commitment to continue improving service reliability even in current circumstances.
36 #4	Scott Fell	Opposes rerouting of 36-Teresita to Glen Park BART; Balboa BART is a major hub going to downtown, while Glen Park BART is not and does not service low income areas.	3	Most 36-Teresita riders are going to BART; taking them to Glen Park would actually be less out of the way than the present route to Balboa Park BART. The section south of Monterey Boulevard is still served by the 43-Masonic.
37 #1	Edward Kamrin; Gene Vorobyov	Opposes ending evening service at 8:30 p.m.; tourists, residents, elderly and disabled customers depend on it to connect Twin Peaks with the rest of the City.	3	In order to reduce costs, service on most lightly utilized community service routes is proposed to end at 8:30 p.m. under Option 3 only. While the 37-Corbett carries about 1,790 daily passenger boardings, it only carries about 170 daily passenger boardings after 8:30 p.m. The cost per passenger to serve customers after 8:30 p.m. is more than 2.5 times higher than the Muni system average. A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
37 #2	Corene Kendrick	Do not cut the 37-Corbett after 8:30 p.m.; many people depend on it to do grocery shopping at the Safeway at Church and Market, and also to get home from work.	3	In order to reduce costs, service on most lightly utilized community service routes is proposed to end at 8:30 p.m. under Option 3 only. While the 37-Corbett carries about 1,790 daily passenger boardings, it only carries about 170 daily passenger boardings after 8:30 p.m. The cost per passenger to serve customers after 8:30 p.m. is more than 2.5 times higher than the Muni system average. A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.

PAGE 23

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
38 #1	Jerry Dott; Gerald Dott, Jr.; David Pilpel; Anonymous comment received via email;	Opposes the discontinuance of 38- Geary service to Ocean Beach.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, no capacity is proposed to be removed from Geary corridor services. Existing 38-Geary local buses that operate to Ocean Beach will still operate to 33rd Avenue under the proposal. Rerouting the 18-46th Avenue to the Ocean Beach branch of the existing 38-Geary service will provide additional service connecting to the 38-Geary and 38L-Geary Limited.
38 #2	Gerald Dott, Jr.; Spencer Lord	Opposes discontinuance of 38-Owl service to Ocean Beach.	2,3	To make late night service more consistent with daytime service, 38-Geary Owl buses would be rerouted to Geary Boulevard and Point Lobos Avenue. Owl service would therefore be available on Geary Blvd. and Pt. Lobos Avenue to the north of the present route, as well as on Fulton Street (5-Fulton Owl) to the south. No owl changes are proposed east of 33rd Avenue.
38 #3	Jason Chu	Supports cutting 38-service west of 33 rd .	2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
38 #4	Aaron Kitashima	It is unclear which branch will take over the OWL service of the 38- Geary Ocean Beach.	2, 3	There would no longer be Owl service along the Ocean Beach branch. The 38-Geary Owl would operate on Geary Blvd. and Pt. Lobos Avenue to the north of the present route, and the 5-Fulton Owl would continue to operate to the south. No owl changes are proposed east of 33rd Avenue.
38L	Gaetana Caldwell- Smith	Suggests extending the 38L-Geary Limited along Pt. Lobos to La Playa and Cabrillo, rather than cutting the 18-46 th Avenue.	2, 3	This proposal would raise costs, not lower them, and that additional articulated buses for such an extension are not available.
39 #1	Patricia Cady; Paul Switzer; Joan Wood, Howard Wong; Gail Switzer	Opposes discontinuance of Union Street branch of the 39-Coit; partnership of the Port, Rec & Park, and local merchants are prepared to market this route. Marketing efforts have already begun to increase ridership; cutting 39 would only help small fraction of SFMTA budget deficit. Eliminating Union Street branch of the 39-Coit; proposal goes against existing agreement between Muni and the community.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, the Union Street branch of the 39-Coit is proposed for elimination. The cost per passenger to serve customers along the Union Street branch of the 39-Coit is more than 2 times higher than the Muni system average. Regardless of the outcome of the current fiscal process, SFMTA is committed to the public private partnership and will continue to work with the various stakeholders to support Coit Tower access.
39 #2	David Pilpel	Opposes eliminating service south of Filbert; reduce span of service instead (to 6 p.m.?).	2,3	Ending the service at 6 p.m. would generate little additional savings, as the 39-Coit service only operates until 8 p.m. today. Elsewhere, this commenter proposes midnight service on all community routes.

PAGE 24

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
39 #3	Dorothy Danielsen; Judy Robinson; Patricia Cady	Opposes eliminating 39-Coit service or rerouting it on to Filbert; this will discourage people from riding and adversely affect the elderly and disabled.	2,3,	Ridership on the Union Street branch is only 116 per day. The more direct routing to Coit Tower may actually increase ridership by more than this amount.
41 #1	Jean Ellis- Jones	Opposed to eliminating a segment of 41-Union because the short turn location at Green is a poor place for bus layovers.	1,2,3	A "no-parking" area for a terminal with separated trolley coach wiring already exists on Union Street between Green and Fillmore streets, and is used on a daily basis for a limited number of trips. Staff will consider adequacy of this terminal space as schedules are developed.
41 #2	David Pilpel	Supports the change; finding terminal on Fillmore or Green may be difficult.	1,2,3	A "no-parking" area for a terminal with separated trolley coach wiring already exists on Union Street between Green and Fillmore streets, and is used on a daily basis for a limited number of trips. Staff will consider adequacy of this terminal space as schedules are developed.
41 #3	Jackie Ato	Suggests cutting the number of stops even more than the proposal.	1,2,3	An analysis of ridership patterns on the 41-Union reveal that ridership is relatively light west of Fillmore, but build rapidly east of Fillmore.
41 #4	Peter Ehrlich	Questions the proposal to put articulated trolleys on the 41 and also to short line it at Union and Steiner; the hilly terrain and power drain due to the trolleys will be a nightmare.	1, 2, 3	SFMTA's ETI articulated coaches have been successfully tested over the 41-Union. The power supply issue raised will be addressed prior to implementation.
43	Emmet McDonagh	Opposes reducing 43-Masonic service; students need the bus and will be riding it more frequently due to reduced 36-Teresita service.	NA	No reductions of 43-Masonic service are proposed at this time.
48	Paul Stevens	Supports removing the "Fountain Loop" on the 48; it has low ridership and is a waste of time and money.	NA	While this proposal is under consideration as part of the TEP, it has not been proposed as part of these service modifications because it does not reduce the number of vehicles or drivers required to provide 48-Quintara/24th Street service and therefore would not provide significant cost savings.
49 #1	Erica Byrne	49 should be dedicated to Van Ness because Mission Street already has the 14 and BART.	NA	Mission Street is too heavily used to recommend discontinuance of any trunkline service at this time.
49 #2	Anonymous comment received via email;	Supports leaving the 49-Van Ness/Mission the way it is.	NA	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
52	Edward Kamrin, Jeni Pleskow, Edie Harris	Opposes ending evening service at 8:30 p.m.	3	In order to reduce costs, service on most lightly utilized community service routes is proposed to end at 8:30 p.m. under Option 3 only. While the 52-Excelsior carries about 2,390 daily passenger boardings, it only carries about 120 daily passenger boardings after 8:30 p.m. The cost per passenger to serve customers after 8:30 p.m. is about 3 times higher than the Muni system average. A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
53 #1	David Pilpel	Opposes discontinuance of route; suggests reducing span of service instead, and through-routing with 10-Townsend.	2,3	If this service were to be retained, reducing its span of service from 7:15 to 6 p.m., cutting into the peak period, is not recommended. With respect to through-routing the portion of the 53-Southern Heights east of Potrero with the 10-Townsend, this appears to be a service modification outside the range of the present fiscally driven discussion, and does not appear likely to generate cost savings.
53 #2	Josh Litwin	Likes having the 53-Southern Heights service, but doesn't necessarily need it.	2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment. It is precisely such "not necessarily needed" services which we have sought to identify for possible reduction or discontinuance.
54	A. Hart	End 54-Felton at 10 p.m., empty buses in the evening after the rush hour. The buses are noisy going through the residential area.	NA	Proposing elimination of service on routes like the 54-Felton were avoided, because they provide major crosstown connections and serve many neighborhoods.
56	David Davenport; Russ Miller	Consider reducing service on the 56-Rutland.	NA	Only one bus is used on the 56-Rutland and service already ends at 9 p.m. It is not possible to reduce service further without eliminating the route entirely.
66 #1	Dirk Hoekstra	How does rerouting the 66-Quintara onto 19th Avenue save money?	2,3	The shorter route, operated at a 30-minute frequency, can be operated with one rather than the present two buses. Connecting to Taraval Street retains these savings, while providing an L-line connection and service to Safeway.
66 #2	Carolyn Chan	Opposes cutting the 66-Quintara	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, the segment of the 66-Quintara proposed for elimination serves only 280 customers daily, at a cost per passenger about 50% higher than the Muni system average.
66 #3	Carolyn Chan	Cut service at 10 p.m.	NA	The SFMTA appreciates this comment. A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
66 #4	Erik Sens	Do not reduce frequency of service on 66-Quintara.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, reducing service from 20 to 30 minutes throughout the day saves a bus to achieve the cost savings on this route.

PAGE 26

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
66 #5	Lisa Louie	Suggests getting rid of 66-Quintara.	NA	The SFMTA appreciates this comment, but is not recommending discontinuing this route based on extensive community feedback collected during the TEP.
66 #6	David Davenport	Opposes cutting service on Quintara west of 19th Ave; would create a service gap outside of peak periods unless substitute Route 48 is provided.	2,3	Under Options 2 and 3, the segment of the 66-Quintara proposed for elimination serves only 280 customers daily, at a cost per passenger about 50% higher than the Muni system average. Due to budget constraints, additional service cannot be added to the 48-Quintara/24th Street at this time.
66 #7	David Pilpel	Opposes the change; suggests eliminating selected trips instead.	2,3	Doing as suggested would be expected to generate little if any cost savings.
66 #8	Peter Ehrlich	Suggests rerouting the 66-Quintara to connect at West Portal rather than at 19th Ave and Taraval.	2,3	This suggestion would eliminate the cost savings from this proposal.
67 #1	David Pilpel	Supports in part.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
67 #2	David Pilpel	Suggests retaining service on Crescent; extending route to Glen Park BART.	1,2,3	While this may be an interesting service restructuring proposal, operating as suggested to Glen Park BART would neutralize any cost savings from no longer operating a full loop.
67 #3	Gretchen Beck	Opposes reduction of service on the 67-Bernal Heights; no convenient and reliable alternatives in the area, especially on weekends.	1,2,3	Service frequency on the 67-Bernal Heights during the day will be unchanged, including on weekends, only buses will not operate in a complete loop. Reduction of evening service after 10 p.m. is under consideration.
67 #4	Anonymous comment received via email;	Opposes reduction of 67 service; Route 67 serves residents of Alemany public housing who go to the Safeway on Mission.	1,2,3	While this was one of the reasons the route was established originally as a loop, examination of ridership data shows little use of Route 67 for shopping at the Mission Street Safeway. Customers making this trip would have to transfer at Mission & 24th Street.
74X #1	David Pilpel, Anonymous comment received via email;	Supports the change.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
74X #2	Michelle Brandt	Opposes the change and proposes reroute onto Lombard Street and lowering fares.	1,2,3	Costs of service on the 74X exceed \$20 per passenger--over 7 times the system average and higher than for any other Muni service. Neither reducing fares nor rerouting this service would save resources.

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
74X #3	Frank Zepeda	Opposes cutting the 74X; suggests better signage.	1,2,3	Costs of service on the 74X exceed \$20 per passenger--over 7 times the system average and higher than for any other Muni service. Marketing efforts to support the route included yellow shrink-wrapped buses and customized signage.
76 #1	Heather Kilday, Harry Pariser	Opposes reducing 76-Marin Headlands service; rides the bus year-round for hiking, it is crowded on weekends.	3	In order to reduce costs, this proposal was include in Option 3 only. Because of its popularity, no changes are proposed to the 76-Marin Headlands route in the Summer months. However, on shorter Winter days and during adverse weather conditions, ridership is much lighter than in Summer.
76 #2	David Davenport	Opposes cutting Route 76 part of the year, suggests cutting service in south of Market instead.	3	This change was considered, but it was determined that it would not reduce operating costs for this service.
76 #3	David Pilpel	Supports the change; suggests doing more, including cutting headway to 30 minutes and reducing span of service.	3	While we agree it would be desirable to operate a 30-minute service, doing so would neutralize the cost savings of only operating six months each year.
76 #4	Anna Sylvester	Opposes cutting the 76-Marin Headlands; the route is the only way for people without cars to get to nature.	3	In order to reduce costs, this proposal was include in Option 3 only. Because of its popularity, no changes are proposed to the 76-Marin Headlands route in the Summer months. However, on shorter Winter days and during adverse weather conditions, ridership is much lighter than in Summer.
89 #1	Dirk Hoekstra	Opposes discontinuance of 89-Laguna Honda; could harm disabled customers leaving Laguna Honda Hospital.	2,3	SFMTA intends to discuss options for having the Department of Public Health assume responsibility for this hospital-oriented service.
89 #2	David Pilpel	Opposes discontinuance of 89-Laguna Honda; suggests reducing span of service instead.	2,3	The Department of Public Health has frequently sought expansion, not reduction, of the hours of service. SFMTA intends to discuss options for having the Department of Public Health assume responsibility for this hospital-oriented service.
108 #1	David Pilpel	Supports curtailment of service to Caltrain.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
108 #2	David Pilpel	Opposes reroute on Treasure Island.	1,2,3	This proposal is a modest contraction of the route, but has strong support from the Treasure Island community because there are limited origins/destinations on H Avenue.
General #1	Dirk Hoekstra	Opposes 30 minute headways after 10 p.m.	3	This proposal was developed as part of the most extensive service reduction package (Option 3). We are developing a recommendation that may be able to limit the magnitude to something similar to Option 2.

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
General #2	Todd Clobes	Supports Options 1, 2, and 3; supports fare inspectors.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
General #3	Gail Chun	Opposes service cuts due to their arbitrariness.	1,2,3	It is unfortunate that these proposals are perceived as arbitrary; in fact, they are based on far more extensive route performance data than the SFMTA has ever had. All proposals have been screened in terms of the number of customer boardings affected, the number of passengers per revenue vehicle hour, the cost per passenger of the affected service, and other measures as appropriate.
General #4	Victor Povicov; Anonymous comment received via email;	Hopes to see elements of the TEP incorporated into proposed changes. TEP service cuts were proposed in the context of other improvements; right now there is no context of improvements.	NA	Many elements of the TEP actually have been incorporated into the proposed changes. These unfortunately constitute many of the TEP's service reductions without the TEP's proposed service enhancements; otherwise there would not be cost savings. It is intended that the TEP's proposed service enhancements can be implemented over the next several years.
General #5	Diane Carroll; Christopher Pedersen; Daniel Zizmor	Bus stop consolidation is one strategy for saving money. Muni should consolidate stops so as to make stops every four blocks. One specific comment to consolidate bus stops along Van Ness.	NA	The SFMTA appreciates these comments. Stop consolidation is not part of the current proposals, but may be considered in the future.
General #6	Jason Chu	Stop wasting money on bus and bus stop maintenance and redundant transit services.	NA	Many of the proposed changes do involve the removal of duplicative services. SFMTA believes that continued focus on maintenance is critical to providing reliable service to our customers.
General #7	Meredith Goldsmith	Now is a good time to increase efficiency and save money while improving service for the majority of riders.	NA	While SFMTA attempted to develop proposals to increase efficiency and save money, the SFMTA's ability to make improvements is restricted under current fiscal constraints.
General #8	Meredith Goldsmith	Opposes ending all non-Owl service at midnight, would prefer 12:30 or 1 a.m.	2,3	SFMTA will consider an alternative that affects span-of-service less severely than in the initial proposals.
General #9	Wendy Tobias	Opposes stopping Metro service at midnight.	NA	SFMTA apologizes for certain misleading statements in some of the initial public materials that were distributed. Changes to Muni Metro operating hours are not currently under consideration.
General #10	Susan Wheeler	Muni is relying on transfers between routes that are often slow and poorly timed; bus schedules must be timed to allow for smoother transfers.	1,2,3	SFMTA remains committed to improving reliability of Muni service, and realizes this becomes even more important to our customers as these fiscal strategies are implemented.

PAGE 29

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
General #11	Josh Litwin	All options are reasonable.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
General #12	Ajay Martin	Do not cut Owl service, or service after 10 p.m.; many people rely on this service.	2,3	No reductions are proposed to Owl service, although one route (38) would be adjusted to conform to the proposed daytime routing. The proposed reductions on various routes to 30-minute frequencies after 10 p.m. would save almost 18,000 annual revenue hours, or approximately \$1.5 million annually, and have been included for that reason in option 3 only.
General #13	Maria Belilovskaya	Do not cut service on community routes after 8:30 p.m.; doing so will alienate the core Muni ridership.	3	A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
General #14	David Davenport	Overall, the TEP data and the proposals are good.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
General #15	Erika Byrne	Van Ness does not have reliable service; consider creating a dedicated bus on Van Ness, rather than routes 47 and 49, which serve other neighborhoods.	NA	The SFMTA is working to improve reliability systemwide; a Van Ness only service is not proposed at this time, because it would force a significant number of thru-riders traveling to SoMa and the Mission to transfer.
General #16	Emmanuel Andres, Shaun White	Opposes service cuts due to their effect on students, youth and seniors.	1,2,3	The SFMTA is obligated to develop a balanced budget. While we regret having to consider service reductions, the magnitude of our operating deficit required us to consider a variety of cost saving and revenue generating options.
General #17	Reggie McCray, Vincent Yeng-Jieh Choo	Suggests combining duplicative service.	NA	The SFMTA appreciates this comment, and has attempted to do as this comment suggests in a number of proposals.
General #18	Barry Toronto	Supports routes ending earlier.	2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
General #19	Barry Toronto	Service reductions in the evening should begin at 10 p.m. rather than 8:30 p.m.	3	A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
General #20	Manish Champsee	Service cuts are better than maintenance cuts; do not cut maintenance.	NA	SFMTA agrees with this comment. It is our intent that service reliability be maintained and enhanced, even if scheduled service must be reduced.
General #21	David Pilpel	Submit temporary Transbay Terminal changes separately.	NA	Changes in routings to serve the temporary Transbay Terminal site were submitted to and approved by the SFMTA Board in March 2008. These changes would likely coincide with the timing of any proposed service modifications that are approved.

PAGE 30

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
General #22	David Pilpel	Various suggestions offered for potential schedule efficiencies.	1,2,3	Commenter offered numerous suggestions outside of SFMTA's formal proposals for potential improvements to operating schedules for various routes. We appreciate the thought and effort this represents, and will take these comments under advisement for consideration during the schedule construction process.
General #23	Peter Ehrlich; Harry Pariser, Melissa Sautter	Oppose cutting service at 8:30 p.m.; neighborhood routes should end at 10 or 10:30, this would also make it easier to put together balanced 8-hour schedules for operators.	3	A modified proposal that would end service at 10 p.m. instead of 8:30 p.m. will be considered.
General #24	Ben Lin, Timothy Wickland, Allison Miller	Opposes service reductions.	1,2,3	The SFMTA is obligated to develop a balanced budget. While we regret having to consider service reductions, the magnitude of our operating deficit required us to consider a variety of cost saving and revenue generating options.
General #25	Frank Zepeda	Supports cutting some routes in the evening.	2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
General #26	Frank Zepeda	Opposes abandoning any routes, particularly those that have standing loads at times, or those that provide alternatives to other service.	1,2,3,	The SFMTA is obligated to develop a balanced budget. While we regret having to consider service reductions, the magnitude of our operating deficit required us to consider a variety of cost saving and revenue generating options.
General #27	Vincent Yeng-Jieh Choo	Supports reducing frequency on routes if there is not enough ridership.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
General #28	Vincent Yeng-Jieh Choo	Opposes reducing the span of service.	2,3	SFMTA will consider an alternative that affects span-of-service less severely than in the initial proposals.
General #29	Mark Scott	I personally have never owned a car in my 16 years living in the City. Being a regular Muni rider and a motorcyclist, I, like many others, have found a combination that allows me to continue a car-free lifestyle. Thus, while motorcycling may not ostensibly appear to be a "transit first" alternative, incentives supporting a non-car-owning lifestyle are overall consistent with that long-standing city policy.	NA	SFMTA encourages use of all alternative transportation options.

PAGE 31

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
General #30	Peter Chou	Both parking and Muni fees will increase significantly. The only convenient and dependable lines are the rail lines that cover only a fraction of the city. You are forcing residents to waste time by using a bad and inefficient public transportation system.	1, 2, 3	Muni system reliability has improved recently, and while we still have not reached our goals, we remain committed to continuing this improvement even in the face of the current fiscal constraints.
General #31	Remi Tan	Concerned that route and frequency cuts be done carefully for routes that are truly underutilized. For under-served routes, could be offered a discount taxi service of Muni pass. Use vans with lower salary level paid through proposed higher parking fees, and extra parking money to increase service on heavily used routes per TEP and help outer resident get message that Muni is more convenient and cheaper than driving.	1, 2, 3	SFMTA is considering various fee increases, not only transit fares, and most of these revenue streams do support SFMTA's transit operations. The current service proposals are based on more detailed ridership and cost information than has ever been available before. Smaller vehicles are under consideration, but our current labor agreements do not provide for differential salaries.
General #32	Jalin Chen	Opposes cutting service due to low ridership; feels that ridership on some buses is low because they are unreliable.	1, 2, 3	While this has been a problem in the past--and system reliability remains below agency targets--our customers generally acknowledge that reliability has improved recently, and our statistics confirm that.
General #33	Christina Wong, R T	Opposes reducing service while also increase fares.	1, 2, 3	The SFMTA is obligated to develop a balanced budget. While we regret having to consider service reductions, the magnitude of our operating deficit required us to consider a variety of cost saving and revenue generating options. These options require consideration of <u>both</u> fare increases <u>and</u> service reductions.
General #34	Rachel Moore, Greg Wong	Service cuts need to be studied very carefully before being implemented.	1, 2, 3	In addition to the analyses performed to date, further analysis will continue through the period of schedule development to ensure the proposals are as carefully crafted as possible. It is even possible that some proposals could be dropped if expected savings cannot be achieved or certain aspects cannot be implemented as intended.
General #35	Guadalupe C. Amador	Opposes cuts and layoffs; raise the fares if necessary	1,2,3	The SFMTA is obligated to develop a balanced budget. While we regret having to consider service reductions, the magnitude of our operating deficit required us to consider a variety of cost saving and revenue generating options. These options require consideration of <u>both</u> fare increases <u>and</u> service reductions.

Line/ Route	Names of Commenters	Issue	Option	Response
General #36	Anonymous comment received via email;	Appreciates being informed by email and the chance to comment.	NA	The SFMTA appreciates this comment.
General #37	Jean Fraser	Muni should get rid of legacy routes that serve very few people.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment. Passenger activity levels were one of the key issues considered when developing proposals.
General #38	Elliot Schwartz	Opposes reducing service; will hurt the environment; goes against the Transit First Policy.	1,2,3	The SFMTA is obligated to develop a balanced budget. While we regret having to consider service reductions, the magnitude of our operating deficit required us to consider a variety of cost saving and revenue generating options.
General #39	Laura Iversen	Supports Option 1; opposes Options 2 and 3 because they decrease the functionality of the system.	1,2,3	The SFMTA appreciates this comment and while we do not think we can limit the reductions to Option 1, we are developing a recommendation that may be able to limit the magnitude to something similar to Option 2.
General #40	Crishel Bonfante	Muni has to get more reliable and cleaner in order to justify fare increases.	NA	Muni system reliability has improved recently, and while we still have not reached our goals, we remain committed to continuing this improvement even in the face of the current fiscal constraints.
General #41	David Johnson	Questions the cost projections for the service cuts; the projections do not factor in the reduction in revenue resulting from the reduction in service.	1,2,3	Service reduction proposals were designed to affect relatively small numbers of customers. Although some customer loss may be expected, fares cover less than 25% of the cost of service. A conservative assumption was used in developing costs, which allows for some portion of lost revenues.
General #42	Gertrude Albert	Service would be better if schedules were posted.	NA	The NextMuni system provides "real-time" bus arrival information at 300 bus shelters currently, and is also available via voice or digital cell phones, computers, and other devices. This has provided a popular, and for most purposes superior, alternative to posted schedules, which have a maintenance costs that SFMTA is currently unable to absorb.
General #43	Ruthanne Barulich	Opposes cutting service while also encouraging the public to use public transit.	1,2,3	The SFMTA is obligated to develop a balanced budget. While we regret having to consider service reductions, the magnitude of our operating deficit required us to consider a variety of cost saving and revenue generating options.

- **Continue with the TEP**

Commenter: Gregory Wong

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and the options to address the 2009-2010 deficit were made keeping the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) in mind. The

proposed service modifications developed in response to the 2009-2010 deficit have been informed by the data collected and the extensive public input received during the TEP planning phase. While the budget challenges may slow the SFMTA's progress toward implementing TEP recommendations, staff is currently developing the TEP Implementation Plan and will be presenting it to the SFMTA Board of Directors this summer. In addition, the Agency continues to apply best practices learned through the TEP to improve service reliability, especially on our busiest routes and lines.

▪ **Support Option One Only**

Commenter: Laura Iversen

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and has developed three potential service options designed to affect the least number of customers possible. The three proposed options represent a potential annual operating savings between \$5.8 million and \$17.8 million, contingent upon the extent of the modifications. The Board of Directors will consider these three options along with other proposals to address the 2009-2010 deficit.

▪ **Increase Service Frequency**

Commenter: Cal Grant

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and will continue to strive to provide the best possible quality of service to our customers. In order to address the 2009-2010 deficit, three potential service options were developed. Each option includes both recommendations for reducing frequencies of some Muni routes and increasing frequencies of some Muni routes to absorb customers affected by other proposed changes or to conserve resources.

▪ **Provide Van Service Where Services are Reduced**

Commenter: Remi Tan

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and anticipates that demand for paratransit services will increase if Muni service reductions are pursued. In order to address the 2009-2010 deficit, three potential service options were developed, representing a potential annual operating savings between \$5.8 million and \$17.8 million, contingent upon the extent of the modifications. These operating savings estimates assume that paratransit demand will grow 2% under Option 1, 4% under Option 2 and 6% under Option 3.

▪ **Would Rather Pay Higher Fares To Avoid Cutbacks In Service**

Commenter: John Cummings, Laura Iversen, Guadalupe C. Amador, Christina Wong, Gerald D. Adams, Sharon R. Meyer

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and the options to address the 2009-2010 deficit were made based on this premise.

3) Specific Comments On User Charges

TRANSIT FARES

i. General

- **Increase The Proof Of Payment Citation From \$50.00 To \$250.00**

Commenter: Ricardo Tovar

Response: The \$50.00 citation amount was established by the Board of Supervisors when the SFMTA received authorization two years ago to cite fare evaders under the proof of payment program. The penalty limits for the first offense is set at \$50; \$75 for the second offense; and \$100 for the third offense committed within one year of the date of the first offense. The SFMTA will be review the level of this citation amount for the 2011-2012 budget year.

- **Collect Fares From Fare Evaders/Back Door Boarding**

Commenter: Steve Vaccaro, Caroline Kleinman, Gregory Wong, John Cummings, K H, Andy Cox, Shaun White, Justin Nomi, S. Kitazawa, Rachel Moore, Denise Nicco, Jalin Chen, Rosie X , Ricardo Tovar, Jeanne Gibson, Dan Edwards, Allen Henderson, Barbara Bocci

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and is in the process of expanding the Agency's Proof of Payment program which is used on the Muni rail system to the Muni bus fleet.

- **Add San Francisco Police Department And Proof of Payment Presence On The System**

Commenter: Gregory Wong, John Cummings, Rebekah

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and is in the process of expanding the Agency's Proof of Payment program which is used on the Muni rail system to the Muni bus fleet . Additionally, the SFMTA is working with the SFPD to strengthen its Vehicle Inspection Program which encourages every police officer to the system during his/her shift.

- **Possible negative impact of eliminating Proof of Payment Inspectors, Street Supervisors, Operators**

Commenter: Robert, Rebekah

Response: Unfortunately, the SFMTA was required to eliminate more than 400 positions to balance the FY 2009-2010 budget. However, the Agency will continue to fill existing vacancies and hire approximately 180 positions in FY 2009-2010 including Proof of Payment inspectors, street supervisors and transit operators.

- **Difficult to Afford Increase**

Commenter: Crishel Bonfante, Keisha Roberts, Heidi-Jane Schwabe, Troy Blair, Brendan Kober, Tracy Leung, Shirley Stuckey

Response: The SFMTA is sensitive to low income customers and offers discount monthly passes for senior, disabled, and youth customers. In addition, the SFMTA has an agreement with the Department of Human Services (DHS) in which DHS provide a \$35 Lifeline Pass for low-income residents. Information on the Lifeline Pass can be obtained by visiting the Customer Service Center at 11 South Van Ness or the SFMTA website.

▪ **Discourages The Use Of Public Transit**

Commenter: Crishel Bonfante, Tim Brace

Response: The SFMTA hopes that the proposed budget options do not discourage use of public transit. The vast majority of transit agencies across the county are facing significant deficits just as the SFMTA and are either reducing service or increasing fares or both given the significant loss in revenue. The SFMTA hopes that the residents and visitors of San Francisco support the City's Transit First policy as well as improving the environment and will continue to choose Muni as their preferred mode of transit.

▪ **No Fare Increase**

Commenter: Kevin Weaver, R T, Alison Miller, Timothy Wickland, Ben Lin, Peter Chou

Response: The SFMTA would prefer not to increase fares but unfortunately given the economic situation, the SFMTA, similarly to most transit agencies across the county are facing significant deficits and are either cutting service or increasing fares or both. For 2009-2010, the SFMTA will be reducing spending by nearly \$70 million to help address the \$128.9 million deficit. Unfortunately, addressing the remaining \$50 million requires reductions in transit service as well as increases in charges across all the modes – transit, parking and taxis.

▪ **Establish a \$5.00 Day Pass**

Commenter: Derek Reibert

Response: The SFMTA considered a day pass as one possible option, however, given the distribution and administrative costs associated with this fare media, the day pass was not included in the final list of options for consideration.

▪ **Set the Discount Fares at 40-50% of the Full Fare**

Commenter: Derek Reibert, David Davenport

Response: The SFMTA is reviewing all of its fare multipliers and will be presenting a policy for the SFMTA Board of Directors' consideration in the near future. The policy will address the multiplier between the single ride and the monthly pass as well as the relationship between the adult fares and the discount fares. It is expected that this policy will be in place for the 2010-2011 fiscal year and going forward.

- **The service cut projections fail to consider the decreased revenue from these service cuts.**
Commenter: David Johnson
Response: The projections were developed using 70% of the National Transit Database direct cost to reflect reductions in revenues and the impact of the difference between service hours reductions compared to pay hours saved.

- **The Discount for Senior, Youth and Disabled is Too High.**
Commenter: Sepehr Zamani, David Pilpel
Response: The SFMTA is reviewing all of its fare multipliers and will be presenting a policy for the SFMTA Board of Directors' consideration in the near future. The policy will address the multiplier between the single ride and the monthly pass as well as the relationship between the adult fares and the discount fares. It is expected that this policy will be in place for the 2010-2011 fiscal year and going forward.

- **Support Increases to Fares At Different Timelines and Different Levels.**
Commenter: David Pilpel
Response: The SFMTA appreciates the comment.

- **Price Fares according to Zones**
Commenter: rogerdepa
Response: Given the limited geography of the City, the City's Transit First policy and a system based on travel into and from the downtown area, a fare based on zones has not been considered.

- **The Lifeline Pass Should Be Eliminated In Favor Of A System That Shifts This Work To The Existing Social Service Agencies**
Commenter: David Davenport
Response: The SFMTA has been working this past year with the Health Services Agency (HSA) to jointly develop a solution to improve the distribution and access for the Lifeline Pass. The SFMTA will continue to explore ways to provide low income customers access to the Muni system while reducing the related administrative costs.

- **Support Fare Increases**
Commenter: Patrick Pun, Jim Flanagan
Response: The SFMTA appreciates the comment.

- **Reward frequent riders of BART and MUNI with reductions in costs if they purchase semi-annual and annual passes.**
Commenter: Jane Williamson
Response: The SFMTA will be considering this option with the implementation of TransLink®, a transit smart card fare payment program.

ii) **Adult Monthly Fast Pass Increase**

▪ **Acceptable if Muni performed better**

Commenter: Crishel Bonfante

Response: It has been quite clear that one of the major reasons why Muni service has not met expectations is due to a lack of adequate resources. It is widely known based on studies by the Grand Jury and the Board of Supervisors' Budget Analyst, Muni has had a structural deficit for decades. Many members of the public say that they are willing to pay more if Muni service improves; however, Muni service cannot improve without adequate resources.

▪ **Raise the Fast Pass higher than Proposed**

Commenter: Gregory Wong, Jean Fraser, Vincent Yeng-Jieh Choo,

Response: The SFMTA Board of Directors will be considering an Automatic Indexing Plan for charges effective in 2010-2011 which will allow fares to increase in small increments every two years rather than large increases infrequently. This policy will ensure customers know what to expect, make fare increases transparent and will also allow the SFMTA to budget appropriately.

iii) **Single Ride Increase**

▪ **Do not Support the Increase to \$2.00**

Commenter: Steve Vaccaro, Harry S. Pariser, Troy Blair

Response: The SFMTA would prefer not to increase fares but unfortunately given the economic situation, the SFMTA, like transit agencies across the country is facing a significant deficit and must explore reducing service, increasing fares or both. For 2009-2010, the SFMTA will be reducing spending by close to \$70 million to help address the \$128.9 million deficit. Unfortunately, addressing the remaining \$50 million requires reductions in transit service as well as increase in charges across all the modes – transit, parking and taxis. Finally, the \$1.50 single ride fare for adults was last increased in 2005.

▪ **Increase it by \$0.25**

Commenter: Gregory Wong

Response: The SFMTA has received comments from customers regarding the ease of paying \$2.00 rather than \$1.75 as it relates to avoiding searching for coins.

▪ **Support the Increase to \$2.00**

Commenter: Laura Iversen, Janet Clyde, Derek Reibert, Vincent Yeng-Jieh Choo, Frank Zepeda

Response: The SFMTA appreciates the comment.

- **Replace the Antiquated Fare Collection System before the Increase to \$2.00**

Commenter: Andy Cox

Response: The SFMTA supports this comment and is in the procuring change machines, funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, as well as rehabilitating the fareboxes. Unfortunately given the need to address the deficit, the SFMTA can not wait for the completion of these projects before increasing the single ride fares.

iv) **Charging For Transfers**

- **Do not Charge for Transfers**

Commenter: Laura Iversen, Melissa Sautter, Aaron Kitashima, Robert, Joe Humphreys, Harry S. Pariser, A. Ozols, Jalin Chen, rogerdepa, Tracy Leung, F. Curtis May, Ph.D. Bill Hough, Vincent Yeng-Jieh Choo, Hennie Wisniewski

Response: This option is no longer being considered.

- **Do you plan to print POP transfer for proof of payment (similar to cable car receipt for proof of payment and non-transfer)?**

Commenter: Kenton Louie

Response: This option is no longer being considered.

v) **Premium Pass**

- **Impact of Possible Switch to Other Lines**

Commenter: Robert

Response: The SFMTA is very aware of this possibility and will be closely monitoring the impact of premium passes if implemented.

- **Do not Support the BART/Muni premium pass**

Commenter: Tracy Leung

Response: Based on ridership from July 2008 through February 2009, reimbursement to BART at \$1.02 per trip is on track to reach \$13.4 million this fiscal year. Currently, approximately 20% of Adult Fast Pass revenues are paid to BART. Payments to BART have grown at an average annualized rate of 14% over the last four years, which reflects an annualized ridership increase of 8% and an increase in the reimbursement rate from \$0.87 to \$1.02 per trip. If FY 2009-2010 Fast Pass usage does not increase over current levels, SFMTA can expect to incur a deficit of \$2.4 million compared to FY 2009-2010 budgeted levels for the use of the Fast Pass on BART. This deficit could reach \$3.6 million if usage next fiscal year grows at rates consistent with four-year trends (8% annualized ridership growth rates).

- **How would I Pay for the Premium Pass**

Commenter: Kenton Louie

Response: The SFMTA will create a separate pass to be used until TransLink®, a transit smart card fare payment program is fully implemented which will allow customers to ride the express and non-express routes.

vi) **Cable Car Passports**

- **The 1-, 3- and 7-day Passports are already "too expensive" to be attractive for most passengers.**

Commenter: David Davenport

Response: The majority of the Cable Car passports are purchased by tourists. The Passport fees were last raised in 2005.

PARKING RATES

i) **General**

- **Charge Car Users More**

Commenter: Peggy da Silva, Timothy Wickland

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment but must consider all stakeholder interests including automobile users.

- **Increase the fines for anyone parking in bus stops, Increase the fines for red-light runners.**

Commenter: Jane Williamson

Response: The SFMTA charges the highest amount allowable under State law.

- **Establish fines for excessively high decibel exhaust pipes on cars, trucks and motorcycles.**

Commenter: Jane Williamson

Response: This is within the jurisdiction of Board of Supervisors.

- **Increase Parking Rates to Keep Muni Services**

Commenter: Elliot Schwartz, Remi Tan

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and the options to address the 2009-2010 deficit were made based on this premise.

- **Reduce Projects and Expansion Instead of Raising Parking Rates and Expanding Parking Hours**

Commenter: David Hill

Response: Most projects and expansions are funded through grants which are restricted for capital uses and these funds are not available for operating needs which is where the \$128.9 million deficit rests.

- **Enhance the Use of Parking Cards and Allow Discounts for High Value Cards**

Commenter: Heidi Lypps, Peter Hartikka, Jon McBain, Andrew Kim, WolfQueen, George Durden, Psva Leo

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment related to the enhanced availability of parking cards which can be purchased via the internet. Additionally, the SFpark program will be replacing parking meters to allow for credit card payments in pilot areas. At this time, the SFMTA is not considering parking discounts for high value cards.

- **Increase Parking Garage and Parking Meter Rates and Extended Hours Based on Demand**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: The SFpark program will be implementing demand based pricing in the pilot areas which encompass 25% of metered on-street parking spaces (6,000) and approximately 11,500 off-street parking spaces. Once the 18-month pilot program is completed, SFMTA intends to expand demand based parking pricing Citywide. The pilot will also include extended hours.

- **Consider the \$3 Surcharge for Citations to Recover State Increase**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: Based on the recent increases in parking citation penalties, the additional \$3 is not recommended at this time

ii) **On Street Parking**

- **Oppose the Extension of Hours beyond 6 p.m. and instead Increase Parking Rates More Than \$0.50 Per Hour**

Commenter: Deirdre McCrohan, John Czarnik, David Ferguson,

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment but must consider all stakeholder interests, as well as the City adopted Transit First policy.

- **Oppose the Extension of Paid Parking Hours beyond 6 p.m.**

Commenter: John Czarnik, David Hill, Christina Wong, Michael Dotson, Mook, Peter Chou, Leah Cooper, Erin Rooney, Jessica White, My Do

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment but must consider all stakeholder interests, as well as the City adopted Transit First policy. Additionally, the SFMTA is evaluating relaxing time limits so that paid parking may be available in more than one and two hour blocks and could allow someone to park for four hours between 6 p.m. and 10 p.m. in certain parts of the City.

- **Oppose the Extension of Paid Parking to Sunday**

Commenter: David Ferguson, David Hill, Michael Dotson, Mook, Peter Chou,

Leah Cooper, Erin Rooney, Jessica White, My Do

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment but must consider all stakeholder interests, as well as the City adopted Transit First policy. Additionally, the SFMTA is evaluating relaxing time limits so that paid parking may be available in more than one and two hour blocks.

▪ **Why not increase the Residential Parking Permit**

Commenter: Erica Byrne, Gina Brown, Jean Fraser

Response: Residential Parking Permit program are cost recovery fees and the permit amount cannot exceed the costs of enforcement.

▪ **Support the Increase to Hourly Parking Rates, Raise it More**

Commenter: Remi Tan, Jean Fraser

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment but must consider all stakeholder interests including automobile users.

▪ **Cannot afford the Increases**

Commenter: John Czarnik, Peter Tousignant, Leah Cooper

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment; however, parking rates have not increased in the City since 2005.

▪ **The Proposed Increase of \$1.00 to Motorcycle Hourly Rates is Too High**

Commenter: DB Noyola, Rich Risbridger, Sasha Pave, Morgan Lang, Ilo Kratins, Pete Young, Matthew M. Randle, Joel M. Blackman, Eric Vanderlin, Heidi Lypps, Jon McBain, Peter Hartikka, Andrew Kim, WolfQueen, Dan Edwards, Roy Murakami, George Durden, Christopher Passanisi, Psva Leo, Mook, Andrew Lesslie, Eric Wight, Erin Veneziano, Jonathon Clark, Christina Gommerman, Chris Meiering, John Gruninger, Erin Rooney, Mike Greenberg, Patrick D. Moore, Mark Scott, Sivan Mozes, Steve Tourdo, Jessica White, Kyle Sund, Stephen Linden, Kip Gebhardt, Greg Luecke, Hubert Bugajski, Phil Venton, Mike, Dahn Van Laarz, Shannon J. Halkyard, Jim, Jim Bowlby, Danny Krause, Rob Callbeck, Tad Dodson, Andrew R. Whalley

Response: The SFMTA has amended the original proposal so that motorcycle users would pay proportionally to the space they occupy relative to an 18 foot space, or a 21- foot space with buffer red zones, rounded to the nickel. Current rates are \$0.25 per hour in Zone One, \$0.15 per hour in Zones Two and Four and \$0.10 per hour in Zone 3. This would increase to \$0.70, \$0.60, \$0.40, \$0.60 if meter rates increased by \$0.50.

▪ **Do Not Raise Motorcycle Hourly Rates**

Commenter: Douglas Arthur Worley, Bjorn Pave, David Hill, Ilo Kratins, Ross Capdeville, Steven Williams, J. P. , Jane Williamson, Steven Solter, Robert Charbonneau, Jeff Johnston, Jason, Andy Bajka, Kevin Vollbrecht, Jeffrey Meleg,

John Jarman, Maureen Sharkey, Scott Anderson, Joshua Hackett, Neil Clark, Cheryl Eng, Terry Anastassiou, Peter Fraenkel, Vinicio Vazquez, Tim Z Falconer, Amaury Gallisa, Jim Flanagan, David E. Thiel, Brian Biggs, Azmeer Salleh, Eric Worthington, George Lula, Max Zhang, Dana L. Rees, Nicholas Weaver, Jason Smith, Geoff Walshe, Clyde Wildes, Bonnie, Bill Swartz, Colin Hessel, Dave Rathofer, Suguru Nishioka, Tiffany Khaler, Harry Whalley, Shawn Kenning, Gary Skow, Peter Fraenkel

Response: While SFMTA would prefer not to increase raise rates, motorcycle rates were last increased in 2002-2003. The SFMTA has amended the original proposal so that motorcycle users would pay proportionally to the space they occupy relative to an 18- foot space, or a 21-foot space with buffer red zones, rounded to the nickel. Current rates are \$0.25 per hour in Zone One, \$0.15 per hour in Zones Two and Four and \$0.10 per hour in Zone 3. This would increase to \$0.70, \$0.60, \$0.40, \$0.60 if meter rates increased by \$0.50.

- **Double the Parking Fee Instead of Raising Motorcycle Hourly Rates to \$1.00**

Commenter: Sasha Pave

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment but must consider all stakeholder interests in the City including automobile users and motorcyclists.

- **Cut Back on Services to Avoid Increase to Parking Rates and Extension of Parking Hours**

Commenter: David Ferguson, David Hill

Response: The SFMTA appreciates this comment and has developed three potential service options. The three proposed options represent a potential annual operating savings between \$5.8 million and \$17.8 million, contingent upon the extent of the modifications. The Board of Directors will consider these three options along with other proposals to address the 2009-2010 deficit.

iii) **Off Street Parking**

- **Raise Rates to Equal Private Garages**

Commenter: Remi Tan, Frank Zepeda

Response: The 2009-2010 amended budget proposal includes increases in parking fees at all city garages. If approved, these increases will bring parking fees at City garages close to rates at private garages. These rate increases reflect rates at nearby facilities, and the City's interest in providing affordable rates to support the retail businesses and cultural and entertainment venues, and thereby support local economy.

iv. **Taxi Fees And Medallions**

- **Offer Discount Taxi Service in Areas where Muni Service is Reduced**

Commenter: Remi Tan

Response: There may be opportunities to coordinate with the taxi industry to make increased taxi service available where Muni service is reduced; however it is not feasible in the short term to arrange for payment of private taxi service with Muni fare media.

▪ **Taxi Drivers Should Be Tested On Geographical Knowledge Of The City**

Commenter: Rebekah Drechsel

Response: The SFMTA is in the process of assuming taxi driver training responsibilities from three private entities and the San Francisco Police Department. As part of this process, the curriculum used to train new taxi drivers will be carefully reviewed and updated. Geographical knowledge of the city will be one of the subject matter areas addressed in training.

▪ **Taxi Medallions Should Be Transferable To Purchasers Who Are Connected To The Taxi Industry; Proposed Pilot Program Should Utilize Newly Issued Medallions Through A Minimum Bid Auction To Establish A Market Price. I Support The Patrick Shannon Plan.**

Commenter: Donald L. Fassett

Response: On March 27, 2009, the SFMTA issued a Request for Information seeking proposals regarding Prop K reform. Proposals must be submitted by May 1. Once those proposals are received, the SFMTA will use the ideas contained in the proposals and input received from the industry to identify the details of a pilot program.

▪ **Support The Transfer Of Taxi Medallions To Help Balance The Budget.**

Commenter: Frank Noto

Response: The SFMTA will consider the transferability of medallions as one of the alternatives for Proposition K reform, along with additional input received from the taxi industry that are received in response to the SFMTA's March 27, 2009 Request for Information for Proposition K reform proposals.

▪ **Offer A Proposal For Proposition K Reform Called The "Patrick Shannon Plan." The Main Tenets Of This Plan Are: 1. Pre-K Owners Reclaim The Transferability They Originally Purchased; 2. K Permittees Are Allowed To Purchase Transferability For \$100K; 3. New Permits To Be Auctioned And Cabdrivers As Well As Any True ESOP, Cooperative Or Bona Fide Employee-Owned Company Allowed To Bid For Permits; And 4. Transfer Fees To Be Charged By The City Upon Transfers Of Medallions.**

Commenter: Patrick Shannon

Response: The SFMTA appreciates the comment. The comments received will be included and evaluated with all responses to the Request for Information after May 1, 2009.

- **Taxi Related Fees Should Be Cost Recovery**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: Existing taxi permit fees do not recover current regulatory costs. MTA staff proposes to increase existing fees to more fully recover taxi regulatory costs.

- **Taxi Revenues Should Not Subsidize the Rest of the Modes and Should Be Kept Separate**

Commenter: David Pilpel

Response: This is a policy matter that will be addressed by the Board of Directors after receipt of proposals for Proposition K reform.

Funding Impact

Impact to Proposed Amended Operating Budget for 2009-2010.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the SFMTA Board of Directors adopt a resolution finding that a fiscal emergency exists caused by the failure of the Agency to adequately fund agency programs, facilities, and operations under California Public Resources Code section 21080.32 and California Environmental Quality Act implementing guidelines, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations section 15285. The SFMTA has responded within 30 days to the oral and written comments and suggestions made by the public.

The City Attorney has reviewed this item.

SAN FRANCISCO
MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. _____

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency “SFMTA” faces a severe fiscal challenge resulting from the economic downturn; and

WHEREAS, The SFMTA is considering reduction in transit service and increases to various fares, fees, fines, rates and charges that support transit service; and

WHEREAS, Reductions in transit service normally require an evaluation of the potential environmental impact of such reductions under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, CEQA provides a statutory exemption for the reduction or elimination of existing transit service, facilities, programs, or activities by an Agency as a result of a declared fiscal emergency caused by the failure of Agency revenues to adequately fund programs, facilities and operations; and

WHEREAS, A fiscal emergency exists when an agency is projected to have “negative working capital” within one year from the date that the agency finds that a fiscal emergency exists; and

WHEREAS, California Public Resources Code section 21080.32(d)(2) provides that, in calculating the available working capital, an agency is to add together all unrestricted cash, unrestricted short-term investments, and unrestricted short-term accounts receivable and then subtract unrestricted accounts payable and that reserves shall not be included in this calculation; and

WHEREAS, Analysis of SFMTA’s negative working capital for 2009-2010 identifies a shortfall of approximately \$112 million and \$91 million at the end of April 2010; and

WHEREAS, On April 7, 2009, the SFMTA Board of Directors held a noticed public hearing on the proposed declaration of fiscal emergency; and

WHEREAS, On April 21, 2009, the SFMTA responded to comments and suggestions made by the public at the April 7, 2009 meeting and received through April 10, 2009, at a regularly scheduled SFMTA Board of Directors meeting; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors declares a fiscal emergency exists caused by the failure of agency revenues to adequately fund agency programs and facilities pursuant to California Public Resources Code section 21080.32 and California Environmental Quality Act implementing guidelines, Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations section 15285;

and be it further

RESOLVED, That pursuant to section 21080.32 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15285 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, the SFMTA Board of Directors finds that the SFMTA faces a fiscal emergency caused by the failure of agency revenues to adequately fund agency programs, facilities and operations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors finds it necessary to increase certain fees, rates or charges that support public transit service as well as to reduce or eliminate certain public transit services and that such increases in fees, rates or charges and such service reductions are statutorily exempt from review under CEQA; and finally be it further

RESOLVED, That the SFMTA Board of Directors finds that the reduction or elimination of the availability of existing service are statutorily exempt from CEQA review.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its meeting of _____.

Secretary to the Board of Directors
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency