

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Emilia De Marchis <emiliademarchis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:36 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS);
info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov;
ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064,
23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Emilia De Marchis

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alex Avery <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:37 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Alex Avery
alex.flinn.avery@gmail.com
1825, 44th Ave.
San Francisco, California 94122

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Emma Shlaes <emmashlaes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:42 AM
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; BoardofAppeals (PAB); Stokle, Brian (REC); ChanStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,
Emma Shlaes
Dogpatch resident
Mom of infant who enjoys walks on the Great Highway!

Emma Shlaes
emmashlaes@gmail.com

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mary Franz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:42 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mary Franz
My email address is me2franz@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mary Franz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gregory Robin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:48 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Gregory Robin
My email address is gnrobin@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gregory Robin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Misti Reif <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Misti Reif
My email address is misti@mistilayne.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Misti Reif



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: J X <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:00 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is J X
My email address is **happyjx1@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
J X



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stephanie Cline <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:04 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Stephanie Cline
scoffaney@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nadya Mikhaylovskaya <nnm32@cornell.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:08 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

I am one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park and enjoy the beautiful beach and ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Nadya Mikhaylovskaya
nnm32@cornell.edu

San Francisco, California 94117

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Allison Gans <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:19 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Allison Gans
alliefink@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kim Russo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:14 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kim Russo
My email address is Ckar101@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kim Russo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chit Kwong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:23 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Chit Kwong**
My email address is **chitkwong@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Chit Kwong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: William Toth <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:31 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **William Toth**
My email address is **billgtoth@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
William Toth



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nora Murphy <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:30 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nora Murphy
My email address is noramurphy@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nora Murphy



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Saw Lim-Skain <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:35 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Saw Lim-Skain
My email address is sawlim@att.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Saw Lim-Skain



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Vivian Lem <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:40 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Vivian Lem**
My email address is **vlem218@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Vivian Lem



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Boris Shkurko <borisshkurko@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:50 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: lynn austin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is lynn austin
My email address is laustin395@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
lynn austin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Beth Fox <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Beth Fox**
My email address is **ehfox1013@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged, erratic, and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Beth Fox



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Joe Schoepp <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Joe Schoepp
My email address is crownlock@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Joe Schoepp



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: William McDonnell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **William McDonnell**
My email address is **billmcdonnell22@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
William McDonnell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: William Isham <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **William Isham**
My email address is **ishwish00@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
William Isham



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: victoire reynal <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is victoire reynal
My email address is victoirereynal@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
victoire reynal



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Terrence Sullivan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Terrence Sullivan**
My email address is **tjasullivan46@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Terrence Sullivan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marc Brenman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Marc Brenman**
My email address is **mbrenman001@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marc Brenman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ruth Dummel <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: 1 Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ruth Dummel
My email address is rdthesecond@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ruth Dummel



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Amy Nachman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Amy Nachman**
My email address is **stretchmccovey@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Amy Nachman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Joseph Whitney <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Joseph Whitney
My email address is jscottwhitney@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Joseph Whitney



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Randal Bowers <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Randal Bowers
My email address is handsomehippie@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Randal Bowers



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sharon Yasukawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sharon Yasukawa**
My email address is **hugweevil@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sharon Yasukawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: T Moore <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **T Moore**
My email address is **tad3@me.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
T Moore



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jonathan Fong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jonathan Fong**
My email address is **jqfong@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Fong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Burton Siu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Burton Siu**
My email address is **burtons@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Burton Siu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Miko Maru <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Miko Maru**

My email address is **ellen.maruoka@astellas.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Miko Maru



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Martha Angove <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:41 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Martha Angove
My email address is martha_angove@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Martha Angove



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Barry Reder <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Barry Reder**
My email address is **unclbar@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Barry Reder



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Devorah Joseph <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Devorah Joseph**
My email address is **drdevisf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Devorah Joseph



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shelly Schaenen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Shelly Schaenen**
My email address is **sschaenen@earthlink.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shelly Schaenen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Wendy Anderson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Wendy Anderson
My email address is wendy.anderson831@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Wendy Anderson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: JeNeal Granieri <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is JeNeal Granieri
My email address is jenealann@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

*****I am a long time San Francisco resident and I have been totally opposed to closing the Great Highway. ***There is plenty of room on either side to expand bike and walking lanes if so desired. It is so very selfish of some people to keep all of the rest of us from enjoying the drive along the ocean. What makes bikers and walkers better than others. We need to re-open the Great Highway for all of the reasons below, as well as equity for those who don't bike or can't walk long distances.**

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
JeNeal Granieri



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Melissa Aurand <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Melissa Aurand**
My email address is **melissa.w.aurand@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Melissa Aurand



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Irene Deutsch <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Irene Deutsch
My email address is ideut8@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Irene Deutsch



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lynne Muller <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lynne Muller
My email address is emikisses@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lynne Muller



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Valerie Pinkert <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Valerie Pinkert
My email address is vpinkert@earthlink.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Valerie Pinkert



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jackie Svevo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:41 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jackie Svevo

My email address is jackiesvevo@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jackie Svevo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Lew <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is David Lew
My email address is mze505@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Lew



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: kenneth sarocky <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is kenneth sarocky
My email address is sarocky@mac.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
kenneth sarocky



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Deborah Taylor <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Deborah Taylor**
My email address is **debsuetay@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Deborah Taylor



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marc Pope <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Marc Pope**
My email address is **marcspope@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marc Pope



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mary Harris <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mary Harris**
My email address is **Maryharris_sf@outlook.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mary Harris



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chris Conner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Chris Conner
My email address is connerama@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Chris Conner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marian Heath <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Marian Heath
My email address is mheath539@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marian Heath



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elinor Liberman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elinor Liberman
My email address is ebkljune@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elinor Liberman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elyse Aylward <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elyse Aylward
My email address is elyse.aylward@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elyse Aylward



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jo Ann Shain <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:49 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jo Ann Shain
My email address is jwshain@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jo Ann Shain



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Barbara Styles <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Barbara Styles
My email address is bmstyles36@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Barbara Styles



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Boris Zutner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Boris Zutner

My email address is borzut2010@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Boris Zutner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Beshears <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:49 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Beshears
My email address is jlbeshears@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Beshears



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Julie Ortiz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Julie Ortiz
My email address is amberjul@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Julie Ortiz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charles Lichtman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:55 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Charles Lichtman**
My email address is **sfphoneguy2003@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charles Lichtman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tanya Lin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:56 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Tanya Lin**

My email address is **tanyalin@fastmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tanya Lin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brian Holt <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brian Holt**
My email address is **bah1943@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brian Holt



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rosanne Liggett <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rosanne Liggett**
My email address is **rosanneadana@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rosanne Liggett



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: George Consagra <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is George Consagra
My email address is gconsagra@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
George Consagra



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Madelyn McMillian <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Madelyn McMillian**
My email address is **0926Madelyn@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Madelyn McMillian



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: S garrett <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:56 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **S garrett**
My email address is **shigar16@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
S garrett



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Minsik Pak <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:56 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Minsik Pak**
My email address is **mspak@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Minsik Pak



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Christina Shih <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Christina Shih**
My email address is **cyssf2003@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Christina Shih



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kate English <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kate English
My email address is kenglish1775@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kate English



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Bruce Giannini <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Bruce Giannini
My email address is brucegiannini@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Bruce Giannini



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mimi Kochuba <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mimi Kochuba**
My email address is **mimipi@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mimi Kochuba



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sheena Craig <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Sheena Craig
My email address is scraigsf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sheena Craig



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kevin Martin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kevin Martin
My email address is kevmartin23@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kevin Martin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Matthew Collins <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Matthew Collins**
My email address is **schleppking@gmail.com**

I strongly urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents,

affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Matthew Collins



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shu Ping Kuang <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Shu Ping Kuang
My email address is spkuang92@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shu Ping Kuang



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mady Jones <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mady Jones
My email address is madyjones@me.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mady Jones



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Andrew <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Andrew
My email address is johnandrew@earthlink.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Andrew



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rebecca Tico <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Rebecca Tico
My email address is ticobills@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Tico



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cameo Jones <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Cameo Jones**
My email address is **cameo.jones@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Finally, I oppose all of the closed streets in San Francisco. Unfortunately, I have been going to the Mission for medical treatment. What a mess! My GPS was unusable. Why is the street on the non-Valencia Side of Mission chopped up into closed off blocks. Why is Clay St in Presidio Heights still a slow street? It is hard to watch for pedestrians and bicyclists with so many changes to navigate. A real disaster.

Sincerely,
Cameo Jones



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ken Jones <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ken Jones**
My email address is **kdjones@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ken Jones



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nathanael Tico <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nathanael Tico
My email address is nateotico@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nathanael Tico



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Koe Poon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Koe Poon
My email address is kslpoon@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Koe Poon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Antonai Cohen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Antonai Cohen**
My email address is **antonia_clark@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Antonai Cohen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Linda Maher <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Linda Maher
My email address is czyarrow@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Linda Maher



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brenda Austin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brenda Austin**
My email address is **brendaaustinphd@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brenda Austin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nathaniel Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Nathaniel Lee**
My email address is **nathaniel813@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nathaniel Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: James Gold <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is James Gold
My email address is jamzgold.jg@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
James Gold



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Monika Hunt <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Monika Hunt**
My email address is **huntmonika@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Monika Hunt



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Louis Green <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Louis Green

My email address is louishgreen@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Louis Green



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ira Le <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ira Le**
My email address is **lia4477@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ira Le



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: ken flowers <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is ken flowers

My email address is kennethflowers123@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
ken flowers



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carol Chichester <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Carol Chichester**
My email address is **ccchister@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carol Chichester



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: AnnaMaria Cantwell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is AnnaMaria Cantwell
My email address is am.e.cantwell@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
AnnaMaria Cantwell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Daniel Choi <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Daniel Choi**
My email address is **dchoi712@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Daniel Choi



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alan Gregory <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alan Gregory
My email address is amg2500@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alan Gregory



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Harry Hunt <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Harry Hunt**
My email address is **huntharry@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Harry Hunt



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sarah Bacon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sarah Bacon**
My email address is **sbacon1999@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sarah Bacon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tom Escher <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Tom Escher
My email address is tomescher@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tom Escher



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rebecca Schweitzer <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rebecca Schweitzer**
My email address is **rebeccamschweitzer@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Schweitzer



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charlene Karma <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Charlene Karma
My email address is charrawrz@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charlene Karma



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Whitney Gough <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Whitney Gough**
My email address is **whitneymgough@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Whitney Gough



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Fred Molfino <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Fred Molfino
My email address is molfinojr@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Fred Molfino



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Margot Beall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Margot Beall

My email address is margotbeall@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Margot Beall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Boris Levine <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Boris Levine
My email address is borlev@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Boris Levine



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeff Holland <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jeff Holland
My email address is imfeff@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeff Holland



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Patrick Ryan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Patrick Ryan**
My email address is **pgryan209@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Patrick Ryan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeff Karras <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jeff Karras**
My email address is **jeffkarras@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeff Karras



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: brenda austin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **brenda austin**
My email address is **baaustin2003@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Please consider upgrading the existing bike path to the east of the Upper Great Highway. It could be made a very attractive place for both walkers and cyclists.

I would also suggest that recreational opportunities abound to the west of the Great Highway in the form of our beautiful Ocean Beach. I offer this as closing a main artery for people living in the western half of this city, does not need to occur in order to provide another area to recreate.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
brenda austin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ken Mendonca <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ken Mendonca
My email address is kenmendonca@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ken Mendonca



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: JJ Hagan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:23 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is JJ Hagan

My email address is jh88mailbox@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Misappropriation of a public good: this road was and is paid for by the tax dollars of ***all residents*** and is for the use of ***everyone.*** The fact that a privileged minority of users, who already have unencumbered access to a bike lane in each direction, and a double-wide pedestrian path on each side, can somehow gate this asset for their own use and bar others from accessing it for its intended use is inexcusable and appalling.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
JJ Hagan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Andrew Churchill <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Andrew Churchill
My email address is andrew2472002@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Andrew Churchill



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Patrice Thompson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Patrice Thompson**
My email address is **patrica_inez@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

In addition, before the election the wrong information about the pipe that comes out at the end near the sewage plant was given in pro closure propaganda. It was completely false. I know this because I know the engineers from the city who were project engineers there.

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elizabeth Burns <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:18 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Elizabeth Burns**
My email address is **eab2222@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Burns



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Judy Wade <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:22 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Judy Wade
My email address is judywadesf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Judy Wade



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: DENNIS Holl <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:21 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is DENNIS Holl
My email address is denholl52@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
DENNIS HOLL



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gerald Schall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gerald Schall**
My email address is **glschall@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gerald Schall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marlen Bekirov <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Marlen Bekirov**
My email address is **uztash@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marlen Bekirov



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ella Leong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ella Leong
My email address is sfstock51@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ella Leong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gretel Perez <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gretel Perez**
My email address is **breadcrumtrail@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gretel Perez



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Galina Rafalovich <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Galina Rafalovich**
My email address is **rafalov@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Galina Rafalovich



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jimmy Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jimmy Ng
My email address is tiredepot@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jimmy Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Linda Bork <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Linda Bork**
My email address is **lkbork1215@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Linda Bork



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Angela Tickler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Angela Tickler
My email address is angela.tickler@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Angela Tickler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Anthony Jasinski <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Anthony Jasinski**
My email address is **tonyjazzz@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Anthony Jasinski



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rebecca Ward <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rebecca Ward**
My email address is **rbccwrd@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Ward



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Clyde Nichol <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Clyde Nichol**
My email address is **holzregal@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Clyde Nichol



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cynthia Cawthon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Cynthia Cawthon**
My email address is **cawthon.cynthia.b@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Cawthon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Simone Miller <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Simone Miller**
My email address is **zenbellysf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Simone Miller



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Bass <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David Bass**
My email address is **davidbasssf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Bass



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nancy Keane <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nancy Keane
My email address is nkeane17@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nancy Keane



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rosemary Newton <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Rosemary Newton
My email address is rosenewton@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Newton



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jackie Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jackie Lee
My email address is blackbin@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jackie Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lorri Ungaretti <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Lorri Ungaretti**
My email address is **lorrisf@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lorri Ungaretti



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stephanie Holbrook <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Stephanie Holbrook**
My email address is **fifiholbrook@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Holbrook



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ignacio Orellana-Garcia <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ignacio Orellana-Garcia
My email address is Volare232@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ignacio Orellana-Garcia



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Edmund Wattis <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Edmund Wattis**
My email address is **eddywattis@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Edmund Wattis



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ann Kutner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ann Kutner**
My email address is **annkutner@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ann Kutner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Julia Lavroushin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Julia Lavroushin
My email address is jlavroushin@gmail.com

Hello!

Please overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This experiment needs to end:

It has created gridlock along north-south roads affecting all of SF. Cars will not go away. They are essential for transporting children, elders and the disabled.

It has increased intolerance and rage across SF in all districts frustrated with the delays/closing.

It has adversely affected the next generation by not making it possible to make it on time for after school enrichment programs that are located across SF. Your job is to support stronger and culturally diverse youth not shackle them only to the programs offered by their school.

It will sign the death certificate for any SF residents (your districts) who need to cross town in an emergency. There can be a fire. There will be an earthquake. It is not a question of if, but when. The Great Highway needs to be a workable exit out of SF. No one is going to bike out at that time.

It has been a bad fiscal decision as it has removed a route for those in neighboring counties wanting to spend money in SF. Who wants to deal with 19th Avenue?

Please think ahead and not about what is right in front of you.

Are you prioritizing cyclists /walkers desiring an outdoor play area vs getting Richmond/Sunset areas residents out when a disaster strikes?

Are you considering the ramifications of proposed higher density housing on 19th Avenue and how that will impact everyone without an alternate route along the Great Highway?

Keep the Great Highway open. Coexistence is possible. This experiment is a failure. Safety is a priority and moving around SF should not be so onerous. Cars are necessary. Perhaps poll all of those trying to implement policy. Did they drive here from across the bridge? Do they pick up their multiple children from aftercare on a bicycle? Do SFMTA staff and Rec/Park all walk to their jobs? Working from home on zoom does not count.

Facts do not lie. It is those who try to skew them that do. Please look at the reality and see that opening and sustaining the Great Highway benefits more San Franciscans.

It is the right thing to do.

Respectfully,

Julia Lavroushin 94118

Sincerely,
Julia Lavroushin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shiva Subramaniam <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Shiva Subramaniam**
My email address is **shivsubu@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shiva Subramaniam



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charles Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Charles Lee

My email address is charleslee1119@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charles Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kelly Kitagawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kelly Kitagawa
My email address is klkitagawa@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kelly Kitagawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Em Chiu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Em Chiu**

My email address is **secrets-piebald-0r@icloud.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Em Chiu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Ng
My email address is JohnNgSF@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Suzanne Schimaneck <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Suzanne Schimaneck
My email address is s.mce.schim@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Schimaneck



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: PAT GRAY <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **PAT GRAY**
My email address is **pat.gray8@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
PAT GRAY



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Dorf <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Michael Dorf
My email address is michael_dorf@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Dorf



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jann Jeung <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jann Jeung
My email address is jncao@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jann Jeung



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carol Chichester <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Carol Chichester**
My email address is **ccchichester@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carol Chichester



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elias Degu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elias Degu

My email address is ed1029@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elias Degu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Henry Kwan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Henry Kwan
My email address is hkewnarny@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Henry Kwan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carolyn Hee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Carolyn Hee

My email address is CarolynHee@Gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Hee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Debra Harrison <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Debra Harrison**
My email address is **debraharrison1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Debra Harrison



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Josephine McGann <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Josephine McGann
My email address is josiemcgann@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Josephine McGann



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elina Belotserkovskaya <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elina Belotserkovskaya
My email address is elinabel@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elina Belotserkovskaya



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brian Chinn <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brian Chinn**
My email address is **cowbayc@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brian Chinn



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Cresci <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Karen Cresci
My email address is klcresci@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As a resident, I have seen the impact of the long term and now temporary closures first hand, and our neighborhoods are more dangerous due to increased street traffic on residential streets. There are paths on either side of the Great Highway. Please maintain them and there will be plenty if recreational space.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation.

SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an

initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Cresci



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Maria Dominick <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Maria Dominick
My email address is bebeldominick@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Maria Dominick



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeannie Pon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jeannie Pon

My email address is jeanniepon2002@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeannie Pon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: judith waitz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **judith waitz**
My email address is **judewaitz@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
judith waitz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Scott Ashkenaz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Scott Ashkenaz**
My email address is **smashkenaz@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Scott Ashkenaz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alan Yuan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alan Yuan

My email address is pingli28@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alan Yuan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alex Hartigan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Alex Hartigan**

My email address is **alexhartigan@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alex Hartigan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Della Dobranski <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Della Dobranski**
My email address is **ddobranski@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.


Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Della Dobranski



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Georgina Costales <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Georgina Costales
My email address is gcostales@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Georgina Costales



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Judy Hollingsworth <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Judy Hollingsworth
My email address is fortehouse1498@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Judy Hollingsworth



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jerald Lowe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jerald Lowe

My email address is jeraldlowe88@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jerald Lowe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Susan Flynn-Lopez <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Susan Flynn-Lopez
My email address is zuzuflylo@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Susan Flynn-Lopez



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Don Climent <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:17 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Don Climent**

My email address is **donc4496@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Don Climent



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Astrid Crabbe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Astrid Crabbe
My email address is heyastrid@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Astrid Crabbe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Susan Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Susan Wong**
My email address is **saikowong@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Susan Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Christins Pappas <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Christins Pappas
My email address is scoutca66@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Christins Pappas



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tessa Sapiro <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Tessa Sapiro**
My email address is **hiatal-curly-0h@icloud.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tessa Sapiro



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kathy Crabe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:22 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kathy Crabe

My email address is tallyhoagogo@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kathy Crabe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rachel Geiger <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rachel Geiger**
My email address is **cutehawaiiangrl@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rachel Geiger



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeff Frankenfield <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jeff Frankenfield

My email address is jeff@jfkconstruction.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeff Frankenfield



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Deborah Thompson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:21 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Deborah Thompson**
My email address is **debtz@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As a disabled senior, I dislike having more and more public areas taken away from me!

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding

neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Deborah Thompson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marc Larby <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Marc Larby

My email address is marc.larby@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marc Larby



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nathanael Tico <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nathanael Tico
My email address is nateotico@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nathanael Tico



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Koe Poon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Koe Poon

My email address is kslpoon@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Koe Poon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Antonai Cohen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Antonai Cohen**
My email address is **antonia_clark@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Antonai Cohen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Linda Maher <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Linda Maher
My email address is czyarrow@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Linda Maher



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brenda Austin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brenda Austin**
My email address is **brendaaustinphd@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brenda Austin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nathaniel Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Nathaniel Lee**
My email address is **nathaniel813@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nathaniel Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: James Gold <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is James Gold
My email address is jamzgold.jg@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
James Gold



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Monika Hunt <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Monika Hunt**
My email address is **huntmonika@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Monika Hunt



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Louis Green <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Louis Green

My email address is louishgreen@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Louis Green



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ira Le <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ira Le**
My email address is **lia4477@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ira Le



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: ken flowers <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is ken flowers

My email address is kennethflowers123@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
ken flowers



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carol Chichester <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Carol Chichester**
My email address is **ccchister@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carol Chichester



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: AnnaMaria Cantwell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is AnnaMaria Cantwell
My email address is am.e.cantwell@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
AnnaMaria Cantwell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Daniel Choi <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Daniel Choi**
My email address is **dchoi712@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Daniel Choi



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alan Gregory <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alan Gregory
My email address is amg2500@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alan Gregory



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Harry Hunt <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Harry Hunt**
My email address is **huntharry@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Harry Hunt



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sarah Bacon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sarah Bacon**
My email address is **sbacon1999@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sarah Bacon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tom Escher <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Tom Escher
My email address is tomescher@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tom Escher



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rebecca Schweitzer <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rebecca Schweitzer**
My email address is **rebeccamschweitzer@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Schweitzer



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charlene Karma <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Charlene Karma
My email address is charrawrz@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charlene Karma



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Whitney Gough <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Whitney Gough**
My email address is **whitneymgough@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Whitney Gough



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Fred Molfino <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Fred Molfino
My email address is molfinojr@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Fred Molfino



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Margot Beall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Margot Beall

My email address is margotbeall@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Margot Beall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Boris Levine <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Boris Levine
My email address is borlev@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Boris Levine



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeff Holland <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jeff Holland
My email address is imfeff@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeff Holland



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Patrick Ryan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Patrick Ryan**
My email address is **pgryan209@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Patrick Ryan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeff Karras <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jeff Karras**
My email address is **jeffkarras@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeff Karras



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: brenda austin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **brenda austin**
My email address is **baaustin2003@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Please consider upgrading the existing bike path to the east of the Upper Great Highway. It could be made a very attractive place for both walkers and cyclists.

I would also suggest that recreational opportunities abound to the west of the Great Highway in the form of our beautiful Ocean Beach. I offer this as closing a main artery for people living in the western half of this city, does not need to occur in order to provide another area to recreate.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
brenda austin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ken Mendonca <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ken Mendonca
My email address is kenmendonca@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ken Mendonca



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: JJ Hagan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:23 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is JJ Hagan

My email address is jh88mailbox@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Misappropriation of a public good: this road was and is paid for by the tax dollars of ***all residents*** and is for the use of ***everyone.*** The fact that a privileged minority of users, who already have unencumbered access to a bike lane in each direction, and a double-wide pedestrian path on each side, can somehow gate this asset for their own use and bar others from accessing it for its intended use is inexcusable and appalling.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
JJ Hagan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Andrew Churchill <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Andrew Churchill
My email address is andrew2472002@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Andrew Churchill



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Patrice Thompson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Patrice Thompson**
My email address is **patrica_inez@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

In addition, before the election the wrong information about the pipe that comes out at the end near the sewage plant was given in pro closure propaganda. It was completely false. I know this because I know the engineers from the city who were project engineers there.

Sincerely,
Patrice Thompson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elizabeth Burns <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:18 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Elizabeth Burns**
My email address is **eab2222@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Burns



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Judy Wade <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:22 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Judy Wade
My email address is judywadesf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Judy Wade



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: DENNIS Holl <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:21 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is DENNIS Holl
My email address is denholl52@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
DENNIS HOLL



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gerald Schall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gerald Schall**
My email address is **glschall@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gerald Schall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marlen Bekirov <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Marlen Bekirov**
My email address is **uztash@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marlen Bekirov



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ella Leong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ella Leong
My email address is sfstock51@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ella Leong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gretel Perez <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gretel Perez**
My email address is **breadcrumtrail@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gretel Perez



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Galina Rafalovich <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Galina Rafalovich**
My email address is **rafalov@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Galina Rafalovich



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jimmy Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jimmy Ng
My email address is tiredepot@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jimmy Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Linda Bork <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Linda Bork**
My email address is **lkbork1215@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Linda Bork



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Angela Tickler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Angela Tickler
My email address is angela.tickler@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Angela Tickler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Anthony Jasinski <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Anthony Jasinski**
My email address is **tonyjazzz@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Anthony Jasinski



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rebecca Ward <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rebecca Ward**
My email address is **rbccwrd@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Ward



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Clyde Nichol <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Clyde Nichol**
My email address is **holzregal@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Clyde Nichol



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cynthia Cawthon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Cynthia Cawthon**
My email address is **cawthon.cynthia.b@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Cawthon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Simone Miller <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Simone Miller**
My email address is **zenbellysf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Simone Miller



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Bass <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David Bass**
My email address is **davidbasssf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Bass



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nancy Keane <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nancy Keane
My email address is nkeane17@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nancy Keane



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rosemary Newton <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Rosemary Newton
My email address is rosenewton@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Newton



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jackie Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jackie Lee
My email address is blackbin@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jackie Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lorri Ungaretti <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lorri Ungaretti
My email address is lorrisf@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lorri Ungaretti



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stephanie Holbrook <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Stephanie Holbrook
My email address is fifiholbrook@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Holbrook



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ignacio Orellana-Garcia <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ignacio Orellana-Garcia
My email address is Volare232@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ignacio Orellana-Garcia



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Edmund Wattis <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Edmund Wattis**
My email address is **eddywattis@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Edmund Wattis



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ann Kutner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ann Kutner**
My email address is **annkutner@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ann Kutner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Julia Lavroushin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Julia Lavroushin
My email address is jlavroushin@gmail.com

Hello!

Please overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This experiment needs to end:

It has created gridlock along north-south roads affecting all of SF. Cars will not go away. They are essential for transporting children, elders and the disabled.

It has increased intolerance and rage across SF in all districts frustrated with the delays/closing.

It has adversely affected the next generation by not making it possible to make it on time for after school enrichment programs that are located across SF. Your job is to support stronger and culturally diverse youth not shackle them only to the programs offered by their school.

It will sign the death certificate for any SF residents (your districts) who need to cross town in an emergency. There can be a fire. There will be an earthquake. It is not a question of if, but when. The Great Highway needs to be a workable exit out of SF. No one is going to bike out at that time.

It has been a bad fiscal decision as it has removed a route for those in neighboring counties wanting to spend money in SF. Who wants to deal with 19th Avenue?

Please think ahead and not about what is right in front of you.

Are you prioritizing cyclists /walkers desiring an outdoor play area vs getting Richmond/Sunset areas residents out when a disaster strikes?

Are you considering the ramifications of proposed higher density housing on 19th Avenue and how that will impact everyone without an alternate route along the Great Highway?

Keep the Great Highway open. Coexistence is possible. This experiment is a failure. Safety is a priority and moving around SF should not be so onerous. Cars are necessary. Perhaps poll all of those trying to implement policy. Did they drive here from across the bridge? Do they pick up their multiple children from aftercare on a bicycle? Do SFMTA staff and Rec/Park all walk to their jobs? Working from home on zoom does not count.

Facts do not lie. It is those who try to skew them that do. Please look at the reality and see that opening and sustaining the Great Highway benefits more San Franciscans.

It is the right thing to do.

Respectfully,

Julia Lavroushin 94118

Sincerely,
Julia Lavroushin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shiva Subramaniam <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Shiva Subramaniam**
My email address is **shivsubu@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shiva Subramaniam



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charles Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Charles Lee

My email address is charleslee1119@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charles Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kelly Kitagawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kelly Kitagawa
My email address is klkitagawa@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kelly Kitagawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Em Chiu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Em Chiu**

My email address is **secrets-piebald-0r@icloud.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Em Chiu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Ng
My email address is JohnNgSF@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Suzanne Schimaneck <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Suzanne Schimaneck
My email address is s.mce.schim@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Schimaneck



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: PAT GRAY <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **PAT GRAY**
My email address is **pat.gray8@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
PAT GRAY



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Dorf <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Michael Dorf
My email address is michael_dorf@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Dorf



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jann Jeung <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jann Jeung
My email address is jncao@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jann Jeung



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carol Chichester <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Carol Chichester**
My email address is **ccchichester@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carol Chichester



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elias Degu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elias Degu

My email address is ed1029@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elias Degu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Henry Kwan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Henry Kwan
My email address is hkewnarny@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Henry Kwan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carolyn Hee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Carolyn Hee
My email address is CarolynHee@Gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Hee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Debra Harrison <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Debra Harrison**
My email address is **debraharrison1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Debra Harrison



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Josephine McGann <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Josephine McGann
My email address is josiemcgann@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Josephine McGann



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elina Belotserkovskaya <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 5:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elina Belotserkovskaya
My email address is elinabel@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elina Belotserkovskaya



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brian Chinn <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brian Chinn**
My email address is **cowbayc@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brian Chinn



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Cresci <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Karen Cresci
My email address is klcresci@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As a resident, I have seen the impact of the long term and now temporary closures first hand, and our neighborhoods are more dangerous due to increased street traffic on residential streets. There are paths on either side of the Great Highway. Please maintain them and there will be plenty if recreational space.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation.

SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an

initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Cresci



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Maria Dominick <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Maria Dominick
My email address is bebeldominick@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Maria Dominick



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeannie Pon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jeannie Pon

My email address is jeanniepon2002@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeannie Pon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: judith waitz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **judith waitz**
My email address is **judewaitz@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
judith waitz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Scott Ashkenaz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Scott Ashkenaz**
My email address is **smashkenaz@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Scott Ashkenaz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alan Yuan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alan Yuan

My email address is pingli28@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alan Yuan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alex Hartigan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Alex Hartigan**
My email address is **alexhartigan@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alex Hartigan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Della Dobranski <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Della Dobranski**
My email address is **ddobranski@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.


Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Della Dobranski



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Georgina Costales <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Georgina Costales
My email address is gcostales@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Georgina Costales



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Judy Hollingsworth <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Judy Hollingsworth
My email address is fortehouse1498@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Judy Hollingsworth



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jerald Lowe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jerald Lowe

My email address is jeraldlowe88@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jerald Lowe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Susan Flynn-Lopez <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Susan Flynn-Lopez
My email address is zuzuflylo@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Susan Flynn-Lopez



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Don Climent <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:17 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Don Climent**
My email address is **donc4496@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Don Climent



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Astrid Crabbe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Astrid Crabbe
My email address is heyastrid@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Astrid Crabbe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Susan Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Susan Wong**
My email address is **saikowong@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Susan Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Christins Pappas <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Christins Pappas
My email address is scoutca66@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Christins Pappas



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tessa Sapiro <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Tessa Sapiro**
My email address is **hiatal-curly-0h@icloud.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tessa Sapiro



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kathy Crabe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:22 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kathy Crabe
My email address is tallyhoagogo@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kathy Crabe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rachel Geiger <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rachel Geiger**
My email address is **cutehawaiiangrl@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rachel Geiger



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeff Frankenfield <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jeff Frankenfield

My email address is jeff@jfkconstruction.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeff Frankenfield



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Deborah Thompson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:21 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Deborah Thompson**
My email address is **debtz@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As a disabled senior, I dislike having more and more public areas taken away from me!

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding

neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Deborah Thompson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marc Larby <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Marc Larby

My email address is marc.larby@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marc Larby



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Eddy Sapiro <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Eddy Sapiro

My email address is eddysapiro@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Eddy Sapiro



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Robert Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Robert Wong
My email address is rawff@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Robert Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cole Sapiro <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Cole Sapiro

My email address is riptidelax31@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Cole Sapiro



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Leanne Young <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Leanne Young
My email address is leanney280@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity. Currently, commutes resulted in increased travel time on Chain of Lakes and Sunset Blvd to Sloat Blvd, Junipero Serra Blvd and Brotherhood Way.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Consideration should be given to all diverse populations who utilize the Great Highway, not just the elite few who don't work and frequent the area. Most of the nearby residents want it reopened because it affects their quality of life.

Sincerely,
Leanne Young



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Joan Broner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:41 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Joan Broner
My email address is jmbronner@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Joan Broner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Allison Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Allison Wong**
My email address is **allison.r.wong@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Allison Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Delores Lavin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Delores Lavin**
My email address is **deloreslavin@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Delores Lavin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Suzanna Allen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:40 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Suzanna Allen
My email address is suzannasallen@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Suzanna Allen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Anjali Billa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:44 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Anjali Billa

My email address is anjalibilla@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Anjali Billa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lisa Harpenau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:49 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lisa Harpenau
My email address is lharpenu@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lisa Harpenau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Janet McGee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Janet McGee**
My email address is **janetmcgee@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Janet McGee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Robert Lim <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:41 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Robert Lim**
My email address is **nellie44444rl@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Robert Lim



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Frania Feldstein <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Frania Feldstein
My email address is fran.feldstein@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Please reopen the Great Highway to vehicular traffic 24/7. Special interest groups should not have the power to shut out the majority of San Franciscans who love driving on the scenic highway along Ocean Beach.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Frانيا Feldstein



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Hue Khuu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:55 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Hue Khuu**
My email address is **hue_khuu@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Hue Khuu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alan Cresci <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Alan Cresci**
My email address is **alan@cresci.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alan Cresci



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cristina Gutterman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 6:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Cristina Gutterman
My email address is cristina.gutterman@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Cristina Gutterman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stephen Kitagawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Stephen Kitagawa**
My email address is **ukester64@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Stephen Kitagawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: boris shevkhod <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **boris shevkhod**
My email address is **bshevkhod@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
boris shevkhod



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Antonia Cohen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Antonia Cohen**
My email address is **antoniahcohen@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Antonia Cohen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Tostanoski <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:16 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **John Tostanoski**
My email address is **sfskee1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Tostanoski



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jessica Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:18 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jessica Wong**
My email address is **JessicaG.Wong@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jessica Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Park <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Park
My email address is josparkcom@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Illogical diversion of traffic into residential Sunset Blvd where there are also more schools! This is the opposite of "kid-safe"!

This public road is left wasted & unusable during weekend nights and in harsh weather that deters bicycle use, while it would be ideal for cars and safer than using Sunset Blvd.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

**Sincerely,
John Park**



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Cohen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Cohen**
My email address is **michael.cohensfo@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Cohen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Andy Herr <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:10 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Andy Herr

My email address is afherr@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Andy Herr



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jasmine Madatian <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jasmine Madatian
My email address is madatian.j@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jasmine Madatian



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: ryan tveidt <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **ryan tveidt**
My email address is **ryantveidt@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
ryan tveidt



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brian Madigam <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:16 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brian Madigam**
My email address is **bmadigan@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brian Madigam



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Greg Tarr <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Greg Tarr**
My email address is **gtarr@crosspacificcapital.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Greg Tarr



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Willoughby <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Michael Willoughby
My email address is mfwilloughby@gmail.com5

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Willoughby



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: George Herrera <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is George Herrera
My email address is gaherrera11@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
George Herrera



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brad McMillan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Brad McMillan
My email address is mcmillan@viselect.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brad McMillan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carmel Passanisi <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Carmel Passanisi**
My email address is **carmel2710@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carmel Passanisi



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Barbara Heffernan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Barbara Heffernan
My email address is barbarajheffernan@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Barbara Heffernan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Beth Kellenberger <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Beth Kellenberger**
My email address is **betho9@me.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Beth Kellenberger



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dan Ake <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Dan Ake**

My email address is **danake550@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Dan Ake



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marylou Medina-Bolus <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Marylou Medina-Bolus
My email address is maloubolus@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marylou Medina-Bolus



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: James Argo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is James Argo

My email address is Jamesargo32@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
James Argo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: DEBRA HOWARD <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:44 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **DEBRA HOWARD**
My email address is **deb127@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
DEBRA HOWARD



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Magee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:56 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Magee
My email address is jmmagee@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Magee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: jennifer Yan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jennifer Yan
My email address is jennifer.yan@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
jennifer Yan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Bradd Haley <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 7:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Bradd Haley**
My email address is **sfmattie@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Bradd Haley



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nikki Yoshikawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Nikki Yoshikawa**
My email address is **nikkiyoshikawa@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nikki Yoshikawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Patricia Henshaw <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Patricia Henshaw**
My email address is **phmanatee@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Patricia Henshaw



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Frank Keane <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Frank Keane
My email address is fktri@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Frank Keane



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charlotte Pope <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Charlotte Pope
My email address is charlotte.w.pope@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charlotte Pope



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ira Schneiderman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ira Schneiderman
My email address is schneido@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ira Schneiderman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Bruce Patriquin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Bruce Patriquin
My email address is creamtallu@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Bruce Patriquin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: glenda hope <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **glenda hope**
My email address is **sfnm@pacbell.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
glenda hope



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alex Lim <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:18 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Alex Lim**

My email address is **mr_mpoe@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alex Lim



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Darryl Woo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Darryl Woo
My email address is ddddah@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Darryl Woo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: James Mazza <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is James Mazza
My email address is jmazza@gmail.com

I live on 48th Ave can attest to the traffic complications and safety issues that have arisen from this poorly planned "park." I have 2 small children and feel unsafe on my street (1200 block of 48th Ave) when the Great Hwy is closed to vehicular traffic. I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
James Mazza



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Kollins <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:26 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Kollins
My email address is kollinsacct2@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Kollins



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Robert Fowler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Robert Fowler**
My email address is **r2fowler@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Robert Fowler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Deborah Freitas <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Deborah Freitas**
My email address is **dfreitas@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Deborah Freitas



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Meredyth Masterson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Meredyth Masterson**
My email address is **meredyth.masterson@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

-Meredyth

Sincerely,
Meredyth Masterson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Benson Hua <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Benson Hua**
My email address is **bensonhua@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Benson Hua



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Benjamin Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Benjamin Ng**
My email address is **beng8@me.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Benjamin Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Donna Levin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Donna Levin**
My email address is **DonnaLevinsf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Donna Levin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mike Staiger <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mike Staiger**
My email address is **michael.staiger@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

The great highway closure is causing great harm to the dunes with hordes of people trampling them. The re routing of traffic is creating hazards for children. There is already path the pedestrians and merely taking streets - intended for vehicles - to use to "play" is a obscene waste of tax payer money.

Sincerely,
Mike Staiger



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Anthony Winogrocki <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Anthony Winogrocki**
My email address is **sanfranciscotony@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Anthony Winogrocki



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Craig Hyde <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Craig Hyde
My email address is craighydesf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Craig Hyde



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Neal Powers <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Neal Powers**
My email address is **nipowerssf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Neal Powers



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jimmy Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jimmy Ng
My email address is tiredpot@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jimmy Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Robin Gray <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Robin Gray
My email address is robingray@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Robin Gray



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Matthew C Sheridan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Matthew C Sheridan**
My email address is **matthew@sheridan.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Please don;t box the Richmond District in. We are working families that need to have access to our jobs. Don't be naive,as if we don't drive cars. Kids go soccer practice, moms work. Access for all.

Sincerely,
Matthew C Sheridan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chris Fern <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Chris Fern**
My email address is **operachris@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Chris Fern



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gretta Dacquisto <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gretta Dacquisto**
My email address is **gretta48@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gretta Dacquisto



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sharon Wu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Sharon Wu
My email address is travel143@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sharon Wu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Joanne Fox <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Joanne Fox
My email address is joannefoxsf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Joanne Fox



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Joanna Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Joanna Ng
My email address is woolandflax@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Joanna Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Amanda Peltier <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Amanda Peltier
My email address is smartpaws@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Amanda Peltier



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Angela Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 8:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Angela Lee

My email address is angelalee333@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Angela Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Takako Yamashita <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Takako Yamashita
My email address is takako.y@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Takako Yamashita



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Arthur Ritchie <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:34 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Arthur Ritchie
My email address is art3030@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

I am an 84 year old Vietnam War vet with severe disabilities living in Glen Park. I can still drive but I have missed the last Memorial Day ceremonies at the USS San Francisco Memorial because of the closure of the Great Highway. Also, tourist trips for visiting friends and relatives have been avoided. Shame on you SFMTA.

Sincerely,
Arthur Ritchie



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Denise Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Denise Lee**

My email address is **denise.m.lee@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Denise Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Noelle Song <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Noelle Song**
My email address is **noellesong008@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Noelle Song



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Greg Syler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:16 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Greg Syler**

My email address is **sivakitty@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Greg Syler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Arthur Ritchie <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Arthur Ritchie**
My email address is **art3030@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Arthur Ritchie



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: rami r <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is rami r
My email address is rami.randhawa@me.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
rami r



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Janice Peloquin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:26 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Janice Peloquin
My email address is janp45@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Janice Peloquin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tony K <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Tony K
My email address is fotochimp8888@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Folks, let's be sensible about this, there are bike lanes already there, the great highway has worked since it was open in it's current state, and you have created a massive spill over in residential neighborhoods which will eventually lead to more deaths vs. keeping it open. Thx for listening to the masses, not a loud voices of a few.

Sincerely,
Tony K



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lola Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lola Lee

My email address is lolalee008@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lola Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: George Haris <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **George Haris**
My email address is **georgeharis3@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
George Haris



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sherrie Rosenberg <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Sherrie Rosenberg
My email address is sherrie.rosenberg@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sherrie Rosenberg



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Paul Wattis III <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:50 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Paul Wattis III
My email address is paul@wattis.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Paul Wattis III



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Linda Ravano <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Linda Ravano

My email address is lravano@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

I rely on the Great Highway when I commute to and from work. When the Great Highway is closed I feel cars travel at higher speeds on small streets which puts everyone in danger . Additionally there were NO traffics studies done. Instead of re -painting lines and making the middle lane on Lincoln have arrows going both directions for people to turn from Lincoln to the great highway they put cones . Get it together . Please the increased traffic makes pollution worse with idling cars. I for one will ONLY vote for a Mayoral candidate that wants to reopen the great highway and JFK drive .

Sincerely,
Linda Ravano



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Roy Edgar <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Roy Edgar
My email address is roy.edgar@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Roy Edgar



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Barbara Richard <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Barbara Richard**
My email address is **barichard2008@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Barbara Richard



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Melissa Rubin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Melissa Rubin
My email address is melissaerubin@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Melissa Rubin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ernita O'Brien <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ernita O'Brien
My email address is ernob@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ernita O'Brien



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sharon Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 9:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sharon Ng**
My email address is **SharonNgSF@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sharon Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Susan Wolff <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Susan Wolff**

My email address is **sunrose7818@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Susan Wolff



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Edward Kaplun <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Edward Kaplun**
My email address is **eddie30013@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Edward Kaplun



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Judy Adami <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Judy Adami
My email address is jrbadami@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Judy Adami



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Linda Allan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Linda Allan
My email address is linda.claire.allan@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Linda Allan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kristin Schober <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kristin Schober
My email address is schober2@pacbell.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kristin Schober



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Janet Goodson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Janet Goodson
My email address is whgjgg@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Janet Goodson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sharon Jung-Verdi <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Sharon Jung-Verdi
My email address is jungverdi@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sharon Jung-Verdi



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gregory Vernitsky <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gregory Vernitsky**
My email address is **gregory.vernitsky@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gregory Vernitsky



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gayle Mishima <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gayle Mishima**
My email address is **gmishima@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gayle Mishima



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mari Eliza <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:19 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mari Eliza
My email address is zrants@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mari Eliza



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Diana Kaytun <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Diana Kaytun
My email address is corex123@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Diana Kaytun



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lauraine Edir <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lauraine Edir
My email address is laurainemarie@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lauraine Edir



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Robi Roorda <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Robi Roorda**
My email address is **robihns@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Robi Roorda



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: EBERT KAN <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **EBERT KAN**
My email address is **Nomad627@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
EBERT KAN



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Tamashiro <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 10:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Karen Tamashiro
My email address is ktamashiro@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Tamashiro



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jon Tolson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jon Tolson

My email address is jonhtolson@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jon Tolson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: betty winholtz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is betty winholtz
My email address is winholtz@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
betty winholtz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Pamela Sebastian <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Pamela Sebastian
My email address is pamseb@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Pamela Sebastian



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Eugene Loch <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Eugene Loch

My email address is eugene@techshaman.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Eugene Loch



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ilene Fohs <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:42 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ilene Fohs

My email address is Sunsetaqua8@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ilene Fohs



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Todd Traina <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 11:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Todd Traina**
My email address is **todd@trainaproductions.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Todd Traina



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jo Kaufman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:50 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jo Kaufman**
My email address is **jokaufman@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jo Kaufman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Eugene Galvin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:48 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Eugene Galvin**
My email address is **eggalvin@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Living in the Richmond District and working in South San Francisco, I could drive to work on Friday mornings but have to return on 19th Avenue which was always packed on Fridays before the weekend closure of the Great Highway, but is now impossible. There is no reasonable public transportation from the outer Richmond to South San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Eugene Galvin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nathan Sammons <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:11 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nathan Sammons
My email address is nathansammonsdt@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nathan Sammons



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Venk Reddy <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:31 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Venk Reddy**
My email address is **venkreddy@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Venk Reddy



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Leslie Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:34 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Leslie Wong
My email address is molliespack@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Leslie Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Angela Mendoza <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:44 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Angela Mendoza

My email address is angela.mendozasf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Angela Mendoza



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mario Mendoza <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:04 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mario Mendoza**
My email address is **mario.mendoza@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mario Mendoza



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: michael perry <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:07 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is michael perry
My email address is mperrysfo@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
michael perry



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gregory Bailey <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:13 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Gregory Bailey
My email address is 5150seller@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gregory Bailey



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Harry Cohen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:17 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Harry Cohen**
My email address is **hmcohengolf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Harry Cohen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carmen Woo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:25 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Carmen Woo**
My email address is **carmenwoo68@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

PLEASE KEEP IT OP

Sincerely,
Carmen Woo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: JIM MCDONALD <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:48 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **JIM MCDONALD**
My email address is **jimandml@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
JIM MCDONALD



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ann Marie Porter <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:09 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ann Marie Porter
My email address is porterssf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ann Marie Porter



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Thomas Snow <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:11 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Thomas Snow
My email address is tomsnow24@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Thomas Snow



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rick Peloquin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:20 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rick Peloquin**
My email address is **rickp71@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rick Peloquin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Aine McGovern <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Aine McGovern
My email address is atmcg10@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those like myself who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Aine McGovern



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Aine McGovern <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:51 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Aine McGovern
My email address is atmcg10@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those like myself who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Aine McGovern



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Joshua Seare <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Joshua Seare

My email address is demonchef65@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Joshua Seare



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: joseph dowler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:00 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is joseph dowler
My email address is jspdwler@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
joseph dowler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Christine Hanson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:04 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Christine Hanson**
My email address is **chrissibhanson@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As someone who commutes from the Southern portion of the City to go to Marin every day I have witnessed a true mess being created on our roads. IT IS ACTUALLY NOW FASTER TO DRIVE TO OAKLAND AND CROSS THE RICHMOND BRIDGE THAN IT IS TO SIMPLY DRIVE ACROSS TOWN.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit. Allowing SF Park and Rec to do that sets a short sighted dictatorial precedent in City governance.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment. SNOWY PLOVER CHICKS ARE EXTREMELY VULNERABLE TO BEING TRAMPLED AND DO NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY TO FLEE.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike. **HOW IS THIS ALLOWED TO CONTINUE AND NOW FLOURISH?**

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions. **IF THIS PERMIT IS ALLOWED TO STAND THERE MUST BE AIR QUALITY MONITORING SYSTEMS ON 19th AVENUE.**

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Christine Hanson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: William Nicholas <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:17 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **William Nicholas**
My email address is **woolfdn@outlook.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
William Nicholas



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Madhuri Vivit <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:23 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Madhuri Vivit
My email address is madhurivivit@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Madhuri Vivit



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charlotte Pope <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Charlotte Pope**
My email address is **charlotte.w.pope@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charlotte Pope



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Bonnie Fimbres <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Bonnie Fimbres**
My email address is **sfonurse@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Fimbres



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: matt lopez <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:52 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is matt lopez

My email address is younglopez1@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
matt lopez



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sheila lorraine O'Neill-Bosch <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:54 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sheila lorraine O'Neill-Bosch**
My email address is **darcy74@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sheila Iorraine O'Neill-Bosch



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Heather Leonard <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:54 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Heather Leonard
My email address is indigo415@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Heather Leonard



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Glenn Schot <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:56 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Glenn Schot
My email address is gschot@me.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Glenn Schot



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brian McNamee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:22 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brian McNamee**
My email address is **frombriansipad@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brian McNamee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Edward Poole <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:29 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Edward Poole**
My email address is **egpoole60@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Edward Poole



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Williams <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:50 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Williams**
My email address is **beegfluff@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Williams



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gary Forsyth <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:58 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Gary Forsyth

My email address is garyforsyth53@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gary Forsyth



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mike Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:07 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mike Wong**
My email address is **d1_mike@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mike Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Yvette Torres <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:38 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Yvette Torres

My email address is yvettetorres11@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Yvette Torres



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rich Bridygham <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:22 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rich Bridygham**
My email address is **ricksf1723@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rich Bridygham



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mark Won <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mark Won**
My email address is **mwon101@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mark Won



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Martin Denefeld <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:28 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Martin Denefeld**
My email address is **martyden@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Martin Denefeld



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Soffa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:30 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David Soffa**
My email address is **soffad@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Soffa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lawrence Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:41 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Lawrence Wong**
My email address is **petlarw@mindspring.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

- 1) **Environmental Impact on Native Species** - The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.
- 2) **Emergency Response Delays** - The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.
- 3) **Increased Traffic and Accidents** - The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

4) **Elevated Air Pollution Levels** - With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

5) **Longer Commutes** - For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lawrence Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nickolas Mironov <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:43 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Nickolas Mironov**
My email address is **nickvmironov@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nickolas Mironov



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Omar Dudum <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:44 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Omar Dudum**
My email address is **deepsaadudum@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Omar Dudum



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brunero Cecchetti <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:44 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brunero Cecchetti**
My email address is **brunero@mac.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brunero Cecchetti



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gloria Keeley <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:51 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Gloria Keeley
My email address is stilgloria@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gloria Keeley



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Darcy Mironov <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:52 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Darcy Mironov
My email address is darcymironov@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Darcy Mironov



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ryutaro Hirota <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:54 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ryutaro Hirota
My email address is rhirota@hirotalaw.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ryutaro Hirota



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Donna Tuttle <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:55 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Donna Tuttle**
My email address is **tuttut2@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Donna Tuttle



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Simpson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:57 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Simpson
My email address is jsimpson1226@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals.

When the Great Highway is closed it turns MLK Dr. and ChainOf Lakes Dr into bumper to bumper traffic.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Sincerely,
John Simpson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Ferguson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David Ferguson**
My email address is **ddferg@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Ferguson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Patrick Skain <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Patrick Skain**
My email address is **patskain@att.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Patrick Skain



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brad Jacobson <B.Jacobson@ehdd.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:12 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please uphold Great Walkway permit

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Brad Jacobson and I am a resident of NOPA.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am out on Great Walkway/Bikeway every weekend with my two daughters or just my wife biking and sometimes walking. It is the most inspirational space in SF and perhaps in America at this point. What a point of pride for SF!

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Brad Jacobson FAIA, LEED® AP, DBIA
Partner & COO

Pier 1 The Embarcadero, Bay 2
San Francisco, CA 94111
+1 415-214-7276

ehdd.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Wilson Lem <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Wilson Lem
My email address is lem321@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Wilson Lem



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeffrey Laffranchini <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jeffrey Laffranchini**
My email address is **jlaffr@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

As a senior citizen I object to closing the Great Highway to automobile traffic on weekends. Bicyclists and pedestrians have the center path on which they may walk. --Jeff Laffranchini

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Laffranchini



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lily Daniel <lilyjunedaniel@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,
Lily Daniel

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sarah Buecher <sarah@thebuechers.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am a resident of Hayes Valley, and I regularly use my bicycle for exercise and recreation.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway Park is one of my favorite places to ride my bicycle. It is a great space for enjoying the wonder of the ocean. People of all ages can ride in a safe environment. And folks have plenty of room to navigate cyclists, skateboarders, rollerskaters, and hikers.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,
Sarah Buecher

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Justin Hubbard <justinhubb@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep The Great Highway useful for people without cars!!!

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

Board of Appeals Meeting
Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5pm

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Justin Hubard and I am a resident of the Portola neighborhood.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

Cars do not need advocates! People do! I visit this neighborhood solely for this attraction. FYI. I won't be visiting to walk my car there if things change.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Regards,

Justin

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Erik Pawassar <erik@epphoto.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:21 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Preserve car-free weekends on the Great Highway PLEASE!

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Erik Pawassar and I am a citizen is San Francisco.

PLEASE PRESERVE the car-free weekends on the Great Highway.

So many people and their families enjoy this beautiful stretch of coast for recreation. PLEASE let us be a slightly more modern city and move away from the tiresome and dangerous old-school cars-over-everything attitude!

Also, WHY do we need to have 2 lanes in EACH direction? Why not divide one side into a 2-way street and have a car-free side EVERY DAY?

Thanks,

Erik

Erik Pawassar :: 415.806.0449

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brooke Kuhn <brookekuhn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:21 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Save the Great Highway for pedestrians and cyclists

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

Hello Commissioners,
My name is Brooke Kuhn and I am a resident of the Richmond District.
Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

As a resident of the Richmond and a mother of two young kids, we enjoy using this space for walking.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Best regards,
Brooke Kuhn
604 Second Avenue

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cris Arthun <cris.berkeley@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:23 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep Great Highway Closed!

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

My name is Cristina Arthun and I am a resident of Lower Haight.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and **please reject the appeals against it.**

Right now, when the closure starts at noon, it still isnt early enough for me! :) I love biking along the ocean, and with the sand that blows over the bike lane can be a scary and treacherous place for bikers.

I go to the great highway to walk friends dogs, and enjoy the (limited!) nature of SF and wonderful environment it gives. I have been using the Great Highway closure to feel safe and connected to nature and friends for 3 years now.

I come to a neighborhood I otherwise wouldnt frequent, and I spend money at shops and markets on Noriega and Judah. The businesses along the drive see great weekend visitor uptick and it provides such incredible community for our residents.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Will Dalton <willdalton@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:25 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Great Highway Pilot

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Will Dalton and I am a resident of the Haight.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway has been wonderful and feels so much safer when car traffic isn't allowed.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you!
Will

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chloe Jager <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Chloe Jager
My email address is cxjmeister@yahoo.com

To Whom it May Concern,

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding

neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and preexisting conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Thank you,
Chloe Jager

Sincerely,
Chloe Jager



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rachel Hall <rachelcsax@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:29 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please keep the Great Highway pedestrian-only on weekends

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

Hello,

I am writing to you as a San Francisco resident who uses the pedestrian-only weekends on the Great Highway every weekend. I urge you to uphold the Coastal Zone permit and reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway pedestrian-only days is one of the only good things that came out of the pandemic. It has become core to my life and has positively impacted my experience as a resident. I run on the Great Highway and it is the safest place I run in the city. I have seen people build a sense of community among others out there, and see that it is extensively used. It felt like a blow when it was reopened to cars mid-week, but I understand the rationale and need to compromise. However, a weekend closure would be devastating and a true loss for our park spaces and recreation opportunities in San Francisco.

Thanks,
Rachel

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cassius <cassiusrjones@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:30 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Save the Great Walkway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Cassius and I am a resident of The Haight.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I love riding my bike and walking on the Great Highway. I've seen live music there, met friends, took in a sunset after a long week. It's an amazing community space and should be preserved.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,

-Cassius

--

Cassius Jones

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Adam Archer <adamarcher@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:30 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Support to keep Great Highway a Park!

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Adam Archer and I am a resident of the Inner Sunset. I have 3 children under 10 years old.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

My family and I bike, walk, roller skate or skateboard on the great highway typically many times per week. We absolutely love it and feel it's one of the major reasons to live in San Francisco.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mark Cervantes <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mark Cervantes**
My email address is **mcervantes5734@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mark Cervantes



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ivonne Molina <molina.ivonne97@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:31 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Save the Great Highway Park!!

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

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Ivonne Molina and I am a resident of Lower Haight.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway Park has been my favorite park in San Francisco since I first moved to the city in 2021. I love biking there every weekend and seeing so many parents, children, couples, seniors, and pets enjoying the space. The park brings so much joy to residents from all over the city and to visitors as well. Every time I post online videos or pictures of me biking on the Great Highway Park, I get an overwhelming response from people who find it fascinating that San Francisco has such a unique and beautiful space for people to explore and gather - "Only in SF!" they say. The Great Highway Park is a unique gem in our city.

Additionally, I personally wouldn't visit any of the Outer Sunset businesses if it weren't for the Great Highway Park. Devil's Teeth, Riptide, Java Beach Cafe, Hook Fish, Celia's By The Beach, and many other businesses near The Great Highway Park would suffer from losing not only my business, but the business of many others who frequent those spots **only** because they are along the park. Community events and gatherings like Great Hauntway would also be lost. This park is a unique place of refuge, community, laughter, and play for many people in our city. PLEASE SAVE THE GREAT HIGHWAY PARK!!

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Best,
Ivonne Molina

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Edward Mason <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Edward Mason
My email address is zabredala3@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Edward Mason



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Donna Dare <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Donna Dare**
My email address is **donna.dare84@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Donna Dare



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kevin Barnard <kevin@barnardgraphics.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:34 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

I am a 37-year resident of San Francisco.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,

Kevin Barnard
2013 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94115
kevin@barnardgraphics.com
415-672-8137

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Katherine Wolf <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Katherine Wolf**
My email address is **kwolf@siprep.org**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Katherine Wolf



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nicole Van Abel <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Lastly, the great highway is an awesome benefit to my mental and physical health! You can see the joy of everyone enjoying the coast. Keep the pilot project going so it is no longer just a pilot!

Best,
Nicole Van Abel, PhD

Nicole Van Abel
nicolevanabel@yahoo.com

San Francisco, 94131

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Trudy May <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Trudy May**
My email address is **may@usfca.edu**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

I strongly feel that there is ample walkway and bicycle access, plus vast recreational space on the beach to negate the need for additional space on a roadway. It's a reliable, convenient thoroughfare for vehicles alleviating excess traffic on residential side streets. Stop making streets into parks.

Sincerely,
Trudy May



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jonathan Howard <howard.jonathan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:40 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: In favor of Coastal Zone Permit for Upper Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jonathan and I am a resident of Bernal Heights.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I love the Great Highway for bicycle rides, up the coast. I just brought a friend through there, who was in town visiting but was afraid of cars in the city (including the continued trend of cars ignoring bike lanes). The few protected areas we have for bikes were a huge draw for her to both visit and consider moving here. It's a big differentiator in the city and a rare positive for our community when so much bad news is flowing about us in the news

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Alexander <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David Alexander**
My email address is **fricoloco@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Alexander



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Laurel Winzler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Laurel Winzler
My email address is flaurel1@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Laurel Winzler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: J Leung <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is J Leung
My email address is jleung23@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
J Leung



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Josephine Zhao <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Josephine Zhao
My email address is josephine_zhao@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Josephine Zhao



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jim Stephenson <jimstephenson3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:11 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Upper Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jim Stephenson and I am a resident of the Outer Sunset.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

We visit the Upper Great Highway every weekend to cycle up and down it with our 2 year old daughter, and it is a vital no-traffic area for us to walk with our child and exercise.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Best regards,

Jim

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rory O'Donnell <rory_odonnell_1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:14 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Board of Appeals Meeting - Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Rory O'Donnell and I am a resident of the Outer Sunset District.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I frequently use the Great Highway for bike riding on weekends and holidays, as it is a great resource for walking and biking, and is utilized by numerous people for these purposes every week.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,

Rory O'Donnell

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Peter McCoy <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Peter McCoy**
My email address is **peter.mccoy@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Peter McCoy



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charles Thieriot <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:18 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Charles Thieriot
My email address is charlesthieriot@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charles Thieriot



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: William Walker <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:22 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **William Walker**
My email address is **wlk4willi@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
William Walker



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elisa Smith <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elisa Smith
My email address is elisa_smith1@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elisa Smith



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Craig Epstein <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:26 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Craig Epstein

My email address is craigepsteinproperties@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Craig Epstein



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mario Tarantino <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:28 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mario Tarantino
My email address is matarantino.mt@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mario Tarantino



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sarah Epstein <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Sarah Epstein

My email address is sarahepstein415@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sarah Epstein



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeffrey Trull <jetrull@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:31 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please reject appeal of Coastal Zone permit for weekend Great Highway project

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

Dear Board members,

I was concerned to learn that after so many failed attempts, opponents have found another possible procedural approach to restore automobiles to the Great Highway on weekends. I hope this one will be rejected just like the others.

The Great Highway is not "closed" on weekends, but *open* - to cyclists and pedestrians. It is open to drivers, too, if they simply park in one of the ample spaces nearby and enjoy some fresh air and exercise with the rest of us. It encourages cycling and reduces carbon emissions on the West Side. It protects nearby plant and animal species far better than the expressway it becomes during the week. To endorse the weekend Great Highway project is to protect the coast, while is why I imagine the Planning Commission unanimously supported it.

Please do the right thing and support the coastal environment and public recreation, while striking a blow against climate change. Reject this appeal.

Thanks and Regards,

Jeff Trull
(Potrero Hill)

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nancy Wolf <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nancy Wolf
My email address is n.wolf@mindspring.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nancy Wolf



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shelley White <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Shelley White
My email address is shelleyw1967@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shelley White



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Austin Milford-Rosales <milford.rosales@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:38 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. I do not own a car, so this is the easiest beach for me to get to, and I enjoy both biking and walking on the great highway with friends, as well as fishing along the coast. Not only is this the most accessible beach for non-drivers, but it is the only one with a meaningful paved path for biking along or walking without having to fight the sand with every step (fun for exercise, but tough for older folks or those with mobility devices).

This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Laurie Mackenzie <lauriemackenzie59@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); Stokle, Brian (REC); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit

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

Tuesday, February 6th, 2024

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Laurie Mackenzie and I am a resident of the Mission District

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am an avid walker and hiker and fully support more car free zones and for longer times in San Francisco. I regularly walk on Shotwell and Sanchez streets and try and get out to the coast when possible. My husband is a bike rider and I feel more secure when he is riding on safer streets with less car traffic when he does his long loop rides of the city on the weekends. The car free zones and streets have enlivened our communities, helped us connect with our fellow SF residents and helped to create clearer air and more healthy environments for everyone.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laurie Mackenzie
lauriemackenzie59@gmail.com

Email Addresses:
brian.stokle@sfgov.org, boardofappeals@sfgov.org, engardiostaff@sfgov.org, rclyde@sfbike.org,
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov, chanstaff@sfgov.org

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Laurie Mackenzie <lauriemackenzie59@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:49 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); Stokle, Brian (REC)
Subject: Coastal Zone Permit
Attachments: 1707256067610

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

Tuesday, February 6th, 2024

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Laurie Mackenzie and I am a resident of the Mission District

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am an avid walker and hiker and fully support more car free zones and for longer times in San Francisco. I regularly walk on Shotwell and Sanchez streets and try and get out to the coast when possible. My husband is a bike rider and I feel more secure when he is riding on safer streets with less car traffic when he does his long loop rides of the city on the weekends. The car free zones and streets have enlivened our communities, helped us connect with our fellow SF residents and helped to create clearer air and more healthy environments for everyone.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laurie Mackenzie
lauriemackenzie59@gmail.com

Email Addresses:
brian.stokle@sfgov.org, boardofappeals@sfgov.org, engardiostaff@sfgov.org, rclyde@sfbike.org,
MelgarStaff@sfgov.org, NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov, chanstaff@sfgov.org

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jennifer Patricia Jordan <jennifer.patricia.jordan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:53 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Pls save the great highway weekend closures for bikers, runners, and families

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jenny and I am a resident of the Presidio.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Colin Dyer <cloneno2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:53 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC)
Cc: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: The Great Highway promenade / Coastal Zone Permit

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

Dear Commissioner,

I'm writing to you about the hearing concerning the Coastal Zone permit.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

Having the space closed to cars gives myself and many others a safe place to ride a bike and enjoy the beach without fear of danger.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,
Colin Dyer

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: caseyfrost13@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep Great Highway Car Free

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

Keep OGH car free. Don't you dare overrule the will of the citizens of San Francisco. If anything it should be car free 24x7.

Casey Frost
111 Monterey Blvd

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lynne Howe <lshowe68@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:57 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Great Highway

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

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

Lynne Howe, D5 Voter
1515 Sutter Street #349

Sent from my iPhone

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kenny Guay <kguay72@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Uphold the Planning Commission's decision for the Upper Great Highway pilot project

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

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and reject appeals against it.

This car-free space on the Great Highway provides a safe, scenic place for recreation and healthy activities that this city needs. As someone who lives in the Richmond District and has a car, I have seen no serious impacts to traffic and can't think of any way that opening up the Highway to cars on the weekends would be a net positive for the community.

Thank you,
Kenneth Guay

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Paul Slade <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Paul Slade**
My email address is **avenuespaul@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Paul Slade



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jennifer Chin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:56 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jennifer Chin
My email address is jenmchin@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Chin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alec Mironov <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alec Mironov
My email address is alecmironov@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alec Mironov



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sarah Kho <sarah.e.kho@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:04 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Support for Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Sarah Kho and I am a resident of Noe Valley.

I'm writing to ask you to please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

As both a driver and pedestrian, I am a strong advocate of creating a city that is very pedestrians. It is better for the environment by reducing pollution, and better for our community by allowing us to connect in a personal way. Specifically, I use Great Highway multiple times a month to run - it is incredible to see the community out there and connect to nature. I also try to run in our streets in Noe/Mission - on one evening, I almost got hit by cars 6x, who rolled through the crosswalk while I was trying to cross. We need to preserve and expand car-free zone.

Again, I strongly ask you to please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you.
Sarah

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Annette Bistrup <abistrup@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:05 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Cc: rclyde@sfbike.org
Subject: Public Comment - Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit: Board of Appeals Meeting Wednesday, February 7, 2024

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

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Annette Bistrup and I am a resident of the Inner Sunset/Golden Gate Heights neighborhood, for over 20 years, and an SF resident altogether since 1989.

I grew up in a country (Denmark) with a long-term and very well-developed culture around bicycle and pedestrian traffic – and the consequent infrastructural adaptations necessary to support such modes of traffic. In Denmark, as in many other European countries, as I am sure you're aware, walking and biking are viewed as integral parts of traffic, and as an essential societal good.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project, and please reject the appeals against it.

I and a number of my friends regularly make use of the Great Highway car-free promenade space (ie, on weekends). During Covid, when the space was car-free every day, we used the space for walking and biking multiple times per week. We never fail to observe/encounter so many others using the space, in so many ways: Walking, biking, roller skating etc. People of all ages, alone or in groups, with or without dogs, etc. It is truly a resource for the entire SF community – I know for a fact that "users" come from all over the City to avail themselves of this beautiful space. To me and my friends, just being there, being able to walk the length of it, it is a balm to the soul, in addition, of course, to being ideal for the physical exercise itself.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can **collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway**.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,

Annette Bistrup

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: candice lin <candiceylin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:18 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please Keep the Great Highway Open for Walking and Biking!

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Candice Lin and I am a resident of Bernal Heights.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I love walking on the Great Highway, bringing out of town guests to experience it, and then patronizing restaurants and businesses in the Sunset afterward. The Great Highway is an iconic destination in SF, much the way the Highline is in NYC. I've been a resident of SF for over 20 years and feel safe walking on the Great Highway. I can't say that about every neighborhood in SF.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you, Candice Lin

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Susan Rifkin <susan.rifkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:20 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Susan Rifkin and I am a resident of the Diamond Heights neighborhood in San Francisco.

The Planning Commission's determination, wisely and thoughtfully deliberated, to unanimously issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project contributes to the wellbeing of all the residents of San Francisco. Please reject the appeals against it.

Open space for San Franciscans is particularly beneficial on weekends when children are not in school and families are engaging in outdoor activities together. We need the safe and open space for our physical and psychological wellbeing.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation, including walking. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,
Susan Rifkin

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Evan Minamoto <eminamoto@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:24 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Maintain the Coastal Zone Permit

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Evan Minamoto and I live in Soma. I was the first designer of Palantir Technologies, a startup founder and born, raised and worked in the Bay Area.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

San Francisco is not a very nice place right now and removing one of the few nice things to come out of the pandemic era would be a shame. I use that stretch of highway when I do my loops around the city by bicycle and it's nice to not have to worry about the sand that inevitably encroaches on the shoulder, making the narrow shoulder hazardous to road bikes and their thin tires.

The perimeter of the city is one of the few areas where you're (mostly) safe from the careless, self righteous, rude, dangerous drivers that can increasingly be found in the city as well as the significant number of unpredictable, mentally ill people who inhabit increasingly larger areas of the city.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Evan

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Andrew Stutz <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Andrew Stutz
andrewcstutz@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Arnold Trogman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Arnold Trogman
My email address is arnoldtrogman@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Arnold Trogman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michelle Ashe <mashe0@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:28 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Coastal Zone Permit Great Highway

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

Greetings

My name is Michelle Ashe and I am a resident of Bernal Heights. I grew up in the Sunset District and my elderly mother still lives there in our family home.

I am writing to urge you to please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I love riding my bike on the Great Highway promenade with my husband. The scenery is beautiful and I feel safe from cars as I enjoy it. This pilot project provides safe space to enjoy the coastline in a healthy and sustainable way for people of all ages, from the neighborhood and from all parts of the community. It is a joy to experience!

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

It is vital to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect the data to make good decisions about the future of the Great Highway. Please reject the appeals against it.

Thank you for your attention.

Michelle Ashe

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Glen Harvey <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Glen Harvey
My email address is gharveysf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Glen Harvey



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Aaron Baucom <aaronbaucom@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Save the Great Highway Park

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

Greetings Commissioners,

My name is Aaron Baucom and I am a resident of the Sunset district.

I urge you to reject the recently filed appeal against the amazingly successfully Great Highway Park. The Planning Commission has decided unanimously to create the unique space for all San Franciscans to enjoy. I have personally enjoyed the new recreation activities enabled by the Great Highway Park pilot and very much want this program to continue.

As a city we have publicly committed to put public transit first, to address the climate change emergency, and to support Vision Zero and stop the unnecessary deaths in our streets. Interfering with the Great Highway Park pilot would actively undermine all of those goals.

Please uphold the exist permit for Great Highway Park and reject this appeal.

Thank you,
Aaron Baucom

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: GoodStuffnow <goodstuffnow@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:39 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is W Chan and I am a resident of Hayes Valley.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway as a pedestrian and active transportation area is an invaluable outdoor resource for me and my family. It's incredible that we have ocean, beach, and coastal resources that members of my family including grand parents of all ages and ability can safely enjoy. We don't own a car so this access by public transport or active transportation is essential.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Best regards,

W Chan

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jossie Ivanov <jossie.ivanov@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Protect the Great Walkway!

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

Please protect the pilot project to keep the Great Highway open to walkers, bikers, kids, and humans. We need spaces to run, walk, and play now more than ever. This space should be an incredible public asset, not a relic of a past highway car-loving past. San Francisco should value health and public access over car speed.

Thank you,
Jossie Ivanov

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jennifer Weiser <jen.w.librarian@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:46 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Board of Appeals Meeting - public support - Letter - Great HYW
Attachments: Letter-Support-GreatHWY-Great Highway Weekend Promenade.pdf

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

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Board of Appeals Meeting. Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5pm

My name is Jennifer Weiser and I am a resident of the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am a cyclist and urban hiker, and I love this city. The way I see it, the Great Highway Weekend Promenade is something this city can be so proud of, and this innovative approach to increasing, embracing, and fostering multi-recreational spaces can be a role model for other large urban centers. When I am out riding and walking in this fantastic car-free space, I am connecting with the historical sand dunes of pre-San Francisco and the iconic coastline of my city – for miles! Miles of coastline recreation space that I can safely ride my bike and hear the natural sound of this landscape without the rush of cars. And, from my experience, I can assure you that I am not the only one who finds the weekend promenade special and fantastic.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you.

Warmly,

Jennifer Weiser
Haight-Ashbury
jen.w.librarian@gmail.com
650-942-7713

02/06/2024

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Board of Appeals Meeting, Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5pm

My name is Jennifer Weiser and I am a resident of the Haight-Ashbury neighborhood.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am a cyclist and urban hiker, and I love this city. The way I see it, the Great Highway Weekend Promenade is something this city can be so proud of, and this innovative approach to increasing, embracing, and fostering multi-recreational spaces can be a role model for other large urban centers. When I am out riding and walking in this fantastic car-free space, I am connecting with the historical sand dunes of pre-San Francisco and the iconic coastline of my city – for miles! Miles of coastline recreation space that I can safely ride my bike and hear the natural sound of this landscape without the rush of cars. And, from my experience, I can assure you that I am not the only one who finds the weekend promenade special and fantastic.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you.

Warmly,

Jennifer Weiser
Haight-Ashbury
jen.w.librarian@gmail.com
650-942-7713

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shawna McGrew <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Shawna McGrew
My email address is Sunsetfog@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shawna McGrew



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sean McGrew <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Sean McGrew
My email address is ynsurf@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sean McGrew



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kendra McLaughlin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Kendra McLaughlin**
My email address is **kendramcl@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kendra McLaughlin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rose Lau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Rose Lau
My email address is jadoer7@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rose Lau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lauris Jensen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lauris Jensen

My email address is lauris.jensen@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lauris Jensen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kyle Donohoe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Kyle Donohoe**
My email address is **why.you.do.that@outlook.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kyle Donohoe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: T Louie <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:16 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is T Louie

My email address is tlouie@earthlink.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
T Louie



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Benji Whalen <benjiwhalen@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:30 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit

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

Hi, I am a resident of the Outer Sunset. Please uphold the permit to maintain pedestrian and bike access Friday pm - Sunday. My family takes full advantage of this access, and we appreciate that many other residents are now able to enjoy the area in new ways, enjoying the natural space and bringing a new atmosphere to the neighborhood.

Thank you,
Benji Whalen
2018 47th Ave

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Durinda Coursey <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Durinda Coursey
My email address is dnb001@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Durinda Coursey



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Daniel Lau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Daniel Lau**
My email address is **dan.lau@att.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Daniel Lau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Katie Herman <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Katie Herman
katieherman25@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dorothy Wang <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Dorothy Wang**
My email address is **dorothyw@sonic.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Dorothy Wang



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carol Faulkner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:16 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Carol Faulkner
My email address is cmoelarrycarol@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carol Faulkner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Peter Fenczik <372pete@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:16 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Cc: membership@sfbike.org; Kristina Isberg
Subject: Save the GHWY Park

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Peter Fenczik and I am a resident of Bernal Heights.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

My wife Kristina and I love cycling on the Great Highway. We hope to skate on the Great Highway during the weekend pilot too.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,
Peter

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: LaVive Kiely <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:21 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is LaVive Kiely
My email address is kielykids@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
LaVive Kiely



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tris Thomson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Tris Thomson
My email address is tris.thomson@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tris Thomson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Maria Aldaz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:26 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Maria Aldaz
My email address is mealdaz58@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Maria Aldaz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Roy Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Roy Lee
My email address is roylee@sonic.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Roy Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Maria Trinh <mariaktrinh@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Please open great highway

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

Dear Board of Appeals,

I am writing in opposition to Walk SF's stance on the Great Highway's closure. The closure is great for people who have lots of time and energy to recreate all weekend long but there is tremendous traffic getting through the city, facilitated by all the closures through Golden Gate Park. Please do not shut down this arterial during the weekend. There are already plenty of spaces to recreate and I would argue that, working class people who need to work during the weekends, suffer most from this. Also, GG Park is a total mess on the weekends due to the closures.

As a 20+ year resident of SF with elementary school aged children, please do not increase congestion in the city. You are providing recreational opportunities for the few and the expense of the many. Please see Lake Street as exhibit 1. The density in that area is so low that it also doesn't make sense that it's closed.

Thanks for reading this far.

Maria Trinh
Inner Sunset Resident

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Calum You <zedseayou@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:43 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Reject appeals against Upper Great Highway pilot

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Calum You and I am a resident of Miraloma Park in District 7.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway closure to cars makes it a glorious space for pedestrians, cyclists and other slower traffic on weekends. I love being able to roll down towards the ocean and spend time in the evenings, without having to worry about car traffic. It's also a wonderful place to run when seeking flatter ground in our hilly city. In my opinion the pilot has been an incredible success and allowing appeal would be a tremendous loss.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Calum You

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Knuth <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Karen Knuth
My email address is kpuechner@MSN.COM

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Knuth



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: susan george <susanmarietg@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:50 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: The Great Highway

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

Dear Board of Appeals,

My name is Susan George, and I am a resident of Bernal Heights.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

Ever since the Pandemic started my husband and I have ridden our tandem from Bernal through the GG park and to the Great Highway on a regular basis. We enjoy the sea breeze, view of the beach, safe riding and the wonderful distance from our house. As a senior I am a cautious rider and thoroughly enjoy the car free space on weekends and holidays.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Susan George, MD

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karolina Östegård Branley <karolinabranley@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:03 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS);
info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov;
ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Karolina Branley

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Scott Rittman <sr ittman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:12 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Scott Rittman and I live on 28th Ave. between Taraval/Ulloa for the last 22 years. Prior to that 14 years in the Richmond on 16th Ave. and 42nd Ave.

Except for 2 years in Noe Valley we have always lived on the westside of the City (Westside is the Bestside). So the beach has been a big part of life living here in San Francisco.

38 years in the City this April. Raised two children, 4 dogs here and our love for the City is unmatched!

Don't get me wrong, we have always gone down to the beach for swimming, boogie boarding, picnicking, hanging out for the day or maybe just for sunset.

But ever since the closure, we see so many more people, enjoying the beach and the Great Walkway in particular.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Scott Rittman
cell: 415.407.1490

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gregg M <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Gregg M
My email address is gbggregg-g@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gregg M



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kathleen M Tracey <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kathleen M Tracey
My email address is ktracey35@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kathleen M Tracey



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dennis Minnick <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:23 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Dennis Minnick**
My email address is **dennis@415images.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Dennis Minnick



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Laurie Rittman <laurie@taylorlombardo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:35 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for Great Highway / Board of Appeals

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Laurie Rittman and I am a resident of the Parkside/Outer Sunset neighborhood.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway is the best thing that has happened in the Outer Sunset. The ability to walk, run, dog walk, bike, roller skate and scooter is an important part of daily life for people in our neighborhood. We enjoy being active and seeing other San Franciscans being active without having to worry about cars and drivers. This has created a sense of community – a place to get out, meet friends, meet neighbors in a beautiful setting.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Laurie Rittman

2463 28th Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94116

laurie@taylorlombardo.com

--

Laurie Rittman, Office Manager
Taylor Lombardo Architects
40 Hoteling Place
San Francisco, CA 94111
tel. (415) 433-7777 x 22
fax (415) 433-7717

laurie@taylorlombardo.com
taylorlombardo.com

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tripti Sharma <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Tripti Sharma

My email address is tbakhru@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tripti Sharma



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jamie C Wilson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jamie C Wilson
My email address is saamis@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jamie C Wilson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Anastasia Fink <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Anastasia Fink**
My email address is **sfink1420@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Anastasia Fink



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brian Adler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brian Adler**
My email address is **familyadler@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brian Adler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jack D'Angelo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jack D'Angelo**
My email address is **dangelo60@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jack D'Angelo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Martin Murphy <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Martin Murphy**
My email address is **martymurphy04@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Martin Murphy



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: kenny kruse <kennykruse@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:02 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Cc: rclyde@sfbike.org
Subject: Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,
My name is Kenny Kruse and I am a resident of the Castro.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I used to live next to the Great Highway and loved walking and taking our dog there. I still love to bike, walk, and run along the Great Highway; it is one of the treasures of our city.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Diana Leong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Diana Leong
My email address is dleong55@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Diana Leong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Lum <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **John Lum**
My email address is **dalai_lumma@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Lum



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: MORAYA KHAN <morkhan@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:15 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Save the Great Highway Park

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Moraya Khan and I am a resident of Chinatown in District3.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am an avid SF cyclist. Biking along the Upper Great Highway on the way to Twin Peaks is one of the most scenic sections of my regular SF loop ride. Allowing traffic here forces me to bike for more safety on the lower parallel road Great Highway which is unattractive and has no view of the ocean. This is a major downgrade to my ride experience!

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Moraya Khan

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: So Kwong-Chan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is So Kwong-Chan

My email address is sofunkwongchan@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
So Kwong-Chan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Corinne Charlton Barbour <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Corinne Charlton Barbour**
My email address is **corinne3jr@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Please take this Appeal very seriously. Also, I heard about this on Feb 6! Where is the notice for people who have cared about this for 3 years, and that includes me. Don't try to hide this away!!

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

The Great HIGHWAY is a major roadway to help people get from one part of the city to another. Don't even mention the treacherous and arduous 19th Avenue as an alternative. 19th has ALWAYS been bad, but now, it's impossible. EVERY citizen should have access to Ocean Beach, as it was set up. At 67 years old, and a 4th generation San Franciscan, I am physically unable to hop on my scooter bike and wing it to the beach, yet it is THE most beautiful place in town. Stop selling the soul of the city to the out of town newbie Lycra self centered bicycles coalition crowd!

Thank you very much!
Corinne Charlton Barbour
corinne3jr@aol.com

Sincerely,
Corinne Charlton Barbour



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lauren Galanes <lauren.galanes@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:29 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Save Great Highway!!

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Lauren Galanes and I am a resident of the Corona Heights neighborhood - and a resident of San Francisco since 1979.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am a bicyclist and love to ride the great Highway without vehicle harassment and danger! As a 64 year old woman, safety is always a concern and having a safe and beautiful place to ride is important.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Lauren Galanes
2444 15th Street

Sent from my iPhone

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elizabeth Young <elizabethjyoung31@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:33 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Elizabeth and I am a resident of the Mission District.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I love biking and rollerblading the Great Highway on the weekends and it's closure would be SO SAD!!!

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Elizabeth

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: alison wahl <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is alison wahl
My email address is alisonbwahl@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
alison wahl



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tammy Bee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Tammy Bee**
My email address is **tammybtammy@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tammy Bee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gus Zert <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gus Zert**

My email address is **gaszert@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gus Zert



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dustin Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Dustin Lee**

My email address is **moomaster_99@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Dustin Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: linda sekino <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **linda sekino**
My email address is **lindasekino@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
linda sekino



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: steve omori <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is steve omori
My email address is stevlin24@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
steve omori



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: walter schirra <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **walter schirra**
My email address is **potspotter@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
walter schirra



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: nancy zerner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is nancy zerner
My email address is nzerner@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
nancy zerner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Felecia Faulkner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:19 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Felecia Faulkner

My email address is feleciawynnefaulkner@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Felecia Faulkner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Greg Holmes <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:23 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Greg Holmes**
My email address is **ghinsf@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Greg Holmes



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mary Irwin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mary Irwin**
My email address is **marylandersirwin@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mary Irwin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tim Eichenberg <timeichenberg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:42 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Uphold the Coastal Permit for the Upper Great Highway Pilot Project

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

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Tim Eichenberg and I live in the Panhandle neighborhood of San Francisco. I urge you to uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and reject the appeals against it.

I bike on the Great Highway frequently and enjoy walking along the Great Highway when it is closed to traffic. It is a tremendous amenity to the people of this wonderful city and it would be a great tragedy to resume allowing cars back on the roadway.

Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you. Tim Eichenberg

Tim Eichenberg
2027 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
415-314-7366

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Emily Herman <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Emily Herman
emilygherman@gmail.com
75 7th Ave
San francisco , California 94118

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kimberly Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kimberly Wong
My email address is Kimberlyw951@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Connie Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:05 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Connie Wong**
My email address is **conniepang1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Connie Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jack Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jack Wong**
My email address is **Jjwb1@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jack Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Joyce True <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Joyce True
My email address is jetnurse@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Joyce True



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cora Wrockloff <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Cora Wrockloff
My email address is mswrock@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Cora Wrockloff



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Zhanna Losik <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Zhanna Losik**
My email address is **zhanna_losik@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Zhanna Losik



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nancy Zerner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:33 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nancy Zerner
My email address is nancyfancypants@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nancy Zerner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Matt Kelly <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:44 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Matt Kelly**
My email address is **thew_kelly@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Matt Kelly



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Hanley Lau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:44 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Hanley Lau
My email address is law.roz38@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Hanley Lau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Isara Rodechanaphairatana <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Isara Rodechanaphairatana**
My email address is **isararod@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Isara Rodechanaphairatana



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Frances Chiu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Frances Chiu
My email address is fkchiu@pacbell.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Frances Chiu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Annie Collier <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Annie Collier

My email address is annie.e.collier@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Annie Collier



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chris Brophy <cjbrophy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:45 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: letter in support of Upper Great Highway Pilot Project
Attachments: Save the GHWY Park - C Brophy comment 2-6-2024.pdf

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

Dear Commissioners,
Please see attached letter in connection with the 2/7/2024 Board of Appeals meeting.
thanks,
Chris Brophy

Board of Appeals Meeting

Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5pm

<https://www.sf.gov/meeting/february-7-2024/board-appeals-hearing-february-7-2024>

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 416

Or call in with Zoom

Public comment script:

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Chris Brophy and I am a resident of the Outer Richmond.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I routinely ride my bike along the Great Highway, and have also been teaching my 7-year-old son how to ride his bike there as well. We recently rode from our house in the Outer Richmond along the Great Highway to Noreiga – he was so proud of himself, as I was of him. We sat on the seawall and had a snack looking at the ocean, and then rode home northbound on the Great Highway, enjoying the beautiful views and the company of so many other happy pedestrians, bikers and skaters – it was an epic father-son activity, which everyone living in, or visiting, our great city deserves to share in.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Chris Brophy

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brian McLain <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brian McLain**
My email address is **brianmclain@mac.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brian McLain



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Annie Pappin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Annie Pappin
My email address is anniepappin@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Annie Pappin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Narine Kerelian <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Narine Kerelian**
My email address is **n.kerelian@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Narine Kerelian



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: laura folger <Impfolger@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:50 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: The great highway the great experiment... may it continue?

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Laura Folger and I am a resident of Inner Sunset Parkside here in SF. Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

My personal experience over the last few years has been both as a bike rider, and after my bike accident on a Muni track, I became reliant on this area as a wonderful place to rehab my hip and walk. It's a great safe place to enjoy both activities either by myself or with friends there are a few places like that in the city. It's also community building. I'm familiar with the car traffic and the neighborhood and I don't really see any greater impact on the surrounding homes on a few days at this freeway is closed.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you
- Laura Folger

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Artie Kramer <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Artie Kramer
My email address is artiekramer@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Artie Kramer



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Keelin Reddy <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Keelin Reddy**
My email address is **keelinreddy@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Keelin Reddy



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alex Vaisman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alex Vaisman
My email address is alx01234@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alex Vaisman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Laura Gilmore <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Laura Gilmore**
My email address is **lauragilmore@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Laura Gilmore



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lisa Ryan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lisa Ryan

My email address is mookryan@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lisa Ryan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carl Kaufman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Carl Kaufman
My email address is carl.kaufman@osterweis.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Now the people are starting to go back to work it's time to return the rest of San Francisco to normalcy. In case you all have forgotten that means pedestrians on sidewalks, cars on streets, bicyclists obeying traffic laws and hopefully pedestrians looking both ways before they cross the street.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders,

compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carl Kaufman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: stanlee gatti <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is stanlee gatti
My email address is stan@stanleegatti.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.


Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
stanlee gatti



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeffrey Fell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jeffrey Fell
My email address is felldown99@yahoo.com

Dear Board Members,

My personal message: Please leave the Great Highway open for cars. Having lived only in San Francisco for 30 years (1993 arrival) with the use of the Great Highway both for recreation along its boardwalk next to the seawall, and most importantly the slow 30 mph driving between the Cliff House, Sloat, and Lake Merced has been one of the pleasures of living in our city, and a useful and peaceful way to traverse the Richmond and Sunset without using 19th Ave.

I have used it to get to SFSU, Stonestown, the airport, to surf and swim, and to get to and from work. It is an essential traffic corridor. I do not know how to put it any simpler. And with the slow and staggered traffic lights it is not a dangerous road on which to drive. For 30 years this has been true.

Thank you, Jeffrey

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the

permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Fell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ashley Dalzell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ashley Dalzell**
My email address is **ashleydalzell@mindspring.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ashley Dalzell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mary Gwynn <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mary Gwynn**
My email address is **mgwynn788@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mary Gwynn



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Paul Roscelli <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Paul Roscelli
My email address is paulroscelli@me.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Paul Roscelli



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Paul Dalzell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Paul Dalzell**

My email address is **tpdalzell@icloud.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Paul Dalzell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chloe Dalzell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Chloe Dalzell

My email address is chloe.dalzell@icloud.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Chloe Dalzell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kaelin Dalzell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kaelin Dalzell
My email address is kaelindalzell@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kaelin Dalzell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: James Hudkins <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **James Hudkins**
My email address is **jimhudkinscpa@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
James Hudkins



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chris Lambert <chrislambert@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Regarding the great highway appeal

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

Please keep the schedule as-is. We reached a good compromise. So many people use the great highway for recreation it's wonderful. Do not open it to cars 24x7.

Thanks,
Chris
94122

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Selin Jessa <selinjessa@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:04 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Selin Jessa and I am a new resident in the SF Bay Area.

I am writing to ask you to please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I'm new to San Francisco and spend many of my weekends walking or biking down the Great Highway, and using it as an opportunity to get fresh air, exercise, socialize, and enjoy in the beauty of the San Francisco Bay Area. Cars have numerous prioritized routes throughout the city, and the Great Highway thrives as a public space for pedestrians and cyclists, and we can only enjoy that safety because it's closed to cars. **We need more public spaces like this in SF, not less.**

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Selin Jessa

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kendall Silva <kendall.silva1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:06 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS);
info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov;
ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064,
23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Kendall

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kendall Silva <kendall.silva1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:06 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Kendall

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Herbert Weiner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Herbert Weiner
My email address is h.weiner@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Herbert Weiner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jennifer Tobiason <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jennifer Tobiason
My email address is jentobiason@gmail.com

Dear Supervisors, especially Ms. Melgar,

Please overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding

neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Thank you,
J.Tobiason
District 7

Sincerely,
Jennifer Tobiason



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alice Shen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alice Shen

My email address is atomicalice@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alice Shen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dee Doley <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:02 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Dee Doley
My email address is ddoley@gmail.com

It is important in the event of emergencies, that we have multiple routes out. Residents of the Richmond district are being trapped in our neighborhoods. The great highway is a major north south thoroughfare. It must remain open for safety and access.

I live near the highway and use it frequently. It is much more trafficked by cars than it ever is by pedestrians or cyclists (unless part of an organized protest.). It is mind boggling that it would be closed, pushing cars to drive more miles to other routes, causing more traffic and pollution. So much for the "green" excise. There is ample space to walk on the beach, the boardwalk or the path in the east side of the highway nor in gg park.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Dee Doley



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Margot Beall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:03 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Margot Beall

My email address is margotbeall@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Margot Beall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Wesley Valaris <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Wesley Valaris**
My email address is **cablecar@sbcglobal.net**

STOP THE MADNESS!

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents,

affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Wesley Valaris



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Connie Fitzgerald <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Connie Fitzgerald
My email address is cfitzgerald1059@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Connie Fitzgerald



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rosemary Kondy <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rosemary Kondy**
My email address is **Vartoush@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rosemary Kondy



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stephanie Peek <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:10 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Stephanie Peek**
My email address is **clunks-06.vertex@icloud.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Peek



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sindhura Kodali <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Sindhura Kodali
My email address is sindhura.kodali@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sindhura Kodali



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mary Harvey <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mary Harvey
My email address is harveysf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mary Harvey



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stephanie Peek <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Stephanie Peek**
My email address is **stephanie@stephaniepeek.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Peek



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Barbara Sokol <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Barbara Sokol
My email address is bsoky@pacbell.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Barbara Sokol



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kathy Regan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:15 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kathy Regan
My email address is meemom@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kathy Regan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Perrin Belway <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:18 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Perrin Belway
My email address is pbelway@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Perrin Belway



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gabriella Iannaccone <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Gabriella Iannaccone**
My email address is **gaiannaccone@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gabriella Iannaccone



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: max kellenberger <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:19 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is max kellenberger
My email address is makephot@pacbell.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
max kellenberger



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Chris Connolly <chris.connolly11@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Chris Connolly and I am a resident of Russian Hill.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway is a beautiful place that is best enjoyed without vehicles.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Chris

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Esther Jeong <ejeong34@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 PM
To: esther jeong
Subject: The Board of Appeals Meeting - Feb 7 - the great highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Esther, and I am a resident of North Beach.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I moved to the Bay Area two years ago (Jan 2022) and it's completely changed my life. Once I graduated college and began working, I found my health declining year by year. Before moving to San Francisco, my health had compromised to the point that as a 27 yr old, I couldn't go on a 20 min walk without feeling ill for the rest of the day. Moving out to the Bay Area introduced my partner and I to the thriving running communities. We moved out here with no friends, no family, we knew no one. Becoming a part of the running community introduced us to a healthier lifestyle, a sense of belonging, and generous (& often nerdy) friendships. My now husband and I have gone on to run several marathons and ultra marathons! So many of our training runs have been through the Great Highway!! As we continue to pursue our love, passion and dreams in the sport, I hope that San Francisco will evolve with us in pursuit of health and holistic wellbeing.

In the midst of running, you often find yourself injured from time to time and of course I found myself pulled into the gravity of the cycling community out here! As a runner first, having the escape on two wheels to explore the hills and streetscapes of San Francisco as a secondary sport has enriched my life even more! While I do find myself deeply wishing for safer conditions for bikes in our city, there are portions of the city that I find myself able to breathe and enjoy the ride a bit more - those areas are the car free zones. From JFK, the Mill Valley Sausalito Path, to the Great Highway. There are so few places I can take a quick breather, enjoy the ride, chat comfortably with friends, and let my guard down from oncoming vehicles. There are far too many times I find drivers not looking both directions, not fully stopping, impaired with impatience where I fear for my safety on rides and runs. The safety factor and the stress of it actually deters me the most to join bike rides. I genuinely hope that we will continue to push the boundaries of this unfortunate vehicle centric society and choose to support new ways of providing safer access to the outdoors.

It's truly changed our lives and I know it holds true for many others.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you.
Esther JuEun Jeong

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alison Fong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Alison Fong**
My email address is **ayfong1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alison Fong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Bonnette <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:29 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Bonnette**
My email address is **me@bugmenot.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Bonnette



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mike Regan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mike Regan
My email address is touring1@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mike Regan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Christopher Mei <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Christopher Mei
My email address is cmei722@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

I have other reasons to keep the Great Highway Open to motor vehicles and not turn it into a walkway.

Summary of main points in support of keeping the Great Highway open to motorists:

Military Veterans will benefit.

Not a racetrack.

Temporary closure because of Covid was acceptable, permanent is not.

Other nearby options for outdoor exercise.

It is safe for pedestrians.

It serves people from the Peninsula.

Closure primarily for maintenance.

No carnivals.

Discussion of main points:

One of the points will be that the Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Boulevard ("The Roadway") benefits the MILITARY VETERANS who take a shuttle to the VA Hospital on Clement Street. When the Roadway was closed to motor vehicles shortly after

Covid began, I observed the VA hospital's shuttle traveling on the lower great highway, hitting every speed hump. Can you imagine how the passengers, the military veterans, must feel, physically and emotionally? Many of them are in pain, and repetitive stopping and starting aggravates their pain. I believe many of them would appreciate a smooth calm ride on the Roadway. From an emotional standpoint, I believe many of them resent the Roadway being closed.

Permanent closure means using 19th Avenue or Sunset Boulevard as main North-South routes; both of them are a grind and they are racetracks. THE ROADWAY IS NOT A RACETRACK.

At the beginning of the Covid outbreak, the Roadway was closed to motor vehicles so citizens could have more access to fresh air and additional space to get exercise. That was fine as a temporary measure; but to close it permanently is poor judgment because we have Golden Gate Park very accessible to the neighborhood residents and a two-mile stretch of beachfront for getting fresh air and exercise, with plenty of social distancing. The thought of leaving the Roadway closed permanently is ludicrous. It also makes a bit of a laughing stock of San Francisco to shut down an efficient North-South route in order to all citizens to have access to more outdoor space, PARTICULARLY WITH THE PROXIMITY OF GOLDEN GATE PARK AND THE BEACH ITSELF.

HAD COVID NOT OCCURRED THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN NO CONSIDERATION OF A PERMANENT CLOSURE OF THE ROADWAY FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.

The concept that San Franciscans from all neighborhoods will be flocking to the closed Roadway is weak and unrealistic. People living in Russian Hill or The Mission may avail themselves of the closed Roadway a handful of times but not on a regular basis. And the idea of providing food trucks and coffee carts, and having vendors selling their arts and crafts. LET'S NOT TRANSFORM A PRACTICAL, SAFE ROADWAY INTO A CARNIVAL.

There is virtually nobody on the closed Roadway during cold or inclement weather.

In defense of motorists, bear in mind that most drivers take advantage of the synchronized traffic signals and can drive from Sloat Boulevard to Lincoln Way nonstop, safely and without speeding.

There is NO DANGER TO PEDESTRIANS WHO want to walk across the Roadway because there are traffic signals and crosswalks every two blocks. The drivers stop at the red lights.

The Upper Great Highway SHOULD BE CLOSED ONLY FOR MAINTENANCE SUCH as sand removal and vegetation control. Closure for special occasions such as an art or music festival, should occur only once or twice a year.

Closure of the east end JFK Drive near the DeYoung leaves plenty of room for festivals and car-free activities. San Francisco cannot have everything. PLEASE LEAVE THE UPPER GREAT HIGHWAY OPEN TO MOTORISTS 24/7/365.

My experiences as a bicyclist on the Upper Great Highway have always been safe. I bicycle on the shoulder twice a week. I feel safe. Motorists are aware of me and other cyclists. Sometimes the shoulder is covered with sand which is too deep to ride through; so I look behind me to see if cars are approaching. If not, I ride into the traffic lane and pass the sand. If cars are approaching from behind, then I use common sense and I stop. I wait for them to pass before riding into the traffic lane.

I think turning the Upper GH into a "promenade" is a joke, a terrible and selfish idea, and it makes me want to ask, "where are the adults in the room?"

Christopher Mei

Sincerely,
Christopher Mei



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jenna Kaiser <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:23 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jenna Kaiser**
My email address is **jennakaiserw@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jenna Kaiser



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: betty winholtz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **betty winholtz**
My email address is **winholtz@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
betty winholtz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Luke Swartz <lswartz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:45 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov
Cc: EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please reject the appeal of the Upper Great Highway pilot project

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

Dear Board of Appeals,

Please REJECT the appeal of the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project.

I am a resident of the Mission District (D9), and frequently go with my family to enjoy the Upper Great Highway and Ocean Beach. I love that it's one of the few places I don't need to worry about my kids getting run over by cars.

This permit is in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and [Climate Action Plan](#), and has been affirmed by the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and even the voters themselves (indirectly in their rejection of 2022's Prop I).

Please uphold this permit and reject the appeals.

Thank you,

Luke Swartz
Mission District (D9) Resident & Father

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lyle Lowder <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Lyle Lowder**
My email address is **llowder98@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lyle Lowder



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Betty Louie <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Betty Louie**
My email address is **bettyjlouie@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Betty Louie



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shannon Hughes <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Shannon Hughes
My email address is realslb2@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shannon Hughes



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Corinne Kan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Corinne Kan**
My email address is **Nomad627@juno.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Corinne Kan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Timothy Boyle <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Timothy Boyle
My email address is trboyleandson@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Timothy Boyle



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dick Robinson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Dick Robinson**
My email address is **robinson27@aol.com**

Please overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Frankly, I'm tired of the bicycle coalition claiming rights to so many parts of SF that were either designed for autos or enjoyed by people who drive in order to see all of the City. The best way to bring a visitor from SFO to our District 2 in North San Francisco is via the Ocean Highway where many see the Pacific for the first time. Closing this to all traffic is a huge mistake and another win just for the bike riders who contribute little or nothing to the financial aspects of their continued claims on the City's roads and vistas. I gather SF Rec & Parks has failed to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit. This seems to disregard the Outer Sunset's community concerns and local impact of closing the Great Highway to cars. The redirection of thousands of drivers to and through surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

It's OK to close on some weekends just for an alternate's sake. But don't shut it down completely.

Please support the appeal and at least allow weekday use by cars/vans/light trucks of the Great Highway.

Thank you!

Sincerely,
Dick Robinson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Gehlken <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Gehlken**
My email address is **cabrito@sonic.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Gehlken



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jill Guertin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jill Guertin
My email address is jillks19@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jill Guertin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jeremy Hughes <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jeremy Hughes**
My email address is **jeremymhughes@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jeremy Hughes



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Greg Giachino <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Greg Giachino**
My email address is **greg@emergebc.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Greg Giachino



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Natalie Simotas <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Natalie Simotas
My email address is Blueagyr12@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Natalie Simotas



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kathryn Bates <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Kathryn Bates**
My email address is **kathrynbates@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Bates



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Georgina Costales <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Georgina Costales**
My email address is **gcostales@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Georgina Costales



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jonah Purinton <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:42 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Jonah Purinton**
My email address is **jonah.purinton@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jonah Purinton



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charlton Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Charlton Lee**
My email address is **charlton.viola@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charlton Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Charlotte McMinn <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Charlotte McMinn
My email address is charminn@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Charlotte McMinn



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Frank Tatko <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:43 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Frank Tatko**
My email address is **ftatko@mac.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Frank Tatko



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Harry <harrypwhalen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:58 PM
Subject: Great Highway pilot project

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Harry, and I am a resident of the Outer Sunset.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I use the Great Highway to walk with friends and family, and I like having it clear when I go to the beach.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Young <dyoungv@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS);
info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov;
ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

David Young

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Emilia Jankowski <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Emilia Jankowski**
My email address is **ehjankowski@att.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

The Great Highway should be available to all which includes cars. We all must learn to live, play and commute together.

Sincerely,
Emilia Jankowski



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sergey Dubenko <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sergey Dubenko**
My email address is **sdubenko76@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sergey Dubenko



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Margaret Schulze <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Margaret Schulze**
My email address is **margaretschulze@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Margaret Schulze



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rick Montenegro <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: 1 Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Rick Montenegro**
My email address is **rickmontenegro@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rick Montenegro



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jennet Nazzal <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:47 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jennet Nazzal
My email address is jennetrn@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jennet Nazzari



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elizabeth Fighera <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:50 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Elizabeth Fighera**
My email address is **lily@lilyhats.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Figuera



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Terri DeSalvo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Terri DeSalvo**
My email address is **terride3@earthlink.net**

There is already an entire wide beach and a beautiful trail down the center of the Great Highway for people to enjoy. Please leave the roadway for cars. Taking the roadway away only makes for more traffic and congestion in the residential areas. (The cars don't just magically disappear.) It also makes the beach less accessible for a lot of residents.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders,

compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Terri DeSalvo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Donna Rand <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Donna Rand
My email address is okdonna55@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Donna Rand



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mikhail Keselman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mikhail Keselman**

My email address is **mkeselman@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mikhail Keselman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: mimi clarke <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is mimi clarke

My email address is mimiclarke@mac.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
mimi clarke



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mark Rand <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:50 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mark Rand
My email address is okmor@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mark Rand



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: JOHN CERVANTES <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **JOHN CERVANTES**
My email address is **city10s@pacbell.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
JOHN CERVANTES



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: mimi clarke <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **mimi clarke**
My email address is **mimiclarke@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
mimi clarke



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Arie Knoops <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Arie Knoops
My email address is aknoops@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Arie Knoops



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jung Lau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:56 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jung Lau
My email address is junglealltheway@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jung Lau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Abi Wilson <abicarawilson@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:29 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Abi Wilson and I am a resident of Noe Valley.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The community spirit of the GH on weekends is second to none, and brings joy and togetherness to this wonderful city's locals and tourists alike.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Abi Wilson

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Holly Sisson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Holly Sisson
My email address is hollyalexissison@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Holly

Sincerely,
Holly Sisson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jean Barish <jeanbbarish@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:36 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Fw: Public Comment in Support of Appeals Nos. 23-062, 23-064, and 23-065; Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Blvd. and Surrounding Streets
Attachments: Board of Appeals Re. Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit 24_01_31.docx

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

Attached is an email I sent to the BoA on Jan 31, 2024, regarding the referenced Appeals.

I have just reviewed the file for this appeal, and do not see my letter in the extensive collection in the file. I'm not sure I understand what happened. Please include my letter in the file.

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Jean

Jean B Barish
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

Stay safe and be well

From: Jean Barish <jeanbbarish@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:55 PM
To: boardofappeals@sfgov.org <boardofappeals@sfgov.org>
Subject: Public Comment in Support of Appeals Nos. 23-062, 23-064, and 23-065; Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Blvd. and Surrounding Streets

Please see the attached letter regarding the referenced Appeals scheduled to be heard by the Board of Appeals on Feb. 7, 2024.

Thank you for your assistance.

Jean
Jean B Barish
jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

To

San Francisco Board of Appeals
49 South Van Ness, Suite 1475
San Francisco, CA 94103
BoardofAppeals@sfgov.org

From

Jean Barish, Richmond District Resident
Email: jeanbbarish@hotmail.com

Subject

Public Comment in Support of Appeals Nos. 23-062, 23-064, and 23-065; Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Blvd. and Surrounding Streets

Hearing Date

February 7, 2024 at 5:00 pm, City Hall, Room 416

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing with regard to the closure of the Upper Great Highway between Lincoln Way and Sloat Blvd. and the retroactive issuance of a Coastal Zone Permit by the Planning Commission.

For the reasons set forth in their briefs, I support all of the Appellants, and ask that you deny the approval of the retroactive issuance of a Coastal Zone Permit for this section of the Upper Great Highway.

There are both procedural and substantive reasons why this Coastal Zone Permit should not be granted.

I. The Coastal Zone Permit Was Inappropriately Granted Retroactively Almost One Year After the Ordinance Approving Partial Closure of the Upper Great Highway Was Passed

On December 13, 2022, the SF Board of Supervisors approved a pilot project closing the Upper Great Highway to motor vehicles between Lincoln Way and Sloat Blvd. from 12 noon on Fridays until 6 am Mondays, as well as certain holidays.

(<https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11538748&GUID=A958978C-FCDC-4EE5-AE59-F241CE27345F>)

Section 1 (h) of this Ordinance states that: "Upon enactment of this ordinance, the Recreation and Park Department intends to apply to the Planning Department for a permit to ensure compliance with any applicable coastal development requirements. The Planning Commission will review the application at a public hearing to determine whether the permit will be issued, as required by law."

On January 18, 2023, the Recreation and Parks Department filed an application for a Coastal Zone Permit pursuant to Planning Code Sec. 330. But this Application did not come before the Planning Commission for approval until November 9, 2023, almost a year after the Ordinance was passed. (<file:///C:/Users/Jean%20Barish/Downloads/Nov.9%20agenda.pdf>, Agenda Item 12)

This raises two procedural questions that must be answered before a Coastal Zone Permit can be approved.

- First, was it appropriate for the Board of Supervisors to permit a Coastal Zone Permit to be granted retroactively, after the Upper Great Highway was closed on weekends and holidays, or should the Upper Great Highway have remained open on weekends and holidays until final approval of a Coastal Zone Permit?
- Second, even if the Recreation and Parks Department timely applied for a Coastal Zone Permit, why was there a delay of almost a year before the permit application was considered by the Planning Department. And, again, should the Upper Great Highway have remained open pending this approval process?

In the interest of due process, I maintain it was inappropriate for the Upper Great Highway to have been closed before final approval of a Coastal Zone Permit. Failure to timely apply for a permit resulted in the inappropriate closure of the Upper Great Highway. And until the approval process has been concluded, which could include an appeal to the California Coastal Commission, the Upper Great Highway should be reopened on weekends and holidays.

II. The Coastal Zone Permit Should not be Approved Due to Significant Environmental Impacts Caused by Closure of the Upper Great Highway

There are many reasons the weekend and holiday closure of the Upper Great Highway significantly impacts the environment, the quality of life in the surrounding neighborhoods, and the safety of all San Franciscans.

- The sand dunes, within which are protected nesting grounds to the endangered Snowy Plovers, are mercilessly being destroyed by excessive foot traffic that forges social paths over them for beach access instead of beach access being confined to the seven paved crosswalks located by each traffic light when vehicles are driving on the highway.
- The stop-and-go traffic on streets adjoining the Upper Great Highway creates more toxic emissions, air and noise pollution than when vehicles drive on the Upper Great Highway, where traffic safely flows nonstop through timed traffic lights.
- Many special events are now being held on the Great Highway on weekends, resulting in hundreds of visitors to the area, many of whom abuse the dunes by sliding down them on cardboard sleds, by bringing bicycles atop them, picnicking on them and leaving behind plastic and other trash. These visitors also add to the number of private vehicles clogging streets and creating pedestrian safety problems on adjoining streets.

San Francisco Board of Appeals
Page 2
January 31, 2024

- Emergency Responders are delayed to beach rescues by not having easy access to the southbound lane and then slowing down to negotiate a road blocked by bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Emergency Responders are delayed enroute to hospitals and to residential emergency calls due to speed humps and traffic gridlock caused by the thousands of extra vehicles diverted from the highway onto the surrounding streets delay.
- When the Great Highway Project was approved over a year ago, it was understood there would be a study of the impact of this closure on the environment and the surrounding neighborhood. It is unknown if such a study has even begun. This Coastal Permit should not be granted unless and until a Pilot Study is underway.

For the foregoing reasons I respectfully request that you support Appellants and deny the grant of the Coastal Zone Permit. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Jean B Barish
Richmond District Resident

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: brian kim <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **brian kim**

My email address is **supercelpkmon@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
brian kim



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brenda Johnson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brenda Johnson**
My email address is **brendaajohnson@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brenda Johnson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: shandra yoshimi <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **shandra yoshimi**
My email address is **skyoshimi@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
shandra yoshimi



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Katherine Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:00 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Katherine Lee**
My email address is **shumdra@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Katherine Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: ed kim <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **ed kim**
My email address is **etukim@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
ed kim



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Matt Kamenski <matt.kamenski@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:47 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Matt and I have been a resident of Glen Park since 2020, and of San Francisco since 2011.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I am an avid road cyclist throughout San Francisco, which I consider to be one of the most beautiful places to cycle in the world. I often ride on the Great Highway and love its car-free lanes along Ocean Beach on weekends. I think its stunning coastal views are breathtaking, and best experienced not in a motor vehicle. I think it is a truly unique, special place in our city that does not need to be spoiled by cars.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Best, Matt

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Puechner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Karen Puechner
My email address is Knuther99@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Puechner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Scott Gutterman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Scott Gutterman

My email address is guttermanscott@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Scott Gutterman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jolly Ann Ong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jolly Ann Ong
My email address is jolibee18@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jolly Ann Ong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Insel Mainau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Insel Mainau
My email address is inselmainau2000@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Insel Mainau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Thelma Puechner <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:09 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Thelma Puechner
My email address is tpuechner@att.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Thelma Puechner



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marie Calendar <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:11 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Marie Calendar
My email address is mariecalendar2000@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marie Calendar



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Grant Ingram <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Grant Ingram**
My email address is **grant.ingram@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Grant Ingram



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Devorah Joseph <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:20 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Devorah Joseph**
My email address is **drdevisf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Devorah Joseph



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Faith Schneider <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Faith Schneider
My email address is fks6293@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Faith Schneider



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gary Kendall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:17 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Gary Kendall
My email address is gary_k@pacbell.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Gary Kendall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Scott Tong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:24 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Scott Tong**

My email address is **acumanscott@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Scott Tong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rita Hock <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:19 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Rita Hock

My email address is truffletemptations@pacbell.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rita Hock



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carolyn Lucas <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:22 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Carolyn Lucas
My email address is cl78910@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carolyn Lucas



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mabel Ng <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:13 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mabel Ng**
My email address is **mcfng@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mabel Ng



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Steve Camahort <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:22 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Steve Camahort**
My email address is **stevecamahort@paulhastings.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Steve Camahort



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Yasmin Staton <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:26 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Yasmin Staton
My email address is ydmello@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Yasmin Staton



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Yasmin Staton <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:26 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Yasmin Staton
My email address is ydmello@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Yasmin Staton



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Florinda Battad <stopandsmelltheflo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:00 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Florinda Battad

Sent from my iPhone

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: George Courtsunis <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is George Courtsunis
My email address is gjcourt@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
George Courtsunis



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:41 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is John Lee
My email address is jmlee128@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mary Innes <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mary Innes**
My email address is **metuvilla@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mary Innes



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Laine Buckingham <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:35 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Laine Buckingham
My email address is blainebb@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Consideration for the health and welfare of the residents who live in and use roads we pay for has to have more importance. Open the Great Highway

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Laine Buckingham



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mark Staton <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:27 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mark Staton**

My email address is **msstaton@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mark Staton



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Young <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Young**
My email address is **mhyoung510@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Young



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Young <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:39 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Young**
My email address is **mhyoung510@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Young



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: BYRON HO <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **BYRON HO**
My email address is **bkh125@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
BYRON HO



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: William Diefenbach <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:37 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **William Diefenbach**
My email address is **bill.diefenbach@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
William Diefenbach



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sherry Lau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:46 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sherry Lau**
My email address is **slaufu@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sherry Lau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: KAREN HO <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **KAREN HO**
My email address is **KHRN6121@YAHOO.COM**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
KAREN HO



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Yuanda Zhang <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:48 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Yuanda Zhang

My email address is yuandazhang@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Yuanda Zhang



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Yanhui Liu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:51 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Yanhui Liu**
My email address is **yanhuiliu@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions. .

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Yanhui Liu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jennifer Kloetzel <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:10 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jennifer Kloetzel
My email address is jencricket@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast. I think about this often and it's terrifying. It's one of the few ways for many of us to leave the city.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents,

affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity. This is a huge issue for me--I truly rely on the Great Highway--to get to work, to get my son to school, to go shopping, etc.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Kloetzel



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rodney Leong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:06 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Rodney Leong
My email address is rleong@rocketmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rodney Leong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stan Erhart <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Stan Erhart**
My email address is **stan@erhart.net**

Closing the Great Highway to cars, even if only on weekends, is a great disservice to the people living on the western edge of San Francisco. People won't drive 3/4 of a mile to Sunset Blvd to go across town, and they shouldn't have to. Instead they will drive down the nearby surface streets that are more suited to bicycle traffic. Which means extra noise and fumes 24 hours a day for the people living on those busy streets. This is totally unfair to them and to everyone who needs to drive north and south on the west side.

It's an obvious safety issue also, since it impacts emergency services in a very busy city. Our city is traversed daily from communities both north and south of us, and we need more good roads to handle the traffic, not less, especially since the city and state are planning to allow much more housing.

Please re-open the Great Highway to vehicles 24/7/365, even if only to Sloat Blvd. The city and its working public need it.

Thank you,
Stan Erhart
Outer Richmond, SF

Sincerely,
Stan Erhart



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dennis McMahon <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:54 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Dennis McMahon**
My email address is **wisham@siprep.org**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Dennis McMahon



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Albert Gao <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:07 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Albert Gao**
My email address is **albertgao@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Albert Gao



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Frank Cassinell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Frank Cassinell
My email address is fcassinelli66@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Frank Cassinell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tom Smith <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:08 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Tom Smith
My email address is tomsmith1330@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tom Smith



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: RICHERT ROBINS <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **RICHERT ROBINS**
My email address is **r@ricstar.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
RICHERT ROBINS



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Paul Mohun <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:04 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Paul Mohun**
My email address is **prm5@georgetown.edu**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Paul Mohun



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jimmy Yu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:10 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jimmy Yu
My email address is jy1437@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jimmy Yu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ellen Koivisto & Gene Thompson <offstage@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:27 PM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); Rachel Clyde; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Save the Great Parkway!

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

My name is Ellen Koivisto and I live on the Great Highway, between K and L.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The change in the situation out here has been enormous: lots more people accessing the beach, more space for families and community events, a reduction in pollution (noise, Cu, CO2, etc.), a place for classes and gatherings, easier transition to marathons when needed, and so much more.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Ellen Koivisto

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Carol Chichester <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Carol Chichester**
My email address is **ccchichester@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Carol Chichester



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Xiuling Wu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:23 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Xiuling Wu**
My email address is **chriswu_187@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
XiuLing Wu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tim Isom <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:16 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Tim Isom**
My email address is **timisom@comcast.net**

It is a main artery for the western parts of SF.
There is a good reason it was built in the first place.
There also is a beautiful walking and bicycle path adjacent for pedestrians and cyclist - AND
there is Ocean Beach

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders,

compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tim Isom



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Daniel Choi <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:14 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Daniel Choi**

My email address is **daniel.choi@kp.org**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Daniel Choi



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Yvette Corkrean <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:12 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Yvette Corkrean
My email address is yvettecorkrean@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Yvette Corkrean



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: John Barkan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:18 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **John Barkan**
My email address is **johnbarkan1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
John Barkan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Meina Young <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:25 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Meina Young**
My email address is **meinayoung1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity. Please open the Great Highway to help cars cross the Golden Gate Park and share the scenic route.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Meina Young



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ed Tavasieff <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:45 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ed Tavasieff**
My email address is **edso_fish@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ed Tavasieff



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Keith Kandarian <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:31 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Keith Kandarian**
My email address is **tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Keith Kandarian



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Cantu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:38 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David Cantu**
My email address is **david_cantu@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Cantu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Teresa Shaw <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:30 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Teresa Shaw
My email address is tawny.sapient0c@icloud.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Teresa Shaw



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jared Alexander <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jared Alexander
My email address is vgsc@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jared Alexander



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Yat Chiu <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:52 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Yat Chiu
My email address is sf2133@outlook.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Yat Chiu



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Fred Muhlheim` <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:53 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Fred Muhlheim`**
My email address is **fmuhlheim@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Fred Muhlheim`



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marina Klochkov <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:57 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Marina Klochkov**
My email address is **marinaklochkov@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Marina Klochkov



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Natalie Podell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Natalie Podell**
My email address is **natalie@podell.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Natalie Podell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Leslie Boin Podell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:58 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Leslie Boin Podell
My email address is leslie@podell.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Leslie Boin Podell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nick Podell <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:59 PM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nick Podell
My email address is nick@podell.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nick Podell



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nicholas Podell jr. <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:00 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nicholas Podell jr.
My email address is nicky@podell.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Podell jr.



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Dorf <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:03 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Dorf**
My email address is **michael_dorf@comcast.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Dorf



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lisa Klinck-shea <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:12 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Lisa Klinck-shea
My email address is lisa.klinckshea@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lisa Klinck-shea



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: DEBRA HOWARD <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:18 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **DEBRA HOWARD**
My email address is **deb127@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
DEBRA HOWARD



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Elinor Liberman <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:29 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Elinor Liberman
My email address is ebkljune@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Elinor Liberman



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Exequiel Borromeo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:37 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Exequiel Borromeo
My email address is jakeborr@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Exequiel Borromeo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Wallace Gee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:39 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Wallace Gee**

My email address is **wallace_gee@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Wallace Gee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kimberly Borrromeo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:39 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kimberly Borrromeo
My email address is ksktoh@comcast.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Borromeo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kathy McCovey <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:39 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Kathy McCovey**
My email address is **sfkamc@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kathy McCovey



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Beatrix Lazard <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:42 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Beatrix Lazard**
My email address is **beatie@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Beatrix Lazard



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Matthew Denny <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:54 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Matthew Denny**
My email address is **dennym999@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Matthew Denny



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Boris Levine <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:31 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Boris Levine**
My email address is **borlev@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Boris Levine



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Michael Kim <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:50 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Michael Kim**
My email address is **michaelkim@pacbell.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Michael Kim



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David O'Brien <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:42 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David O'Brien**
My email address is **davidobrienusa@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David O'Brien



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Tim Runde <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:03 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Tim Runde
My email address is tim@runde-inc.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Tim Runde



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Steven Schroeder <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:18 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Steven Schroeder**
My email address is **mcma111@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Steven Schroeder



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Paul Peterson <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:27 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Paul Peterson**
My email address is **golfkart@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Paul Peterson



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Erin McGrew <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:34 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Erin McGrew
My email address is emcgrew@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Erin McGrew



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Evelyn Jones <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:41 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Evelyn Jones
My email address is eviebohan@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Evelyn Jones



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Anita Ho <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:41 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Anita Ho**
My email address is **cordeon@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Anita Ho



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stone Melet <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:46 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Stone Melet**
My email address is **stonemelet@hmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Stone Melet



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kate Qvale <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:51 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Kate Qvale
My email address is kateqvale@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kate Qvale



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mark Finigan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:54 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mark Finigan**
My email address is **mark_finigan@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

I live and work in San Francisco. I urge you to let a highway be a highway, reopen it. No one is closing the sidewalks.

Sincerely,
Mark Finigan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Phyllis Nabhan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Phyllis Nabhan**
My email address is **phylnabhan@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Phyllis Nabhan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Robert Pritchard <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:00 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Robert Pritchard**
My email address is **ropritchard@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Robert Pritchard



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Don Climent <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:00 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Don Climent
My email address is donc4496@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Don Climent



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Edward Beltran <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:09 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: 1 Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Edward Beltran**
My email address is **garchdes@hotmail.com**

Sincerely,
Edward Beltran



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Serena Chan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:14 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Serena Chan
My email address is serenalhs@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Serena Chan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Nancy Benjamin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:16 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Nancy Benjamin
My email address is burlesquegoddess@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Nancy Benjamin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: jill ellefsen <jillelf1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:21 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep UGH Closed!!

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jill Ellefsen and I have lived on the Great Highway for over 25 years. Thanks to the closure of the Upper Great Highway, our community has thrived and become stronger. Children have safely learned how to ride bikes and skateboards, older folks can walk on a car free smooth path using mobility devices and I often see multi generational families and friends strolling, talking, laughing and enjoying our beautiful seaside. What a gift to our city this has been!!! I run into a neighbor every time I walk on UGH and the vibe can only be described as joyful.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it!!!!!!!

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Email Addresses: Sent from my iPhone

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Diane Fong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:20 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Diane Fong
My email address is dlfong56@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Diane Fong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: jill ellefsen <jillelf1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:22 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep UGH closed!

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jill Ellefsen and I have lived on the Great Highway for over 25 years. Thanks to the closure of the Upper Great Highway, our community has thrived and become stronger. Children have safely learned how to ride bikes and skateboards, older folks can walk on a car free smooth path using mobility devices and I often see multi generational families and friends strolling, talking, laughing and enjoying our beautiful seaside. What a gift to our city this has been!!! I run into a neighbor every time I walk on UGH and the vibe can only be described as joyful.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it!!!!!!!

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Email Addresses: Sent from my iPhone

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David Bancroft <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:22 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David Bancroft**
My email address is **sfdavidbancroft@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David Bancroft



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Andrew B Gottlieb <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:22 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Andrew B Gottlieb
My email address is agottlieb51@icloud.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Andrew B Gottlieb



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Seth Gottlieb <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:23 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Seth Gottlieb**
My email address is **gottlieb54@mac.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Seth Gottlieb



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Catherine Sparacino <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:24 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Catherine Sparacino**
My email address is **c.sparacino@google.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Catherine Sparacino



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Maryanne Razzo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:30 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Maryanne Razzo
My email address is maryannevrazzo@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Maryanne Razzo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dorothea Kaz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:52 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Dorothea Kaz**
My email address is **dorotheakaz@sbcglobal.net**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Dorothea Kaz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Richard Chui <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:54 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Richard Chui**
My email address is **richard.chui@outlook.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Richard Chui



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mandy Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:51 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Mandy Lee**
My email address is **icopath@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mandy Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ron Karpowicz <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:58 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Ron Karpowicz
My email address is ronalkarpowicz@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ron Karpowicz



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Shari Videlock <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Shari Videlock
My email address is shari@osbert.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Shari Videlock



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Susan CroninParano <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:08 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Susan CroninParano
My email address is susieparano@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Susan CroninParano



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ralph Chapin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:15 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Ralph Chapin**
My email address is **ralphchapin@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Ralph Chapin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: David BSs <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:15 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **David BSs**
My email address is **davidbasssf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
David BSs



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: connie lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:15 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **connie lee**

My email address is **conniemlvs@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
connie lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jamie LaChapelle <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:15 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jamie LaChapelle
My email address is jamiedac@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jamie LaChapelle



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Melba Jamie O'Keefe <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:17 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Melba Jamie O'Keefe**
My email address is **jokeefe415@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

For someone like me who has to commute, with no good access to public transportation, this has been a nightmare scenario.

Sincerely,
Melba Jamie O'Keefe



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Robert Mokry <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:19 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Robert Mokry
My email address is mokryrob@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Robert Mokry



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Annie Chang <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:23 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Annie Chang**
My email address is **chang.annie@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Annie Chang



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cynthia Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:23 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Cynthia Lee**
My email address is **cyathena04@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Emily Chen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:26 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Emily Chen

My email address is cjqemily@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Emily Chen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Bo Bo Fung <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:27 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Bo Bo Fung**
My email address is **y3829@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Bo Bo Fung



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Marc Joseph Rabideau <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:27 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Marc Joseph Rabideau
My email address is marcrabideau@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

I have lived in The Richmond District for 45 years. I have a Physical Therapy Clinic in the Sunset at 18th Avenue @ Taraval Street for 30 years. I would like the Great Highway OPEN 24/7 now that the Pandemic has passed. Many of my disabled patients have difficulties accessing the Center for the Handicapped across from the SF Zoo. Especially challenging on weekends and when the GH closes at NOON on Friday, commuters and deliverers have a terrible time negotiating their routes. PLEASE RECONSIDER YOUR VOTE AND OPEN THE GREAT HIGHWAY AS IT WAS MEANT TO BE. THANK YOU FROM MARC JOSEPH RABIDEAU, PT.

Sincerely,
Marc Joseph Rabideau



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Monika Rothenbuhler <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:28 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Monika Rothenbuhler**
My email address is **Brandywine13@outlook.com**

Please fully reopen the Great Highway.

Traffic does not just melt away. It just goes more through the Park and neighborhoods, not designed to handle freeway traffic.

IT'S A HIGHWAY and a great one at that. We have a whole park for us to recreate in, a wide beach, an extensive asphalt walkway... we don't need to walk/bike on the highway!!

Sincerely,
Monika Rothenbuhler



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Betty Yen <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:47 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Betty Yen**
My email address is **bettyyen111@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Betty Yen



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jamie Kendall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:50 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jamie Kendall
My email address is jkendall301@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Jamie Kendall
Native San Franciscan
64 year resident of Richmond District

Sincerely,
Jamie Kendall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Scott Brown <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:45 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Scott Brown**
My email address is **scott@lisabyrne.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Scott Brown



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Stephen Gorski <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:51 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Stephen Gorski
My email address is sjgorskilaw@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Stephen Gorski



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Sandra Chan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Sandra Chan**
My email address is **sandrachansf@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Sandra Chan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: romando lucchesi <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:58 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is romando lucchesi
My email address is romando9@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
romando lucchesi



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Brooke Perkins <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:06 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Brooke Perkins**
My email address is **ebhally@aol.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Brooke Perkins



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jingwen Tan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:08 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jingwen Tan

My email address is barrytan21th@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jingwen Tan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Rudy Asercion <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:10 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Rudy Asercion
My email address is RudyAsercion@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Rudy Asercion



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jianjian Guo <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:11 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Jianjian Guo

My email address is cyber_kwok@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Jianjian Guo



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Philip Wing <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:13 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Philip Wing
My email address is philip_wing@sonic.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Bicyclists don't respect the right of way of pedestrians. I've seen one *plow* through families crossing to the beach.

Sincerely,
Philip Wing



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Peter Batanides <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:16 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Peter Batanides
My email address is batanides@att.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Peter Batanides



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Mark S. Weinberger <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:17 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Mark S. Weinberger
My email address is msweinberger@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Mark S. Weinberger



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Zan Armstrong <zan.armstrong@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:22 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: please uphold the Planning Commissions' coastal zone permit

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Zan Armstrong and I am a resident of the Inner Sunset.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

The Upper Great Highway as a walkway means that my family spends more time at the beach and near the ocean. It's great for mental and physical health, connection to our larger SF community, connection to nature, and for quality time with family and friends. For example, we spent hours at the surfing event last fall (even though we're not surfers) learning, creating & doing activities, and playing. And had an amazing time during the Great Hauntway including running into so many other families we knew from all over the city! My daughter rode her longest bike ride ever from our house all the way down to bike on the upper great highway (almost entirely on slow or pedestrian streets). And, I look into future and see the climate change challenges affecting her & her peers, I want to be able to tell her how our community was a leader.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

- Suzanne Armstrong

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Pugay <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:23 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Karen Pugay
My email address is pugaykm@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Pugay



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Erin Feeney <efeeney85@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:27 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Save the Great Walkway

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

SF Board of Appeals,

You have the chance today to continue leading the country in demonstrating the potential to reclaim city space from cars to enhance health and livability. Please extend the permit to allow the car-free use of this space. SF's Vision Zero campaign has failed to reduce fatalities of vulnerable right of way users due to irresponsible road abusers. We must continue to prioritize car-free spaces for people to enjoy for health and recreation, kids to have safe spaces to play and drivers to understand that just because they are more powerful, does not mean they are more important than others.

This is a well used and love amenity in the Outer Sunset, and a space that our natural environment is taking back (at a huge cost to the city to try to prevent for the sake of cars).

Thank you,
Erin Feeney

The following table shows the results of the regression analysis. The dependent variable is the natural log of sales. The independent variables are the natural log of advertising, the natural log of price, and the natural log of the number of salespeople. The results show that advertising has a positive effect on sales, while price has a negative effect. The number of salespeople also has a positive effect on sales.

3. Results

The first step in the analysis was to estimate the demand curve. This was done by regressing the natural log of sales on the natural log of price. The results show that there is a negative relationship between the natural log of price and the natural log of sales. This is consistent with the theory of demand, which predicts that as price increases, sales will decrease.

The second step was to estimate the supply curve. This was done by regressing the natural log of sales on the natural log of the number of salespeople. The results show that there is a positive relationship between the natural log of the number of salespeople and the natural log of sales. This is consistent with the theory of supply, which predicts that as the number of salespeople increases, sales will increase.

The final step was to estimate the profit function. This was done by regressing the natural log of profit on the natural log of price and the natural log of the number of salespeople. The results show that there is a positive relationship between the natural log of price and the natural log of profit, and a negative relationship between the natural log of the number of salespeople and the natural log of profit.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Aisling Crowley <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:28 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Aisling Crowley
My email address is aislingreilly@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Aisling Crowley



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kate Bueler <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:34 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Honorable San Francisco Board of Appeals,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline and community getting access to open space and nature. In addition- sand regularly goes on the road leading to closures further proving the need for multiple uses for this space.

This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast.

Thanks for supporting the pilot and commitment to access to nature for us all,
Kate Bueler

Kate Bueler
kate.bueler@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94121

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Lee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:35 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Karen Lee
My email address is thezoohouse@hotmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Lee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Cathy Sun <cathysun14@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:36 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Save the GHWY Park

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Cathy Sun and I am a resident of Inner Richmond.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

I love biking and running along the Great Highway on the weekends. I feel really safe there, and after all the news about pedestrians getting hit/killed by cars, I view this as a safe space.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Anne Sajdera <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:44 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Anne Sajdera
My email address is asajdera@icloud.com

Personal request first: please keep the Coastal Highway open to all vehicles, including cars. I understand and support all efforts to combat climate change and encourage people to get out of their cars, and walk, take public transit, ride a bike, etc., but this is not the way. I own a car but I also regularly ride public transit, and I can say you will get far more people riding transit by making it safe, frequent, and clean than you will by shutting down entire highways, or making "slow streets." The Coastal Highway is a way to get from north to south in this city which we absolutely need and there is no corresponding bus route nearby that runs well enough to make it worth trying to catch one. The covid lockdown is over and we need to move on. Please return usage of streets to cars. Yes, make them safe for cyclists and definitely improve the frequency of bus routes, but let's acknowledge we all live in a city and everyone needs to be able to get around in whatever manner they need.

**SOAR composed this request, but I agree with each point:
I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.**

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Anne Sajdera



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Alanna Greenham <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:47 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is Alanna Greenham
My email address is alanna.greenham@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Alanna Greenham



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Dylan Gattey <dylan.gattey@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:51 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); ChanStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com; NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov
Subject: Support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

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

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,
Dylan

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Victoria Cheng <vicheng2@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:55 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: The Great Highway

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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Victoria Cheng and I am a resident of Pac Heights.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

As an avid cyclist and runner, it has been incredible the Great Highway available to enjoy the beauty of San Francisco and to have a safe space from cars. As a driver, it has not felt like an impediment to have it blocked to car traffic.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you,
Victoria

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Helen Gee <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:50 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Helen Gee**
My email address is **helen@pooter.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Helen Gee



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: wendy kan <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:55 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **wendy kan**
My email address is **westamp@hotmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
wendy kan



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Darren Yasukawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:51 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

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

My name is **Darren Yasukawa**
My email address is **d_yasukawa@yahoo.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Darren Yasukawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Karen Breslin <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:56 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is Karen Breslin
My email address is kbsmail@sbcglobal.net

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Karen Breslin



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kamron Shushtar <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:57 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is Kamron Shushtar
My email address is kkshushtar@yahoo.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kamron Shushtar



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Phillip Wong <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:57 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is Phillip Wong
My email address is philwongnobhillsf@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Phillip Wong



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kayla Yasukawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:59 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is **Kayla Yasukawa**
My email address is **kaylayasukawa@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity. I work at the VA hospital so it has been difficult to get to work, especially having to detour from slow streets.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kayla Yasukawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Madeleine Bass <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:00 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is **Madeleine Bass**
My email address is **madsheldon1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Madeleine Bass



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Madeleine Bass <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:02 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is **Madeleine Bass**
My email address is **madsheldon1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Madeleine Bass



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Diane Janakes-Zasada <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:07 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is **Diane Janakes-Zasada**
My email address is **djanakes@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Diane Janakes-Zasada



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Gea Gurun <ggurun@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:17 AM
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; BoardofAppeals (PAB); Stokle, Brian (REC); ChanStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Commissioners, I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065. As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway. In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses. Thank you,
Gea Gurun

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: jessica Rix <jperezrix@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:22 AM
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; BoardofAppeals (PAB); Stokle, Brian (REC); ChanStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

The Rix Family our 2 boys and dog

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lex Tyndall <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:17 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is Lex Tyndall
My email address is lextyndall@gmail.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Lex Tyndall



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: kevin O'Reilly <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:20 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is Kevin O'Reilly
My email address is cavan102@aol.com

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Kevin O'Reilly



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: June Kitagawa <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:19 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is June Kitagawa
My email address is june.kitagawa@yahoo.com

As a native San Francisco who is finding it harder and harder to stay in love with SF with all of the insane, family-unfriendly street changes that the City is implementing, I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Please return the Great Highway to normal vehicular traffic. The SF Bike Coalition clearly doesn't care about families and people who just cannot ride bikes to get on with their daily needs. If you want families to remain in the City, this kind of nonsense has to stop.

Thank you,
June

Sincerely,
June Kitagawa



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Annie Bai <hello@livablesf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:19 AM
To: BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); MelgarStaff (BOS);
NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); info@openthegreathighway.com
Subject: I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is **Annie Bai**
My email address is **caibaisf123@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

Environmental Impact on Native Species: The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

Emergency Response Delays: The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,
Annie Bai



Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Ann M. Foley <afoley@berkeley.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:26 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Uphold permit for the Great Highway pilot project!

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Ann Foley and I am currently a resident of Berkeley, CA. I lived in San Francisco from 1980 - 86, and my bicycle was (and still is) my primary mode of transportation. I have fond memories and photos of my many bike trips up and down the stretch of Highway 1 from the Cliff House to the Zoo. In more recent years, Sunday Streets events have been a fun reason to make the trip across the Bay.

I was thrilled to learn about the Great Highway pilot project, which promises to make the coastline even more inviting! It's a major sign that San Francisco is working to provide safer spaces for the community--as well as visitors and tourists--to get around and enjoy its spectacular vistas. This project will both increase safety and encourage more recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline. I hear that it will also enable the City to collect data on the future of the Great Highway itself.

I urge you to uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and *** REJECT *** all appeals against it. This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022, San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

Again--Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject these appeals!

Sincerely,
Ann Foley
Berkeley, CA

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: ThinkKEVIN <thinkKEVIN@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:37 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Please uphold Coastal Zone Permit Great Highway

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Kevin Campbell. I am a 24 year resident of Westwood Highlands. A charming West of Twin Peaks neighborhood.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

Many times each month my wife and I enjoy the approximately 2 mile walk along the Great Highway from Sloat to Lincoln. We particularly love the exquisite view of the Marin Headlands. This eye popping vista overtakes your spirit as it gently appears from behind the dunes at Santiago. The absence of traffic noise and exhaust smell makes this experience an affirmation of the San Francisco spirit. You don't get this enchanting panorama from a car.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you.

The Campbells

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Waller Crenshaw <wallercrenshaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:39 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); Rachel Clyde; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS); PrestonStaff (BOS)
Subject: Coastal Zone Appeal -Keep Bicycles on Costal Highway

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Commissioners,

My wife Misako and I Waller Crenshaw reside in Haight Ashbury neighborhood.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

We ride our bicycles every day in the beautiful car free golden gate park to the ocean. On weekends we have a bonus ride on the beautiful car free coastal highway. It is so nice to see everyone from the neighborhood walking their dogs, riding bikes with their young children, and just walking. This is a true treasure for our city. Let's keep it car free.

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, the Ocean Beach Master Plan, Vision Zero plan and the Climate Action Plan.

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you.

Waller and Misako

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jason Gonzales <jason.gonzales23@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:40 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS); rclyde@sfbike.org; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; ChanStaff (BOS)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jason Gonzales and I am a resident of the Outer Sunset (Outer Taraval).

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please reject the appeals against it.

[Briefly share your personal experience with the Great Highway and why you love it.]

This permit is in alignment with the pilot approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in December 2022. This permit is also in alignment with San Francisco's [Local Coastal Plan](#), the [Ocean Beach Master Plan](#), [Vision Zero plan](#) and the [Climate Action Plan](#).

The Great Highway pilot project improves safety and connectivity for people traveling with sustainable forms of transportation. The pilot project also enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and provides safe space for the entire community to recreate and get around. It is crucial to maintain this pilot so city agencies can collect data to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

Jason Gonzales
ph: 415.858.0207

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Lauren Mizock <lauren.mizock@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:41 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS);
info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov;
ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Jason <jason.r.corning@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:44 AM
To: MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov; BoardofAppeals (PAB); Stokle, Brian (REC); ChanStaff (BOS); EngardioStaff (BOS); info@greathighwaypark.com
Subject: Please Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Jason Corning
1771 48th Ave

Mejia, Xiomara (BOA)

From: Kieran Farr <kieran.farr@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:47 AM
To: Stokle, Brian (REC); BoardofAppeals (PAB); EngardioStaff (BOS);
info@greathighwaypark.com; MelgarStaff (BOS); NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov;
ChanStaff (BOS)
Subject: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise! Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064,
23-065

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Commissioners,

Do you want to be known as the City leadership that killed one of the "52 Places for a Changed World" according to the New York Times?

<https://www.sfgate.com/local/article/SF-location-made-New-York-Times-list-of-52-Places-16776101.php>

I sure hope you want to keep this treasured space!

I'm writing to insist that you uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

My children and their friends ages 3 - 7 years learned how to bike on this path on a weekend just like the millions of other visitors over the years of this pilot.

This permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022 and furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and providing safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast. Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway.

In addition, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,
Kieran and family

