Letters From the Public
March 6, 2008

Mr. Angelo King, Chairman
Bayview Hunters Point Project Area Committee
1800 Oakdale Avenue, Suite 5
San Francisco, CA 94124

Re: Concerns of Bayview Hunters Point Residents

Dear Mr. King:

As Community Advisory Board Members of the South East Health Center, we are sensitive towards the needs of the Bayview Hunters Point residents, Senior Citizens in particular. The utmost importance is the transportation services.

Please note that we do prize our Senior Citizens and we feel responsible for their welfare. Most of them are single widows and widowers who do not have any means of transportation with the exception of public transportation, which raises great concerns. The current weather conditions, daylight time frame and the distance of their living quarters are an endangerment to their lives. We have to be mindful to such respect as to conjure the best services for them. Lacking in transportation services is causing HARDSHIP to our senior residents.

We are hopeful that your organization will address the following problems:

- The lack of commitment from the cab companies to service this community.
- Complaints about calling the cabs and having the residents waiting up to 2 hrs. And sometimes they don’t show up at all.
- Most of the complaints are from our Senior Citizen community.
- These Senior Citizens would wait for hours in front of grocery stores, business locations, hospitals and clinics.
We are aware that your office is focusing on developments for the economic growth of the Bayview Hunters Point. We feel very strongly that this matter should be addressed directly to your office. These residents are the inhabitants of these developments progressing in this area. Their voices are our voices.

We are anticipating your kind consideration in this matter. Any assistance from your office will speak volumes of consolation to our demise.

If you have any questions, please contact any of the officers as listed.

Sincerely,

Alonzo Walker, Chairman

cc:
San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom
Supervisor Sophia Maxwell
Heidi Machen, Executive Director – SF Taxicab Commission
SF Commission on Aging and Adult Services
Edna James, Commissioner – Aging & Adult Services Commission
Channel 7 – Michael Finney (7 on my side)
April 21, 2008

San Francisco Taxi Cab Commissioner:  
San Francisco Airport Police Bureau GTU Inspection:  
To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing this letter for the long term lease and medallion holders because every year for taxi cab inspection, we have problems with the GTU Inspection department. The problem is that they require us to remove our leather seat coverings which is used to help keep our cabs clean. We cannot prevent a passenger from eating or drinking in our cabs and if the passenger were to make a mess, it is easier for us to clean either the leather seat coverings or leather seats compared to the cloth standard cloth seats included within our vehicles. Also, since we are serving the people of San Francisco, we need to take into consideration of the continuos rainy weather that we face. If we do not have leather seat coverings, the cloth seats will soak up all the rain water when a passenger sits into the cab, and when the next passenger gets into the cab, the seats will be wet and will make their clothing wet. However, with the leather seat coverings, we are able to dry the seats instantly with a piece of cloth and the next customer will have an enjoyable ride, rather than sitting on a wet seat. It is extremely difficult for us to find a vehicle with leather seats, therefore we spend an extra $200+ to order leather seat coverings to cover the cloth seats within the vehicles. Cab companies will not pay an extra $200+ to have leather seats covering made for their vehicles with cloth seats and as a result, the seats in these vehicles are extremely dirty, but somehow, these cabs still pass the inspections. We would prefer to buy a vehicle with leather seats so we don’t have to pay for custom made leather seat coverings, but vehicles with leather seats are extremely hard to find. Company cabs are extremely dirty which affects the preferences of customers because they think that all cabs are just as dirty, so they rather pay more to ride in limos. After riding in cabs with leather seat coverings, the customers usually change their minds and prefers to ride in taxis because we keep our cabs clean and sanitized daily.

P.S. - Please send a respect letter to all cab company managers in response to whether if we are allowed to use the custom made leather seat coverings for our cabs.

Sincerely,

From All Cab Drivers
San Francisco Taxi Commission
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 420
San Francisco, Ca. 94102

415-503-2180
415-503-2186 Fax

-----Forwarded by SFTaxi Commission/ADMSVC/SFGOV on 05/14/2008 05:20PM-----

To: sftaxi.commission@sfnow.org

Date: 05/14/2008 12:24PM
Subject: Nice work, my open letter to the SF Taxicab Commission

Very good, pat yourselves on the back. Last night's performance showed you to be political powerhouses. I'm sure that Mayor Newsom has picked up the phone to each and every Commissioner and has already thanked you for showing such professionalism and respect for the law. Who knows what the law is though? Apparently no one on the Taxicab Commission. The request to move medallion #690 from Regents to Green Cab was in order for the company (of which I am a proud member) to fall into compliance with the TC's rules and was requested at the TC's own urging. Funny how that works isn't it? The TC asks us to move the medallion and then the TC won't let us do it. Again, let me reiterate in case you missed that, The Taxicab Commission asked us to move medallion #690 out of Regents so we would be in compliance with the three layer rule. We applied to move it, the medallion owner personally asked to move it and the TC denied it.

Let me say, the TC has had it's moments and good has come from it. I think Jordana has proven to be a real asset to this City. Even when I disagree with her position I find her to be professional and objective. Unfortunately she is the only one and unfortunately for the citizens of San Francisco, she as Executive Director doesn't have a vote. I hope she will be with the Taxi Industry for a long time because she brings integrity to the table (it's such a lonely table).

The Commissioners have once again embarrassed themselves. This time by allowing the meeting to devolve into a personal bullying session against one individual, Mark Gruberg. The TC has been blinded by it's own personal agenda and fails to recognize that Green Cab is not Mark, it is not the UTW, it is in fact what the law states that it is, a legitimate California LLC with real people doing a really good job. The lack of professionalism that you have once again demonstrated has left me with a very bad taste in my mouth. I am especially disappointed in my former neighbor Paul Gillespie. You are the President of the TC. It is your duty to maintain a level of professionalism. The City Attorney says that the move would have made Green Cab compliant. That was the agenda item and Commissioners' own personal feelings are not to be voted on. Especially "invisible" ones! Paul, I liked you as a person but the direction in which you are moving is not flattering you.

Next month there are nine medallions moving from Metro Cab to Yellow Cab. Is anyone on the TC going to ask why? What does the deal that Yellow Cab made with Mildred Rancatore, Sandra Palazzi and Antoinette Dell'Aqua look like? I think it is suspicious that so
many medallions are suddenly moving from Metro, especially ones that have been there for so long. What is Mildred’s motivation. Shouldn’t you ask to see her agreement with Yellow? What about Yellow’s ties to the notorious and now defunct Union Cab company? Yellow has a questionable background and notorious policies of corruption. Drivers must tip in order to work. Should they be controlling more medallions? Why aren’t these moves called into question? Is this another controversial scheme involving Yellow? Will these medallions go into gas guzzling Crown Vics? Will they be long term leases? What "invisible fourth layers" exist at Yellow Cab? Metro Cab is with City Wide Dispatch, doesn’t City Wide have a better response rate than Yellow? Will you Paul Gillespie and your Commission ask these questions? What are the TC’s rules? Are they even handed?

I’m clearly am looking forward to working again with all of you,
Athan Rebelos

--

Mr. Athan Rebelos
San Francisco International Airport

May 11, 2008

Christopher Mei

Dear Mr. Mei:

This letter is in reply to your April 17, 2008 letter to the San Francisco Taxicab Commission regarding taxicab operations at San Francisco International Airport. The letter was subsequently forwarded to us for our review.

At this time, I wish to apologize for this late reply to your April 17 letter, as well as your unpleasant experience with the Airport’s taxicab operations on April 15, 2008.

The Airport’s taxicab dispatching system is an integral part of the Airport’s Curbside Management Program operated by our contractor, DAJA International LLC. By copy of this letter to Richard Fehr, DAJA’s General Manager at the Airport, I am requesting that he investigate your April 15, 2008 observations and respond back to you with a copy to me within ten (10) working days as to his findings and steps being taken to prevent repeat incidents.

If you have any additional information that would allow us to investigate the matter and/or improve our taxicab dispatching operations, Mr. Fehr may be contacted at (650) 821-2702 or at rfehr@daiainternational.com. Any other questions or concerns regarding the Airport’s taxicab operations may be directed to Dan Wong, Curbside Management Program Administrator, at (650) 821-6512 or dan.wong@flysfo.com.

Thank you for making San Francisco International Airport your airport of choice. I sincerely hope your next experience through San Francisco International Airport will be more pleasant.

Sincerely,

Henry Thompson
Assistant Deputy Airport Director
Operations Management

CC: Richard Fehr, DAJA International (w/attach)
Jordanna Thigpen, SF Taxicab Commission (w/attach)
San Francisco Taxicab Commission

What's the point of having a line if nobody respects it?

I arrived at SFO International terminal April 15th. I went to the taxi line to wait for a cab. There were ground staff organizing the taxis and hailing larger-capacity cabs if someone needed a van instead of a sedan.

So I'm waiting in line and I turn around to see taxis behind me telling passengers to get in. I took the taxi that a party behind me in line was getting into. I told him to wait his turn. Behind him, there were more cabs stopping to load passengers who WERE NOT AT THE FRONT OF THE LINE. It was anarchy, it was a free-for-all. I repeat the question: what is the point of having a line?

I expected the SFO taxis to be organized but on the one occasion when I needed a cab, the system broke down miserably. It was anarchy out there. If I hadn't hollered at the client behind me to tell him to wait, I would have still had to wait. I give the system a failing mark---an F.

Reaching my final destination is just as important to me as it is to the other passengers, and everyone has to wait.

You Commissioners need to ensure that the word gets out to all cabbies that operate at SFO that there is a system and it works if everyone follows it. Taxis are not to stop at the first passenger in the middle of a line who flags them down. The drivers know that they are supposed to get into the line with the other cabs and wait their turn.

I repeat: it was anarchy out there!

I have waited in line many times for taxis in Paris, Florence, Amsterdam, Rome, and other world-class European cities and their system worked beautifully every time. On the one random time that I tried to take a cab from San Francisco International Airport, the system broke down. Your system is in need of major improvement.

I don't know if the impatient passengers are to blame or the impatient drivers.

In short, there was barely any order out there. The cabbies need to control themselves and follow the on-site dispatcher's instructions, wait in line and not be tempted to pick up the first passenger who hails them.

Christopher Mel
San Francisco
4/17/08
May 15, 2008

M.T.A.
One South Van Ness, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA. 94103

Re: Revised 2-Way Radio Replacement Recommendation.

Dear Mr. Heinicke:

In an earlier letter I had advised that the replacement radio for cab companies using UHF frequency radios should be the Motorola CDM model. I am writing to correct that earlier recommendation. It is not just UHF radios that should be replaced. Any radio that does not have a factory installed computer cable port on the back should be replaced. Any radio that does not have a volume control knob rather than a volume rocker switch should be replaced. Any radio that is not thoroughly sealed against liquid spills should be replaced. The recommended replacement radio is the Motorola CM300 model. And here's why.

1. The CDM model is a ten year old design. The CM model is only a five year old design, and hence, technologically superior.

2. The CM300 is equally well sealed against liquid spills.

3. The CM300 is available in VHF frequency. It should be ordered with a 45 watt output.

4. It has in excess of four channels (the minimum acceptable number of channels).

5. It has an eight character alphanumeric display (necessary idiot-proofing for cab drivers).

6. It is "plug & play" ready for connecting to MDT's.

7. It is $100, less expensive than the CDM750 model. If purchased in bulk (500 or 1,000 units), it would probably cost around $350.

8. It is half the size of the CDM model (critically important for taxicabs).

Sincerely,

Wesley Hollis

cc.: Bruce Oka
Jordana Thigpen
Taxi Commissioners
To Whom It May Concern:

I received a parking ticket on March 20, 2008 for “parking in a bus zone” which I believe was unwarranted and incorrect under the circumstances. I want to present my side of the story here. I drive a taxi on weekdays for DeSoto Cab Company, and it was in the course of my duties as a taxi driver that I received this ticket.

I had just picked up a passenger who had flagged me at Montgomery and Broadway, requesting that I take him to Geary and Kearny - about eleven blocks. He apologized for the “short ride” he wanted, and indicated that he “couldn’t walk” the eleven blocks, which I took to mean that he might be disabled in some way.

I approached the intersection from Market St, at which time my passenger indicated that he wished to exit before the building at 2 Geary. On Geary St from the corner of Kearny, is a bus stop that runs for about 30 or so yards, which I where I received the ticket. I noted that there was construction equipment blocking access to the sidewalk on the south side of Geary, so it would have been hazardous to release him there. I would have had to double park for the passenger to exit if I had gone beyond the bus zone, thus obstructing traffic - something I'm always extremely reluctant to do, even though it's a common practice for taxi drivers in San Francisco. I therefore chose to release my passenger in the bus zone, in front of his desired destination.

In the meantime, a police car was pulling over another motorist, who appeared to have come from 3rd St, and who pulled just in front of the self same bus zone with the police car behind him. The police car had its flashing lights on, as well as either its siren or some similar amplified warning sounds. This caused both myself and my passenger to pause in our transaction in an attempt to determine what was happening and whether we were in danger, or should move. Seconds after those two cars pulled in front of us, a bus, which had come from Market St (a 38 Geary I believe) pulled in front of the bus zone to my immediate left; thus preventing me from pulling away from the curb, even though my passenger had completed his exit from my cab in the meantime. I should mention that I checked for buses behind me when I pulled up, but one can only see the buses already at Geary from there, and not one coming from Market St. In addition, the driver of the bus never gave me an opportunity to leave, and didn't honk to signal his/her presence, but just pulled straight in front of me, thereby creating the most unpleasant situation possible under the circumstances. I believe it weren't for the police action and its resulting confusion, (and a rather slow acting passenger) or if the bus driver had given me any opportunity at all to leave, there would have been no problem at all.

It is my understanding that taxicabs are permitted to use bus zones to load or unload passengers so long as they don’t abuse the privilege. I was not “parked” in the bus zone all at, but was unloading a passenger. There was no other acceptable location (that I could see) to unload this passenger within a reasonable distance of his desired destination. I've never made it a habit to stop in bus zones, but now that I've received this ticket, I never stop in bus zones at all, which has left a lot would-be passengers wondering why it is that I refuse to stop and pick them up. The $250 for the ticket represents my earnings for about 3 entire days of driving at that time. If this was enforced consistently, I wouldn't be so concerned, but I see more egregious examples of the same “violation” every day (particularly at the Caltrain station where nearly every cab coming from 4th St drops its passengers in a bus zone). I've never seen a taxi driver get a ticket for this even though it appears identical to my violation, so I wonder if this law enforced the in the same way for everyone.

Sincerely,

James Powers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLATION NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VIOLATION FINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On Crosswalk</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In Front of Driveway</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On Sidewalk</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Double Parking</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In Bus Lane</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parked Within 10 Feet of Curb</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTICE OF PARKING VIOLATION**

**PD 17518756**

**DATE:** 3/20/08  **TIME CHECKED:** 09:40  **TIME ISSUED:** 09:40

**MADE BY:** CHRI  **LOCATION (APPROX.) OF VIOLATION:** 2 BEAD.

**NOTE:** FAILURE TO PAY PARKING FINES MAY SUBJECT MOTOR VEHICLE TO SEIZURE (CVC22651)(A)

**LICENSE NUMBER:** G6U2  **COLOR:** Blue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER'S SIGNATURE</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DO NOT MAIL CASH**

**SEE INSTRUCTIONS**
Hi,

I am writing about the Taxi Wrap Fund which I understand will be voted on shortly. It would be very nice if a small portion of the fund could be set aside for grants for artists/drivers and artists working in the taxi/cab industry.

Thank you.
April 5, 2008

San Francisco Taxicab Commission
Jordanna Thigpen, Acting Executive Director
25 Van Ness Avenue – Suite 420
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Poor Cab Service

Dear Ms. Thigpen,

The taxi industry has always had a problem with service to the public and will continue to remain a problem until the Taxicab Commission uses its power to remedy it.

The reason for all the delays in the city for service is simply that the cab drivers, in the morning, are sitting at a hotel stand or have dead headed to the airport for that long ride – dream ride. During the heart of the day or rush hour, there are drivers that only play the airport regardless of how busy it is in the city. This type of driver doesn’t deserve a Medallion of his own. The majority of these drivers are already Medallion owners or lazy cab drivers. They spend their time playing cards, chess, eating or sleeping in their cab between fares.

These Medallions are out there for the public need and because of this situation they are not getting service. The number of Medallions should be determined by another method.

So, what’s the answer?

The answer is simply a whole new system of allowing cabs to be at the airport which are mandated by the Taxicab Commission.
There was a time, until the 1970's, when there were 'airport cabs' and 'city cabs.' There were cabs that only operated out of the airport or only operated in the city. The 'airport cab' would bring someone into the city and then return to the airport without doing business in San Francisco. 'City cabs' operated within city limits, primarily, could also take people to the airport, drop them off and had to leave empty.

That system worked well for many years.

I believe that service to the public would be better achieved if an allotment of cabs were on a rotating basis; 'airport cabs' or 'city cabs.' This should be scheduled on a weekly rotating basis – one week only to work the airport or only a week in the city. This would end the problem of who would only work one or the other but not both.

Taxicab stands should only have no more than four cabs at a time in them, because if there are too many cabs there, someone somewhere is going without service.

All cabs should operate with a centralized computer dispatch. Therefore, eliminating favoritism at the dispatch office and making for better service. This also makes for a safer driver, no more need for racing to an order or competing for an order.

As a taxicab driver, I always thought that the industry has been unfair to the non-owner driver and to the public for not curing this problem.

I can make myself available to the commission to meet in private to discuss this matter, completely with all the details.

Sincerely,

Robert Tapia

CC: Mayor Gavin Newsom
   City Hall, Room 200
   1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
   San Francisco, CA 94102