

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT  
455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 300  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
PHONE: (415) 904-5260  
FAX: (415) 904-5400  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



# Th10a

A-2-SNF-24-0009 (Great Highway Vehicular Restrictions)

May 9, 2024

CORRESPONDENCE

**From:** [Joey Kotfica](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** board of appeals 2/7/2024 meeting comment  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 5:44:04 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of maintaining the Upper Great Highway Park permit. The "Great Walkway" has been a tremendous enhancement to city infrastructure.

On the weekends, when I bike on the great highway, I see all manner of citizens out: seniors, families with young children, athletes, cyclists learning to ride, and more. It's a proper melting pot that should be celebrated and maintained.

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.

Thank you,

Joey Kotfica  
94117

**From:** [Rory O'Donnell](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Board of Appeals Meeting - Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:14:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rory O'Donnell](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Board of Appeals Meeting - Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:14:25 PM

---

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



**From:** [Jennifer Weiser](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Board of Appeals Meeting - public support - Letter - Great HYW  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:46:34 PM  
**Attachments:** [Letter-Support-GreatHWY-Great Highway Weekend Promenade.pdf](#)

---

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](mailto:jen.w.librarian@gmail.com)  
650-942-7713



**From:** [Lawrence Rhodes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Board of Appeals Meeting Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5pm  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:28:14 PM

---

I think, as an avid cyclist and car driver, that closing the Great Highway for anything other than major 3 day weekends is madness. Cars are forced into neighborhoods not suited for high traffic loads. I don't ride for pleasure though it is a pleasure to ride. I ride to shop, get to work, etc. The free flow of all forms of transportation is vital to a smooth running society. I would be for the closure if no other alternative was available. However we have Golden Gate Park. A Mecca for bicyclists. I used to enjoy driving through the park on my way to work in Marin. I can no longer do so, but I think it is a wise move. JFK is a perfect place to learn to ride and have family outings. I do ride there to get to work in the Golden Gate Park Band. So I still get in a car free space at least once a week in the Summer. Thanks for the attention and please be reasonable on this issue. There is plenty of space on either side of the Great Highway that is always available for walking and riding. I see no need for closure to motor vehicles except, again, for holidays. That is when they would be used mostly. In my opinion. Sincerely,  
Lawrence Rhodes, Bernal Heights.

**From:** [Harold Klingsporn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Board of Appeals re: Great Highway  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:24:08 AM

---

My name is Harold Klingsporn and I live in the Mission.

Please maintain the Planning Commission's Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and hence reject the appeals against it.

Almost every weekend, I bike from the Mission over to the Great Highway and enjoy the car free ride up/down the few miles of car free road.

So I'd very much like you to uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Great Highway. Thank you.

Harold

**From:** [Nichelle Wyatt-Whyte](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Bodega Bay Protected Views  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:18:25 AM

---

Hello,

I am curious if there is someone at the Coastal Commission who can speak to Bodega Bay protected views on the coast for homes. I am possibly buying a home on the coast and I am hoping to find out if the views are protected and what that entails. Thanks for your time!

Also happy to chat by phone (707) 527-2652

Thanks,  
Nichelle

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Waller Crenshaw](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [Rachel Clyde](#);  
[MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [prestonstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:prestonstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Coastal Zone Appeal -Keep Bicycles on Costal Highway  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:39:41 AM

---

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

**From:** [Shawn Troedson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:23:40 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Shawn Troedson and I am a resident of Dogpatch.

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 from one end of SF to the other and being able to ride along the coast safely. I also frequent the small businesses in the neighborhoods close to the Great Highway significantly more now than before the pilot project as it creates a much better ease of access and atmosphere than before. The community activation on the Great Highway has also been a major positive to SF as a whole, even for someone who lives on the other side 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.

**Shawn Troedson**  
**650.521.4600**

**From:** [Terry Erickson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org)  
**Subject:** Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:49:26 PM

---

Hi Planning Commissioners,

My name is Terry Erickson and I live at 3724 Quintara Street in the Sunset District of San Francisco.

I'm emailing you ask you all to please continue to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and reject the appeals against it.

I had no idea that there might an appeal to have traffic on the highway during weekends and am quite upset that this could happen. Stopping traffic on the Great Highway is the best thing that resulted from Covid and if I had my way the highway area would not allow cars at all 7 days a week. There are so many people out of the highway biking and walking whenever there are no cars on the road, including myself. I urge all of you to go there on a weekend and see how many families and young kids are out there biking, roller skating, skateboarding or walking, getting exercise and breathing fresh air. It's a safe place to be and not have to worry about traffic. Plus the ocean views are spectacular. It's really a fun place to go and hang out. On a warm sunny day there are so many people that it's often hard to find parking on Quintara near where we live. On these days it appears to be one of the most popular places in the City with people coming from all over, especially with little kids and lots of bikes! It's very nice to see so many people doing healthy activities and being outdoors :-)

As I'm sure you know, the current pilot was approved by the SF Board of Supervisors and Mayor London Breed in December 2022. An additional reason to continue the pilot is for city agencies to be able to collect data needed to figure out future plans for the Great Highway.

I strongly urge you all to continue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you very much,  
Terry Erickson



**From:** [Gary Levenberg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:12:41 PM

---

RE Board of Appeals Meeting  
Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5pm

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Gary Levenberg and I am a resident of SF for over 40 years, since 1993 in 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.

I am and have been a biker rider all my life for both recreation and transportation. As have my grown children who continue to ride with their families (one still in SF). I ride every day and seek out paths with the fewest cars. The list is not long here in SF - The Great Highway is probably the longest and safest of any bike trail in SF. The Golden Gate Park has JFK and mixed used trails. The Presidio has slow streets and mixed use trails. And The Embarcadero, Marina Blvd and Lake Merced have much improved mixed use trails. Please keep this trail open and safe for mixed use (of course except 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.

Gary Levenberg  
270 Valley

**From:** [Robert E. White](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:44:45 PM

---

I write in support of the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and urge the Board of Appeals to reject the appeals that could endanger the continuation of this pilot project.

I am a senior and a regular user of the Great Highway when available through the pilot project. I travel to and from the Great Highway by e-bike as part of my efforts to stay in shape and get outdoors. I am definitely not alone in that regard. It is a huge benefit to the quality of life for many San Franciscans.

The value of the project to me, and to people like me, is inestimable. I do not believe that the pilot project unduly impinges on other stakeholders, certainly not unduly due to its restriction to the weekend.

It would be a real loss if the pilot project is not continued. For that reason I respectfully urge that the Board of Appeals reject the pending appeals that could end this very useful pilot program.

Sincerely,

Robert E. White  
[50 Fifth Avenue](#)  
[San Francisco, CA 94118](#)  
Telephone: [\(415\) 789-6151](tel:(415)789-6151)  
Facsimile: [\(415\) 418-6001](tel:(415)418-6001)  
e-mail: [rew@rwhitesf.com](mailto:rew@rwhitesf.com)

**From:** [Michelle Ashe](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Coastal Zone Permit Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:28:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Laurie Mackenzie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Coastal Zone Permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:49:37 PM  
**Attachments:** [1707256067610](#)

---

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](mailto:lauriemackenzie59@gmail.com)

Email Addresses:

[brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org), [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org), [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org),  
[rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org), [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org), [NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov),  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)

**From:** [mattnieder@aol.com](mailto:mattnieder@aol.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Comment for Board of Appeals Meeting regarding Extension of the Coastal Zone Permit for Upper Great Highway Project  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:02:40 PM

---

## 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

To SF Board of Appeals Commissioners:

My name is Matthew Nieder and I live in the Mission.

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 indeed *great* because it borders a unique piece of the California coast called Ocean Beach. This is a natural resource that is not only special from an ecological viewpoint but one of the most accessible National nature reserves in the USA. It can be and is appreciated and used by people for various reasons in the most part sharing it in a generous respectful way. Making the Great Highway free from motorized vehicles during the daytime complements general access and use of Ocean Beach. Fewer people will get run over and more people will be able to walk, run, skate, and ride their bicycles to their favorite or maybe even a new spot to access the beach. Considering the Great Highway just another way to get from point A to point B as quickly as possible is short sighted. We already have many such roads and don't really need the Great Highway for that purpose in light of its critical location.

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](#).

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

mattnieder@aol.com

**From:** [Nate Gentner](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Do NOT allow cars on the Great Highway!  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 4:04:16 PM

---

## 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 Nathan and I am a resident of Alamo Square.

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 including my 2 kids, and I have frequently enjoyed the Great Highway on a weekly basis since it was closed to dangerous vehicle traffic. Please keep the Great Highway open for the community to bike and skate.

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.

Nathan

**From:** [Read Vanderbilt](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** For my family, please Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:09:11 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

This is super important for my family and my neighborhood. Closing the upper Great Highway, Friday afternoons and weekends has been a great compromise. I initially was opposed to allowing cars back. And now I think it's a good balance. Let's please uphold that.

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,



**From:** [ExecutiveStaff@Coastal](mailto:ExecutiveStaff@Coastal)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Rexing.Stephanie@Coastal](mailto:Rexing.Stephanie@Coastal)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment: Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:28:58 AM  
**Attachments:** [Abby Cunningham Comments - TBSP Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan 012924.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Abby <[abbywords@gmail.com](mailto:abbywords@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 29, 2024 4:53 PM  
**To:** ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <[ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Public Comment: Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Abby** <[abbywords@gmail.com](mailto:abbywords@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, Jan 29, 2024 at 4:13 PM  
Subject: Public Comment: Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan  
To: Hardcastle, Bree@Parks <[Bree.Hardcastle@parks.ca.gov](mailto:Bree.Hardcastle@parks.ca.gov)>, Shafer, Cyndy@Parks <[Cyndy.Shafer@parks.ca.gov](mailto:Cyndy.Shafer@parks.ca.gov)>  
Cc: <[Effie.Turnbull-Sanders@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Effie.Turnbull-Sanders@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[dayna.bochco@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:dayna.bochco@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Caryl.Hart@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Caryl.Hart@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Susan.Lowenberg@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Susan.Lowenberg@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Ann.Notthoff@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Ann.Notthoff@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Linda.Escalante@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Linda.Escalante@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[mike.wilson@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:mike.wilson@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Katie.Rice@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Katie.Rice@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Paloma.Aguirre@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Paloma.Aguirre@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Meagan.Harmon@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Meagan.Harmon@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Roberto.Uranga@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Roberto.Uranga@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Justin.Cummings@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Justin.Cummings@coastal.ca.gov)>, René Voss <[renepvoss@gmail.com](mailto:renepvoss@gmail.com)>, Chad Hanson <[cthanson1@gmail.com](mailto:cthanson1@gmail.com)>, Jinesse Reynolds <[jrey94925@gmail.com](mailto:jrey94925@gmail.com)>

Hi Bree,

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan.

We all have a vested interest in getting things right when it comes to protecting this beautiful, magical, spectacular place!

Chainsaws, chippers and pesticides are no way to go.

I trust you're receiving lots of public feedback on this important issue.

Thanks for all you do,

Abby Cunningham

**From:** [ExecutiveStaff@Coastal](mailto:ExecutiveStaff@Coastal)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** FW: Tomales fire restoration  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:29:48 AM

---

---

**From:** Spirit Lynn Wiseman <spiritji@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 28, 2024 9:35 PM  
**To:** Hardcastle, Bree@Parks <Bree.Hardcastle@parks.ca.gov>; cyndy.shafer@park.ca.gov;  
ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** Tomales fire restoration

To Bree and to Whom it may Concern,

As a year round swimmer in Tomales bay I have a very intimate relationship with the Birds, animals, tree's and plant life in the Shell Beach area.

As I said at the Marconi Center night, this area is Sacred land.....the elemental world is very strong and has a valuable healing presence that serves many. It is not ordinary land and in no way should it be being subjected to forest massacre in the name of forest management. I am good friends with my ravens and seagulls and even the coyote girl and do not want to see their habitat endangered or disturbed in any way.

Chainsaws and herbicides should NOT be allowed under any circumstance.....Inverness is Inverness we don't want some kind of manicured forest with the forest floor cleared out and habitat destroyed in the name of fire prevention.....

I have personally seen what happens when these gangs of guys chainsawing move across the landscape. Plus they then leave all the dead wood which increases fire danger.....Go look at Lake Lagunitas.

They came here to West Fairfax and chopped down a tree I had grown from seed which was 10 feet tall and alone in a field.....even if I set it on fire myself it was not going to catch the town on fire!!!!

There seems no common sense or sensitivity when the gang is set loose with their chainsaws.

A small example of lack of common sense and sensitivity is there was a beautiful foxglove on the trail down to Shell. A fence post was replaced and they took out the foxglove.....it was not in the way of the post and there was no reason to destroy this beautiful plant .....If this is small scale you can imagine what it will look like large scale.

Please do not allow this project to move forward.....nature is a valuable healer and people desperately need her healing these days.....This is no ordinary land, it is sacred and must be preserved not massacred.

Spirit Lynn Wiseman  
9 Herrera Dr  
Fairfax, Calif 94930  
415-847-4828

**PS Please bring in the native people who actually have a history here on this land and give them a seat at the table....**

.

Spirit Lynn Wiseman

Global Real Estate Advisor

**ENGEL & VÖLKERS Fairfax | Ross Valley | SGV**

Licensee of Engel & Völkers U.S. Holdings, Inc.

850 Sir Francis Drake Blvd

San Anselmo, CA 94960

USA

Mobile: 415-847-4828

Internet: [spiritwiseman.evusa.com](http://spiritwiseman.evusa.com)

Mail to: [spirit.wiseman@evrealestate.com](mailto:spirit.wiseman@evrealestate.com)

DRE# 01210864

<http://www.zillow.com/profile/spiritwiseman/>

**From:** [SF Carl](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 10:35:57 PM

---

Hello,

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.

Thank you,  
Carl Stein

**From:** [Nico Pitney](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway bills  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:30:58 AM

---

Dear Commissioners, I co-sign the letter below. Please reject the appeals that would roll back the progress made toward bringing the Great Highway Park to life. Great cities like San Francisco cannot stay great without effective caretakers. The Great Highway Park has organically become such a vibrant space for so many people to enjoy their community in healthy ways. What a rare gift -- please protect it!

Nico Pitney  
SF resident 11 years

//

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.

**From:** [SF Public Works Great Highway Notification](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Closed - 02-05-2024  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:10 AM

---

[Please click here to acknowledge receipt of this message](#)

The Great Highway is Closed from Lincoln Way to Sloat Boulevard in both directions.

For more information call 311.

From: San Francisco Public Works

**From:** [Leslie LaskinReese](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [sdlreese@comcast.net](mailto:sdlreese@comcast.net)  
**Subject:** Great highway closure  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:36:08 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Leslie and I am a resident of the outer Richmond district. I ride the great highway nearly every weekend, sometimes multiple times. This beautiful stretch of highway is packed every weekend with pedestrians, cyclists, families and the elderly enjoying our beautiful coastline together.

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 ride the great highway nearly every weekend, sometimes multiple times. This beautiful stretch of highway is packed every weekend with pedestrians, cyclists, families and the elderly enjoying our beautiful coastline together. I also travel to the sunset for groceries on the weekend and have no issue finding a safe alternate route.

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.

Leslie LaskinReese  
LeslieLaskinReese.com  
415-336-5203  
Sent from my phone

**From:** [Benji Whalen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org);  
[MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:29:40 PM

---

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



**From:** [Laurie Mackenzie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:47:22 PM

---

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](mailto:lauriemackenzie59@gmail.com)

Email Addresses:

[brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org), [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org), [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org),  
[rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org), [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org), [NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov),  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)

**From:** [Laura Stonehill](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great highway needs to stay a car-free park  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:48:09 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Great highway is such a joyous place for my 7 year old and 3 year old to ride their bikes without cars. Please keep the weekend compromise and reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Thank you,  
Laura Stonehill

**From:** [SF Public Works Great Highway Notification](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Open - 02-05-2024  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:06:36 AM

---

[Please click here to acknowledge receipt of this message](#)

The Great Highway is Open from Lincoln Way to Sloat Boulevard in the Northbound direction.

For more information call 311.

From: San Francisco Public Works

**From:** [Sarah \(Egdal\) Hollenhorst](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Permit  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:43:58 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Sarah Egdal Hollenhorst and I am a resident of the Sunset District in 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.

My children and I love going to the Great Highway on the weekends to run together so we can enjoy our beautiful coastline without the risk of being around cars. We have also practiced bicycling, roller skated, scootered, and played with friends on the Great Highway - now one of a very small number of long flat areas in San Francisco without cars. We have truly loved having this new open space added to 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.

Regards,

Sarah Egdal Hollenhorst

--

Sarah (Egdal) Hollenhorst  
415-999-9858

**From:** [Harry](#)  
**Subject:** Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:58:59 PM

---

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.

**From:** [Mikayla Chang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:54:50 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Mikayla 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.

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.

**From:** [Krista Farey](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Pilot  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:24:34 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Krista Farey and I am a resident of the inner Sunset / Golden Gate 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 bike on the great highway at least twice a week, love it, and find it a much safer and superior experience on days when it is closed to 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.

Krista Farey, MD  
626 Pacheco St.  
San Francisco CA 94116



**From:** [Will Dalton](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Pilot  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:25:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Daniela Wehmeyer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [Asim Bhansali](#)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Proj  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 11:28:33 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Daniela Wehmeyer, 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.

At a time when there is so much talk about the dooms loop in San Francisco, the beautiful outdoors is something that brings people together and makes them fall in love again with San Francisco. Places like Ocean Beach and the Great Highway, which I use recreationally for biking, are certainly one reason why I would not consider moving outside San Francisco. More importantly, as a fifth grade teacher, I hear from students how they and their families biked on the Great Highway on weekends and how much this meant to them. Especially after the pandemic when students spent too much time in front of screens, these social outdoor experiences like biking the Great Highway, that bring people together and celebrate our city in a way that is affordable to all, need to be celebrated and 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.

Sincerely,  
Daniela Wehmeyer

**From:** [Katherine Nielsen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway Promenade  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:10:52 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Katherine Nielsen and I live in the Miraloma Park neighborhood in San Francisco. I am writing to urge you to 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.

Just this past week, I rode my bike on the Great Highway promenade twice - Friday afternoon and Sunday mid-day. Whatever mood I am in when I start my bike ride, I am happy on the Great Highway. It's a beautiful spot and I love seeing people of all ages and backgrounds enjoying the space. Strollers, people with walkers, people in wheelchairs, on bikes, running, walking and more. It's such a wonderful way to bring our community together. And, for me personally, it results in a fantastic bike loop from my home, with much of it car-free: Great Highway then up through Golden Gate Park and then over Twin Peaks.

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.

Katherine Nielsen  
130 Los Palmos Drive  
SF, CA 94127

**From:** [Alfredo Vergara-Lobo](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Great Highway request  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:42:57 AM

---

My name is Alfredo Vergara-Lobo and I am a resident of Sunnyside in D7.

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 ride my bicycle on the Great Highway as often as I can and whenever cars are not present. As an exercise stretch of road, it is nearly impossible to find other stretches like it in our City, therefore, access to this area has a needed, positive impact on my health. I value my health and that of my fellow San Franciscans more than the convenience of greenhouse gas emitting drivers who can easily take multiple other routes to get to their destination.

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

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Laurel Elkjer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:57:23 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Laurel Elkjer and I am a resident of District 3.

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 bike on the Great Highway regularly, and love seeing all of the people enjoying it on weekends.

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.

Laurel Elkjer  
745 Chestnut St  
SF 94133

**From:** [Nancy Casciani](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Great Highway, San Francisco  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:49:40 PM

---

Reopen this major artery to cars! Our political leaders lied to us, they said these closed streets would be open when the pandemic was over, hypothetically the pandemic has been cleared, declared over. There's a path to walk on and a beach. The great human walkway has destroyed this environment and brought excessive levels of garbage not to mention speeding cars. Save the Sunset District.

It's interesting how many homes on the lower great highway still display signs reopen the Great Highway to cars! Save our covers from discussing this and wasting any more tax dollars on it get this road open, 24/7, 365.

Golden Gate Park is 50% closed to auto traffic. What more is there?

San Francisco native!

Foot Traffic has destroyed the fragile environment of ocean Beach dunes.

Please tell the cyclist to stop riding on the grass on JFK Drive. They're putting ruts in it. Damaging the fraudulent environment. Also they have the whole paved street to ride their bikes on. The selfishness of a handful continues!

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Chris Connolly](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [kenny kruse](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#)  
**Cc:** [rclyde@sfbike.org](#)  
**Subject:** Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:02:21 PM

---

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.



**From:** [Brad Azevedo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 4:03:14 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Brad Azevedo, 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.

I am a cyclist who regularly bikes a loop around the city and the Great Highway is an essential part of that connectivity. Car-free access has been a game-changer for cyclist and pedestrian access to the coast and it is so wonderful to see this formerly barren area alive with people on the weekends. This is an example of "if you build it, they will come" and I hope that you will preserve 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.

Brad Azevedo

**From:** [Abi Wilson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:29:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lynne Howe](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:57:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Aggie Zau](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org)  
**Subject:** Great highway: coastal zone permit  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 11:53:41 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Aggie Z and I am a 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.

I love how the Great Highway connects Lake Merced to Golden Gate Park. Running along it, I see people smiling with their morning coffees and getting their exercise. Watching the waves and the surfers, I feel like the Great Highway provides a time of therapy and peace in the otherwise chaotic city life.

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.

Aggie Zau  
[aggie.zau@gmail.com](mailto:aggie.zau@gmail.com) | 408.242.7312

**From:** [Edward Wright](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** I helped create the Great Walkway. Please keep it, and reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 6:04:12 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

The creation of the Great Walkway is one of the proudest accomplishments of my life. It's the reason I started biking again as an adult, it's where my guide daughter has taken some of her first steps, it's where countless kids have learned to ride bikes and experience their coastline safe from cars.

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.

Edward Wright  
[edwardwrightmail@gmail.com](mailto:edwardwrightmail@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94103



**From:** [Jack Eidson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** I love the Great Highway Pilot Project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:25:07 PM

---

Hi all,

I am writing in support of one of the BEST and least doom-loopy parts of San Francisco: the car-free Upper Great Highway!

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 along the beach on the weekend, and supporting local small businesses like Andytown and Hook Fish. I would be less likely to support these Richmond and Sunset businesses without the car-free Upper Great Highway.

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.

Jack

**From:** [Gregory Robin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:53:32 AM

---

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

**From:** [Randal Bowers](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lauris Jensen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:02:36 PM

---

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

**From:** [Diane Fong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:26:28 AM

---

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

**From:** [Katherine Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:31 PM

---

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

**From:** [Edward Mason](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:36:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Susan Wolff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:32:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Christins Pappas](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Carmen Woo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:29:27 AM

---

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

**From:** [Connie Fitzgerald](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:13:39 PM

---

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

**From:** [George Consagra](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jackie Svevo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [walter.schirra](mailto:walter.schirra)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:16:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Bonnie Fimbres](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32:52 AM

---

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

**From:** [Albert Gao](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:51 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mae Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:21 PM

---

My name is **Mae Lee**

My email address is **maeyoulee@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,  
Mae Lee

**From:** [Madeleine Bass](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:00:56 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jeff Karras](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:39 PM

---

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

**From:** [Benjamin Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:48:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sean Owens](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:35 PM

---

My name is **Sean Owens**

My email address is **sean.patrick.owens@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Owens

**From:** [Jasmine Madatian](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:03 PM

---

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

**From:** [Birke Reimnitz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:21 PM

---

My name is **Birke Reimnitz**

My email address is **[birker@mindspring.com](mailto:birker@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,  
Birke Reimnitz

**From:** [Ellen Maruoka](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:10 PM

---

My name is **Ellen Maruoka**

My email address is **mikomaruoka@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,  
Ellen Maruoka

**From:** [Phillip Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:01:51 AM

---

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

**From:** [matt.lopez](mailto:matt.lopez@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:53:34 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jolly Ann Ong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:32 PM

---

My name is **Jolly Ann Ong**

My email address is **jollibee18@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

**From:** [Jerald Lowe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:03 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mark Cervantes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:36:21 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rose Lau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:02:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Judy Adami](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:32:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Christina Shih](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Fred Molfino](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:38 PM

---

My name is **Fred Molfino**

My email address is **[molfinojr@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Charlotte Pope](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32:51 AM

---

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

**From:** [Puja Amin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:36 PM

---

My name is **Puja Amin**

My email address is **puja.amin1@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Puja Amin

**From:** [Rodney Leong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Will Noble](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:54 PM

---

My name is **Will Noble**

My email address is **will@sfnoble.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Will Noble

**From:** [Seth Gottlieb](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:26:30 AM

---

My name is **Seth Gottlieb**

My email address is **[gottlieb54@mac.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Donna Ames-Heldfond](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:47:41 PM

---

My name is **Donna Ames-Heldfond**

My email address is **donna@donnaames.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Ames-Heldfond

**From:** [Barbara Sokol](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:17:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Greg Holmes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:24:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dan Ake](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:02 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alexander Karpovich](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:29:26 AM

---

My name is **Alexander Karpovich**

My email address is **imalexk@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Alexander Karpovich

**From:** [Margot Beall](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rosanne Liggett](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Glenn Schot](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:59:15 AM

---

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

**From:** [Alan Gregory](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Daniel Choi](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Stephanie Peek](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:17:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Margaret Schulze](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mary Irwin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:29:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [EBERT KAN](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:30:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [SAMUEL KWONG](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:29:06 PM

---

My name is **SAMUEL KWONG**

My email address is **misterarcus@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
SAMUEL KWONG

**From:** [Maryanne Razzo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:34:46 AM

---

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

**From:** [Lori Murakami](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:37 PM

---

My name is **Lori Murakami**

My email address is **[lmurakami@sbcglobal.net](mailto:lmurakami@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,  
Lori Murakami

**From:** [Connie Tang](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:46:50 PM

---

My name is **Connie Tang**

My email address is **dr.fowler@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,  
Connie Tang

**From:** [Monica Dowell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:08 PM

---

My name is **Monica Dowell**

My email address is **monicadowell@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Monica Dowell

**From:** [Kendra McLaughlin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:03:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Arthur Hubbard](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:02 PM

---

My name is **Arthur Hubbard**

My email address is **amhsf@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,  
Arthur Hubbard

**From:** [Brian Carr](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:26:19 AM

---

My name is **Brian Carr**

My email address is **bpcarr@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Carr

**From:** [Jessica Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:59 PM

---

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

**From:** [Katherine Wolf](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:36:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alex Karpovich](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:29:25 AM

---

My name is **Alex Karpovich**

My email address is **akarpovich@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 Karpovich

**From:** [Diane Janakes-Zasada](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:07:31 AM

---

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

**From:** [Kathryn Bates](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Madhuri Vivit](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:25:15 AM

---

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

**From:** [Tom Smith](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Misti Reif](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:59:17 AM

---

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

**From:** [Sean McGrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:03:36 PM

---

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

**From:** [Marc Larby](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [tony.winogrocki](mailto:tony.winogrocki@gmail.com)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:40 PM

---

My name is **tony winogrocki**

My email address is **tonywinogrocki@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
tony winogrocki

**From:** [Patrick Ryan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:36 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Brandon](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:47 PM

---

My name is **Michael Brandon**

My email address is **michael@sfvideo.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Brandon

**From:** [James Mazza](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:46:48 PM

---

My name is **James Mazza**

My email address is **[jmazza@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Janet Goodson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:28:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ignacio Orellana-Garcia](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Connie Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:09:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sergio Duarte](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:08 PM

---

My name is **Sergio Duarte**

My email address is **malagueta127@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,  
Sergio Duarte

**From:** [Richard Chui](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:56:03 AM

---

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

**From:** [Trudy May](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:45:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sher Bijan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:59 PM

---

My name is **Sher Bijan**

My email address is **s.bijan@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.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,  
Sher Bijan

**From:** [Barbara Duncan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:24:37 AM

---

My name is **Barbara Duncan**

My email address is **bdwld@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,  
Barbara Duncan

**From:** [Kathy Regan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:17:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Don Emmons](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:29:14 PM

---

My name is **Don Emmons**

My email address is **emmo55@me.com**

I used to use the great highway for business and recreational purposes. It has been a great inconvenience and time waster for me since it has been closed. The pilot program is a mistake in my opinion, and should be shut down permanently. This road is very essential for vehicular Traffic especially including emergency 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,  
Don Emmons

**From:** [Madeleine Bass](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:08:50 AM

---

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

**From:** [David Alexander](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:50:40 PM

---

My name is **David Alexander**

My email address is **friscoloco@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

**From:** [Dorothea Kaz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:56:04 AM

---

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

**From:** [Heather Leonard](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:00:13 AM

---

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

**From:** [Richard Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:35 PM

---

My name is **Richard Lee**

My email address is **glock226@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,  
Richard Lee

**From:** [Brian Holt](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lex Tyndall](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:17:28 AM

---

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

**From:** [Craig Hyde](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:46:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Elizabeth Clark](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:20:02 AM

---

My name is **Elizabeth Clark**

My email address is **swimeclark@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Clark

**From:** [Edward Reilly](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:29:28 PM

---

My name is **Edward Reilly**

My email address is **jreilly749@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,  
Edward Reilly

**From:** [Jack Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:09:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kathy Crabe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rita O'Hara](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:42 PM

---

My name is **Rita O'Hara**

My email address is **tidi58@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,  
Rita O'Hara

**From:** [Shelly Horton](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:19:59 PM

---

My name is **Shelly Horton**

My email address is **shellyhorton@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,  
Shelly Horton

**From:** [Kyle Donohoe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:12:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Stephanie Holbrook](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [Teresa Shaw](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:29:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Amy Nachman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:07 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Gehlken](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:59 PM

---

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

**From:** [Melanie Sworyda](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:23:41 AM

---

My name is **Melanie Sworyda**

My email address is **Cistusrock28@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is 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 rude and self absorbed bike riders make crossing the Great Highway more dangerous and nerve racking than cars, motorcycles and any other vehicle needing a licence. The rude and pushy bike riders have invaded the calm and sensitive areas near the beach. MANY people drive their cars with their bikes to invade this neighborhood when there are bike paths in Golden Gate Park and many other parks. The Great Highway is not a park with interesting plants and birds. The stupidest walk their dogs on the Great Highway which can most definitely hurt their paws in extreme weather. The rude bike riders come much too close to people crossing the road to go to the beach. The city has not done anything about the enormous amount of trash left at the Great Highway after being closed. Do not lie. There are insufficient trash receptacles. This issue has absolutely not been addressed and this little note shows something that is extremely obvious. Fixing this problem years later just shows the lack of care this government has. Yes, with all the false statements about needing housing in this neighborhood the government has chosen this neighborhood as a dumping ground for false benefits to the residents. Closing the Great Highway and adding speed bumps further makes people living in this neighborhood shop elsewhere, where parking is free and easy to obtain. The great majority of the people living in San Francisco do not ride a bike. Electric bikes go much too fast to need to use this road. The road is taxpayer supported and everyone should

be able to use it,not just people entertaining themselves. There is a pathway next to the Great Highway that is used for walking and biking.

Sincerely,  
Melanie Sworyda

**From:** [Perrin Belway](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28:36 PM

---

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



**From:** [Brian Madigan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:58 PM

---

My name is **Brian Madigan**

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

**From:** [Sheila lorraine O'Neill-Bosch](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:00:17 AM

---

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 lorraine O'Neill-Bosch

**From:** [Joyce True](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:09:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Shannon Hughes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:03:03 PM

---

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



**From:** [Louis Green](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:14 PM

---

My name is **Louis Green**

My email address is **[louishgreen@yahoo.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Stanton Brunner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:43 PM

---

My name is **Stanton Brunner**

My email address is **todoquees@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,  
Stanton Brunner

**From:** [John Kollins](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:46:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mike Regan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:06 PM

---

My name is **Mike Regan**

My email address is **myoldgoat@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 Regan



**From:** [Keith Kandarian](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:36:32 PM

---

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

**From:** [Bruce Huston](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:19:38 AM

---

My name is **Bruce Huston**

My email address is **hustonbj@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,  
Bruce Huston

**From:** [June Kitagawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal:chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:19:31 AM

---

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

**From:** [Mandy Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:58:17 AM

---

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

**From:** [Wayne Duncan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:23:41 AM

---

My name is **Wayne Duncan**

My email address is **bdwld@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,  
Wayne Duncan

**From:** [ANNA M BOCKRIS](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:45 PM

---

My name is **ANNA M BOCKRIS**

My email address is **ABOCKRIS@GMAIL.COM**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
ANNA M BOCKRIS

**From:** [Marvin Rose](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:29:46 PM

---

My name is **Marvin Rose**

My email address is **rosema41@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,  
Marvin Rose

**From:** [Mari Eliza](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:18:54 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gabriella Iannaccone](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#);  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Whitney Gough](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [T Louie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:22:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [Scott Ashkenaz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:04:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [J Leung](mailto:J.Leung@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:57:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Tostanoski](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dave Dolby](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:34 PM

---

My name is **Dave Dolby**

My email address is **dave@dolbyventures.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Dave Dolby

**From:** [Linda Mathews](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:05 PM

---

My name is **Linda Mathews**

My email address is **[linda.mathews@yahoo.com](mailto:linda.mathews@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,  
Linda Mathews

**From:** [Ron Karpowicz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:03:06 AM

---

My name is **Ron Karpowicz**

My email address is **ronaldkarpowicz@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Gregory Bailey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:19:31 AM

---

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

**From:** [Matthew C. Sheridan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:53 PM

---

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

**From:** [Denise Atchley](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:33:34 PM

---

My name is **Denise Atchley**

My email address is **denise\_atchley@yahoo.com**

It is unfair to people with limited mobility, to restrict access to the ocean, to those on foot or bike only.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Atchley

**From:** [Grant Ingram](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:03:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jo Huerta](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:45 PM

---

My name is **Jo Huerta**

My email address is **diamonddozen@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,  
Jo Huerta

**From:** [Nancy Bronstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:19:37 AM

---

My name is **Nancy Bronstein**

My email address is **nstirm@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,  
Nancy Bronstein

**From:** [Durinda Coursey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:42:07 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gayle Mishima](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:13:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [George Herrera](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:54 PM

---

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

**From:** [Damian Inglin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:44 PM

---

My name is **Damian Inglin**

My email address is **damianinglin@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,  
Damian Inglin

**From:** [David Cantu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:37:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lorri Ungaretti](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alison Fong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28:38 PM

---

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

**From:** [Laurel Winzler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:57:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Don Climent](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:04:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Annie Bai](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:19:39 AM

---

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

**From:** [Kimberly Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:10:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [J X](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:04:42 AM

---

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

**From:** [Cora Wrockloff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:19:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Candyce Martin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:40:37 AM

---

My name is **Candyce Martin**

My email address is **Crossways@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,  
Candyce Martin

**From:** [Richard Worner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:48 PM

---

My name is **Richard Worner**

My email address is **richworner@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Worner

**From:** [Shari Videlock](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:03:07 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jackson Murphy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:19:08 AM

---

My name is **Jackson Murphy**

My email address is **jackspop2@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,  
Jackson Murphy

**From:** [Josephine Zhao](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:11:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Evelyn Graham](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:13 PM

---

My name is **Evelyn Graham**

My email address is **evelynG@openwaterfront.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Graham

**From:** [Antonia Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:53 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kim Russo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:15:18 AM

---

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

**From:** [Boris Zutner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:44 PM

---

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

**From:** [Robin Gray](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:51 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dino Borjal](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:05 PM

---

My name is **Dino Borjal**

My email address is **djborjal@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,  
Dino Borjal

**From:** [Ed Tavasieff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:55:32 PM

---

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

**From:** [Charlene Karma](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:32 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jenna Kaiser](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28:39 PM

---

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

**From:** [William Nicholas](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:18:19 AM

---

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

**From:** [Mallory Anderson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:04:54 PM

---

My name is **Mallory Anderson**

My email address is **mallymay25@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,  
Mallory Anderson

**From:** [Robi Roorda](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:08:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Daniel Lau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:03:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Soledad Alzaga](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:33:58 PM

---

My name is **Soledad Alzaga**

My email address is **soledadalzaga@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Soledad Alzaga

**From:** [Scott Gutterman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:03:40 PM

---

My name is **Scott Gutterman**

My email address is **[guttermanscott@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Christopher Mei](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Zhanna Losik](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:30:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Cynthia Cawthon](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:13 PM

---

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

**From:** [Diane Broner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:18:18 AM

---

My name is **Diane Broner**

My email address is **woolfdn@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,  
Diane Broner



**From:** [Astrid Crabbe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:04:53 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Angela Tickler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:45:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [WILLIAM PENDERGAST](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:03 PM

---

My name is **WILLIAM PENDERGAST**

My email address is **WDPENDERGAST@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 PENDERGAST



**From:** [Liyao Zhu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:49 PM

---

My name is **Liyao Zhu**

My email address is **chamzhu@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Liyao Zhu

**From:** [Gregory Vernitsky](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:08:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [Helen Katzenmeyer](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:40:38 AM

---

My name is **Helen Katzenmeyer**

My email address is **hdk333@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Katzenmeyer

**From:** [Sharon Wu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:50 PM

---

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



**From:** [Susan CroninParano](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:13:18 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jo Ann Shain](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:44 PM

---

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

**From:** [Harry Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:18:24 AM

---

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

**From:** [Brian McNamee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:27:23 AM

---

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



**From:** [Sarah Bacon](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:30 PM

---

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

**From:** [Yat Chiu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:55:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dorothy Wang](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:16:39 PM

---

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

**From:** [Brenda Johnson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:03:57 PM

---

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



**From:** [Peter McCoy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:18:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [Edward Kaplun](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:07:31 PM

---

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

**From:** [Greg Tarr](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:51 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ward Smith](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:55:36 PM

---

My name is **Ward Smith**

My email address is **wardsmith2004@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,  
Ward Smith



**From:** [betty.winholtz](mailto:betty.winholtz@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [JACKLYN HANRATTY](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:57:18 PM

---

My name is **JACKLYN HANRATTY**  
My email address is **STROSE66@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,  
JACKLYN HANRATTY

**From:** [Carol Faulkner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:16:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Beshears](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:43 PM

---

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



**From:** [joseph dowler](mailto:joseph.dowler)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:05:30 AM

---

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

**From:** [kevin Oreilly](mailto:kevin.Oreilly@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:41:37 AM

---

My name is **kevin Oreilly**

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 Oreilly

**From:** [Charles Thieriot](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:24:42 PM

---

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

**From:** [David BSs](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:19:40 AM

---

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



**From:** [Theo Honniball](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:54 PM

---

My name is **Theo Honniball**

My email address is **415cinema@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Theo Honniball

**From:** [Chit Kwong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:27:23 AM

---

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

**From:** [Ann Kutner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Norman Kondy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:18:24 AM

---

My name is **Norman Kondy**

My email address is **nkondy@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,  
Norman Kondy



**From:** [Meredyth Masterson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nancy Zerner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:38:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Karen Puechner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:06:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jared Alexander](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:55:33 PM

---

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



**From:** [Ken Lowe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:02 PM

---

My name is **Ken Lowe**

My email address is **klowr1234@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Lowe

**From:** [Rebecca Schweitzer](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:28 PM

---

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

**From:** [William Wreden](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:07:24 PM

---

My name is **William Wreden**

My email address is **w.wreden@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,  
William Wreden

**From:** [Alan Hannan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:50 PM

---

My name is **Alan Hannan**

My email address is **alan@mindvision.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Hannan



**From:** [Stephanie Lehman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:02 PM

---

My name is **Stephanie Lehman**

My email address is **slehman21@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,  
Stephanie Lehman

**From:** [Mario Mendoza](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:10:12 AM

---

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

**From:** [Julie Ortiz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ralph Chapin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:19:44 AM

---

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



**From:** [Janet Kung](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:57:20 PM

---

My name is **Janet Kung**

My email address is **jrmkung@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,  
Janet Kung

**From:** [Harry Hunt](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:27 PM

---

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

**From:** [Clyde Nichol](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [William Walker](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:24:43 PM

---

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



**From:** [Insel Mainau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:12:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Bonnette](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:28:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Hanley Lau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Fred Muhlheim`](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:55:36 PM

---

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`



**From:** [Edward Poole](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:29:23 AM

---

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

**From:** [Georgina Costales](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Clyde Nichols](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:02:30 AM

---

My name is **Clyde Nichols**

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 Nichols

**From:** [LaVive Kiely](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:26:20 PM

---

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



**From:** [Joshua Seare](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:05:14 AM

---

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

**From:** [Neal Powers](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [James Hanratty](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:55 PM

---

My name is **James Hanratty**

My email address is **hanrattyj49@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Hanratty

**From:** [Marc Tuttle](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:07:01 PM

---

My name is **Marc Tuttle**

My email address is **marctuttle@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,  
Marc Tuttle



**From:** [Sara Kiehn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:48 PM

---

My name is **Sara Kiehn**

My email address is **sara@kiehn.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,  
Sara Kiehn

**From:** [Tris Thomson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:26:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dianne Dienstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:41 PM

---

My name is **Dianne Dienstein**

My email address is **ddienstein@gmail.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.

I am 78 and have lived at the corner of Fulton and the Great Highway for 33 years and its closure has greatly negatively impacted my life as I believe it has not only for San Franciscans but also everyone from the Peninsula or other parts of the Bay Area who might otherwise come to spend money at San Francisco restaurants and businesses, visit friends or relatives, and enjoy Golden Gate Park and the myriad of parks we already have without needing to create the GH as a park.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Dianne Dienstein

**From:** [Nora Murphy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:29:52 AM

---

My name is **Nora Murphy**

My email address is **[noramurphy@comcast.net](mailto: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



**From:** [Mario Tarantino](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:29:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Susan Flynn-Lopez](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Christine Hanson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:04:13 AM

---

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

**From:** [Marina Klochkov](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:02:36 AM

---

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



**From:** [Tom Hope](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:26 PM

---

My name is **Tom Hope**

My email address is **[tomhope@stanfordalumni.org](mailto:tomhope@stanfordalumni.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,  
Tom Hope

**From:** [max.kellenberger@sfgov.org](mailto:max.kellenberger@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:29:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Marie Calendar](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:12:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:49 PM

---

My name is **Michael Cohen**

My email address is **michael.cohen@venovate.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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



**From:** [Melba Jamie O'Keefe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:19:44 AM

---

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

**From:** [Suzanne Schimaneck](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:57:26 PM

---

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

**From:** [Patricia Wise](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:03:15 AM

---

My name is **Patricia Wise**

My email address is **pawise52@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,  
Patricia Wise

**From:** [michael perry](mailto:michael.perry@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:10:03 AM

---

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



**From:** [Marc Brenman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:02 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:12 PM

---

My name is **Michael Cohen**

My email address is **michael@apertureventures.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Matt Kelly](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Christy Chen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:57 PM

---

My name is **Christy Chen**

My email address is **christykao111@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,  
Christy Chen



**From:** [Barbara Richard](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:06:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Monika Hunt](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [kenneth.sarocky](mailto:kenneth.sarocky@mac.com)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.ca.gov); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Leslie Boin Podell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:02:36 AM

---

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



**From:** [Craig Epstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:29:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Isara Rodechanaphairatana](mailto:Isara.Rodechanaphairatana@sf.gov)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [kaaren.alvarado](mailto:kaaren.alvarado)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:00:42 AM

---

My name is **kaaren alvarado**

My email address is **kaaren25@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,  
kaaren alvarado

**From:** [George von Liphart](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:58 PM

---

My name is **George von Liphart**

My email address is **gvonl@von-liphart.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 von Liphart



**From:** [Mike Regan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:29:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [Robert Mokry](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:19:47 AM

---

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

**From:** [Andy Herr](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Terrence Sullivan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:01 PM

---

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



**From:** [Robert Vanderlaan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:03:17 AM

---

My name is **Robert Vanderlaan**

My email address is **rsvanderlaan@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Vanderlaan

**From:** [Edmund Wattis](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Anthony Winogrocki](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Linda Mathews](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:57:26 PM

---

My name is **Linda Mathews**

My email address is **[linda.mathews@yahoo.com](mailto:linda.mathews@yahoo.com)**

Please do the right thing and conduct the environmental review. Just because the permit was obtained without warrant, doesn't mean it cannot be repealed. What they did was very sneaky and doesn't sound legal actually.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Mathews



**From:** [William Toth](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:31:29 AM

---

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

**From:** [Thelma Puechner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:12:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Della Dobranski](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Eddie Donnellan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:38 AM

---

My name is **Eddie Donnellan**

My email address is **eddie@mewaterfoundation.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,  
Eddie Donnellan



**From:** [Maria Aldaz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:26:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jamie LaChapelle](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:20:36 AM

---

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

**From:** [Saw Lim-Skain](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:40:29 AM

---

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

**From:** [Ruth Dummel](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:01 PM

---

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



**From:** [Frances Chiu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [Timothy Boyle](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:29:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Karl Baderschneider](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:31 PM

---

My name is **Karl Baderschneider**

My email address is **karl.surfacetech@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Karl Baderschneider

**From:** [Elisa Smith](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:30:08 PM

---

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



**From:** [Werner Blumer](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:37 AM

---

My name is **Werner Blumer**

My email address is **wmb@cpuc.ca.gov**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Werner Blumer

**From:** [Donna Levin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:45 PM

---

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

**From:** [Marc Pope](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:38 PM

---

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

**From:** [Vincent Yuen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:31 PM

---

My name is **Vincent Yuen**

My email address is **yyyyyvincent@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,  
Vincent Yuen



**From:** [Mabel Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:13:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Natalie Podell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:02:38 AM

---

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

**From:** [Matthew Rhoa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:10 PM

---

My name is **Matthew Rhoa**

My email address is **matthew@brailer-rhoa.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Rhoa

**From:** [Carol Carruba](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:46 PM

---

My name is **Carol Carruba**

My email address is **carol@carolcarruba.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Carruba



**From:** [Ira Le](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Roy Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:31:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Yi Chen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:59 PM

---

My name is **Yi Chen**

My email address is **c.yilei@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,  
Yi Chen

**From:** [Denise Wilson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:56:02 AM

---

My name is **Denise Wilson**

My email address is **Silverdew7@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,  
Denise Wilson



**From:** [Melissa Rubin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:06:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alex Hartigan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Linda Ravano](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:06:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Faith Schneider](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:13:25 PM

---

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



**From:** [Rebecca Ward](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:09 PM

---

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

**From:** [Denise Wilson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:56:01 AM

---

My name is **Denise Wilson**

My email address is **Silverdew7@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,  
Denise Wilson

**From:** [Vivian Lem](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:40:30 AM

---

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

**From:** [Carol Chichester](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:22 PM

---

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



**From:** [Cranson Tong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:31 PM

---

My name is **Cranson Tong**

My email address is **loenbho@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Cranson Tong

**From:** [Corinne Kan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:30:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Davide Verotta](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:33 PM

---

My name is **Davide Verotta**

My email address is **davide.verotta@ucsf.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.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold, but from a resident, and avid bicyclist, of the Richmond district the situation is very simple.

Every week, Friday to Sunday, the traffic situation becomes chaotic in the whole area from Chain of Lakes to Ocean Beach. The traffic jam caused by the Great Highway closure makes the north-south commute across the Park a, heavily polluting, ordeal. At rush hour it can take 45' to cross the 0.3 miles.

And for nothing. Almost nobody actually bicycles from the eastern districts of San Francisco to the Great Highway. A few, we are talking dozens, get there using motored-bicycles and go for a spin on a strip of asphalt that has ALREADY a bicycle path built to its side.

It is absurd to close the Great highway, as absurd as closing 280, or 101 would be.

Please re-open it! Or at least open it during nights and rush hours.

best regards  
Davide Verotta

Sincerely,  
Davide Verotta

**From:** [Annie Collier](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nancy Wolf](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:35:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [David Lew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:38 PM

---

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

**From:** [Clay Hogan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:31:53 PM

---

My name is **Clay Hogan**

My email address is **clay.hogan@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,  
Clay Hogan

**From:** [Nick Podell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:02:38 AM

---

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

**From:** [Stephanie Wildman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:44 PM

---

My name is **Stephanie Wildman**

My email address is **smwshalom@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,  
Stephanie Wildman

**From:** [Justin Ko](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:00 PM

---

My name is **Justin Ko**

My email address is **daofficialpig@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Justin Ko

**From:** [S Mark Varney](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:43 PM

---

My name is **S Mark Varney**

My email address is **markvarney@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,  
S Mark Varney

**From:** [William Isham](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:59 PM

---

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

**From:** [Judy Hollingsworth](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [connie.lee](mailto:connie.lee@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:20:58 AM

---

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

**From:** [Aine McGovern](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:36 AM

---

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

**From:** [Grant Ingram](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:06:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jackie Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mark Lerdal](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:54:57 AM

---

My name is **Mark Lerdal**

My email address is **lerdalmark@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Lerdal

**From:** [Roger Oyama](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:31 PM

---

My name is **Roger Oyama**

My email address is **rojioyama@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Roger Oyama

**From:** [Nicholas Podell jr.](mailto:Nicholas.Podell.jr@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:02:41 AM

---

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.

**From:** [Jill Guertin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Beth Fox](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:38 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alan Yuan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Brian McLain](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gary Kendall](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:17:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Annie Chang](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:28:07 AM

---

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

**From:** [Sarah Epstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:35:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Chris Ko](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:00 PM

---

My name is **Chris Ko**

My email address is **christyko111@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,  
Chris Ko

**From:** [Evan Fowler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:42 PM

---

My name is **Evan Fowler**

My email address is **robffowler@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,  
Evan Fowler

**From:** [Jeffrey Benningfield](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:33 PM

---

My name is **Jeffrey Benningfield**

My email address is **jsbenningfield@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,  
Jeffrey Benningfield

**From:** [Yvette Torres](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:41:33 AM

---

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

**From:** [Karen Knuth](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:48:42 PM

---

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

**From:** [AnnaMaria Cantwell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:21 PM

---

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

**From:** [Samantha Fong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:34 AM

---

My name is **Samantha Fong**

My email address is **mannie805@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Samantha Fong

**From:** [Tao Wang](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:44 PM

---

My name is **Tao Wang**

My email address is **twang@saicusa.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Tao Wang

**From:** [Eugene Abezgauz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:59 PM

---

My name is **Eugene Abezgauz**

My email address is **eabezgauz@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Abezgauz

**From:** [Vera Genkin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:05:50 PM

---

My name is **Vera Genkin**

My email address is **tuttgen@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,  
Vera Genkin

**From:** [Georgette Petropoulos](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:32 PM

---

My name is **Georgette Petropoulos**

My email address is **georgettekp@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Georgette Petropoulos

**From:** [Jeannie Pon](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lyle Lowder](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Annie Pappin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [Carolyn Lucas](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:24:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Julianne Okeefe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:34 PM

---

My name is **Julianne Okeefe**

My email address is **jnokeefe@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Julianne Okeefe

**From:** [karen kinahan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#);  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:02 PM

---

My name is **karen kinahan**

My email address is **karen.kinahan@ssf.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 kinahan

**From:** [Kathleen M Tracey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:10:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [ken flowers](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kat Regan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:59 PM

---

My name is **Kat 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,  
Kat Regan

**From:** [John Park](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kris F](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:08 PM

---

My name is **Kris F**

My email address is **krsfong@yahoo.com**

Please keep the Great Highway accessible to cars and local commuters!

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to



surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Kris F

**From:** [Shelley White](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:41:32 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rodney D'Acquisto](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:54:57 AM

---

My name is **Rodney D'Acquisto**

My email address is **rodney@cdsdist.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 D'Acquisto

**From:** [Robert Fowler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:42 PM

---

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

**From:** [Meredith Levy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:37 PM

---

My name is **Meredith Levy**

My email address is **meredith@mwlfinejewelry.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Meredith Levy

**From:** [Bo Bo Fung](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:28:10 AM

---

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

**From:** [Steven Schroeder](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:50:46 AM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Dorf](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:09:04 AM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Williams](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:55:20 AM

---

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

**From:** [Ernita O'Brien](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:05:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rita Hock](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:24:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gregg M](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:11:58 PM

---

My name is **Gregg M**

My email address is **ggbgregg-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

**From:** [Narine Kerelian](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Randa Talbott](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:50:17 AM

---

My name is **Randa Talbott**

My email address is **RANDATALBOTT@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,  
Randa Talbott

**From:** [James Gold](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Esfir Shrayber](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:34 PM

---

My name is **Esfir Shrayber**

My email address is **ekstati@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,  
Esfir Shrayber

**From:** [Aine McGovern](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:42 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jennifer Chin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:56:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Barbara Styles](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:36 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gary Forsyth](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:03:51 AM

---

My name is **Gary Forsyth**

My email address is **[garyforsyth53@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Gary Ockey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:59 PM

---

My name is **Gary Ockey**

My email address is **tgbock@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,  
Gary Ockey

**From:** [David Bass](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ken Bentubo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:34 PM

---

My name is **Ken Bentubo**

My email address is **ken@bentubo.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,  
Ken Bentubo

**From:** [Benson Hua](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:42 PM

---

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

**From:** [Marc Joseph Rabideau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:28:11 AM

---

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

**From:** [Lisa Klinck-shea](mailto:Lisa.Klinck-shea@sf.gov)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:18:03 AM

---

My name is **Lisa Klinck-shea**

My email address is **[lisa.klinckshea@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Stephen Kitagawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Grace Lai](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:03 PM

---

My name is **Grace Lai**

My email address is **gracelai888@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,  
Grace Lai

**From:** [Maria Dominick](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:44 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dick Robinson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lynne Myers](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:57 PM

---

My name is **Lynne Myers**

My email address is **lynneinsf@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,  
Lynne Myers

**From:** [Pooi Li Yip](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:49:40 AM

---

My name is **Pooi Li Yip**

My email address is **yip.lily@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Pooi Li Yip

**From:** [Artie Kramer](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:45 PM

---

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



**From:** [Angela Mendoza](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:50:14 AM

---

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

**From:** [Deborah Freitas](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [Devorah Joseph](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:24:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kathleen Lacey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:36 PM

---

My name is **Kathleen Lacey**

My email address is **kathleen@thelaceys.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,  
Kathleen Lacey



**From:** [Jeff Holland](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:07 PM

---

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

**From:** [DEBRA HOWARD](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:18:19 AM

---

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

**From:** [Cynthia Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:28:48 AM

---

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

**From:** [Ed Tavasieff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:40 PM

---

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



**From:** [Brenda Austin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:18 PM

---

My name is **Brenda Austin**

My email address is **brendaaustinpnd@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Mike Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:11:49 AM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Slade](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:58:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dennis Minnick](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:27:40 PM

---

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



**From:** [Eleanor Pollak](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:05 PM

---

My name is **Eleanor Pollak**

My email address is **eleanor.pollak@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Eleanor Pollak

**From:** [Barbara Wampner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:05:47 PM

---

My name is **Barbara Wampner**

My email address is **endpin1@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,  
Barbara Wampner

**From:** [Layne Menn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:44 PM

---

My name is **Layne Menn**

My email address is **layne\_behrens@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,  
Layne Menn

**From:** [Vanessa Pacheco](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:36 PM

---

My name is **Vanessa Pacheco**

My email address is **vanessalp@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,  
Vanessa Pacheco



**From:** [wing lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:35 PM

---

My name is **wing lee**

My email address is **wingli007@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,  
wing lee

**From:** [Natalie Simotas](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01:59 PM

---

My name is **Natalie Simotas**

My email address is **Blueagyrl2@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

**From:** [Wally Rosales](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:35 PM

---

My name is **Wally Rosales**

My email address is **walterrosales837@comcast.net**

To whom it may concern, I am a veteran public servant, in which I've been commuting from my home in the Richmond District for the last almost 30 years. It's a long commute that I take and without a doubt, my favorite part of my commute is driving northbound and southbound along the great highway. In the mornings, it gets me off to a great start to my day and prepare to go out there and keep the public safe, on my way home when I see the ocean I know I'm home.

Covid took that away from me and thousands of others that use the great highway every month. I understand this was a phenomenon that happened to our world and we had to deal with it. But now radical coalitions trying to take away this small joy from us that depend and love driving along the great highway permanently is just absolutely unfair! Most of these folks that are involved in this don't even live in San Francisco, taking this simple joy and RIGHT away from a long time resident of this beautiful city is an absolute crime to not only me, but to every person that needs and enjoys driving along the great highway.

I understand about sharing this beautiful area of San Francisco and I for one am okay with sharing it and having it closed on the weekends, but to completely take it away from us permanently is an absolute disservice, insult and crime to the residents of San Francisco, especially the Richmond District. Please, please, do not close permanently this great joy that brings thousands of us that have to commute and use the great highway.

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

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed

critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy

and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Wally Rosales

**From:** [Lynne Muller](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Elinor Liberman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:33:54 AM

---

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

**From:** [Alex Vaisman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:45 PM

---

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

**From:** [Steve Camahort](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:24:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [boris shevkhod](mailto:boris.shevkhod)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:39 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jamie C Wilson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:44:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [Darryl Woo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:35:38 PM

---

My name is **Darryl Woo**

My email address is **ddddddah@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

**From:** [Thomas Henderson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:45:19 AM

---

My name is **Thomas Henderson**

My email address is **t.stephen.henderson@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Henderson

**From:** [Raymond Stuart](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:39 PM

---

My name is **Raymond Stuart**

My email address is **ray71143@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,  
Raymond Stuart

**From:** [Emily Chen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:29:14 AM

---

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

**From:** [Linda Maher](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [judith waitz](mailto:judith.waitz@sf.gov)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:54:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Arnold Trogman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:28:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Judith Stein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:57 PM

---

My name is **Judith Stein**

My email address is **judithastein@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Stein

**From:** [Kathleen Reilly](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:06 PM

---

My name is **Kathleen Reilly**  
My email address is **jreilly749@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,  
Kathleen Reilly

**From:** [Greg Giachino](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sharon Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:05:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nancy Keane](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Chris Lehman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:44:21 AM

---

My name is **Chris Lehman**

My email address is **crlehman18@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,  
Chris Lehman

**From:** [Mark Won](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:27:26 AM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Wattis III](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:05:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alex Lim](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:35:35 PM

---

My name is **Alex Lim**

My email address is **mr\_mpoee@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

**From:** [Stacey Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:56 PM

---

My name is **Stacey Ng**

My email address is **sboyleng@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,  
Stacey Ng

**From:** [Exequiel Borromeo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:42:11 AM

---

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

**From:** [Monika Rothenbuhler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#);  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:33:29 AM

---

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



**From:** [Jeremy Hughes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:02 PM

---

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

**From:** [Koe Poon](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kon Mironov](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:39 PM

---

My name is **Kon Mironov**

My email address is **[kon.mironov@aol.com](mailto:kon.mironov@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,  
Kon Mironov

**From:** [Eric Zoglman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:44:12 AM

---

My name is **Eric Zoglman**

My email address is **ericzog@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,  
Eric Zoglman



**From:** [Karen Cresci](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:02:30 PM

---

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 of 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

**From:** [Keelin Reddy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Robert O'Donnell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:33 PM

---

My name is **Robert O'Donnell**

My email address is **robert@wealthmechanix.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Isn't it about time to consider fact that there is already a bike lane and sidewalk that parallels the Great Highway FOR ITS ENTIRE LENGTH?

Isn't it time to consider that long-time resident seniors and their families and caregivers have long appreciated a drive along the shore, to spend times together and get the benefit of the sea air?

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

With elections coming up, isn't it time to consider that FIAT CHANGES to this City is what is wrong with this city?

Sincerely,  
Robert ODonnell

**From:** [Glen Harvey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:41:18 PM

---

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



**From:** [Scott Tong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:24:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Anastasia Fink](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:44:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ignacio Orellana-Garcia](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rich Bridygham](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:27:58 AM

---

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



**From:** [Leslie Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:37:33 AM

---

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

**From:** [John Qian](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:39 PM

---

My name is **John Qian**

My email address is **jdqian@saicusa.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Qian

**From:** [Rosemary Newton](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Shawna McGrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:38 PM

---

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



**From:** [Roy Edgar](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:19 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nathaniel Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Brian Chinn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:02:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [Tripti Sharma](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:44:34 PM

---

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



**From:** [Kelly Faulkner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:56 PM

---

My name is **Kelly Faulkner**

My email address is **Kellymariefaulkner@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Faulkner

**From:** [Erin Murphy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:37:09 AM

---

My name is **Erin Murphy**

My email address is **minimurph22@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,  
Erin Murphy

**From:** [David Krucik](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:12 PM

---

My name is **David Krucik**

My email address is **david.krucik@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,  
David Krucik

**From:** [Mike Strain](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:38 PM

---

My name is **Mike Strain**

My email address is **m\_strain@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 Strain



**From:** [Harper Lindstrom](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:33 PM

---

My name is **Harper Lindstrom**

My email address is **harperlindstrom@rocketmail.com**

Please keep the existing arrangement in place for the Great Highway. There are so many people enjoying the Great Highway!

Sincerely,

Harper Lindstrom  
94122

Sincerely,  
Harper Lindstrom

**From:** [Yasmin Staton](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:26:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Wallace Gee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:42:12 AM

---

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

**From:** [Martin Denefeld](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:33:30 AM

---

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

**From:** [Betty Yen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:55:11 AM

---

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

**From:** [Andie Rice](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:05 PM

---

My name is **Andie Rice**

My email address is **BrownieAndie@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,  
Andie Rice

**From:** [ciara.piron](mailto:ciara.piron)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:39 PM

---

My name is **ciara piron**

My email address is **sfishome@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
ciara piron

**From:** [Lisa Ryan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Venk Reddy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:37:27 AM

---

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

**From:** [Betty Louie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Bruce Patriquin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:35:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lara Witter](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:40 PM

---

My name is **Lara Witter**

My email address is **larawitter@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness.

Most importantly, a more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Lara Witter

**From:** [Sherrie Rosenberg](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [BRUCE BOURNE](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:43 PM

---

My name is **BRUCE BOURNE**

My email address is **BWBOURNE@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.

The Bicycle Coalition has gone from "Share The Road" to "Give us the whole damn road" and I think that is a travesty. Please don't give in to this sort of pressure from a special interest group.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
**BRUCE BOURNE**

**From:** [Gabriel Donohoe](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:56 PM

---

My name is **Gabriel Donohoe**

My email address is **gderek@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,  
Gabriel Donohoe

**From:** [Grace Huey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:37 PM

---

My name is **Grace Huey**

My email address is **hueygt@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,  
Grace Huey

**From:** [Elina Belotserkovskaya](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:57:52 PM

---

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



**From:** [Kimberly Borromeo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:42:14 AM

---

My name is **Kimberly Borromeo**

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

**From:** [Heather Luongo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:41 PM

---

My name is **Heather Luongo**

My email address is **heather.luongo@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Luongo

**From:** [Charlton Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Elizabeth Okazaki](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:27:11 AM

---

My name is **Elizabeth Okazaki**

My email address is **toobizilizi@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Okazaki



**From:** [Bonnie Honniball](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:13 PM

---

My name is **Bonnie Honniball**

My email address is **bonniehonniball@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Honniball

**From:** [Mark Staton](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:26:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Jensen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:54:43 PM

---

My name is **Michael Jensen**

My email address is **mistermikejensen@gmail.com**

I urge you to confirm and protect the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to reject the appeals currently underway.

My family lives in the Sunset and opening the Great Highway to all types of use (except vehicles) has been an absolute treasure. The extremely narrow pathway cannot handle the amount of people who desire to use the Great Highway on weekends in particular- thousands of people every day who shop at local stores and restaurants, people who live locally and who travel for the world class views and healthy sea air.

If “closing” the Great Highway on weekends (a misnomer if I’ve ever heard one) deters automobile traffic- GOOD! These people never intended to stop for awhile- they merely want to drive through as quickly as possible- creating a dangerous situation for all the people who do want to use Ocean Beach or ride bikes, skateboards, scooters, etc.

I support better traffic engineering on Sunset Blvd and 19th Ave- but allowing the current appeals to close the Great Highway to family and nature lovers would be an absolute travesty.

Sincerely,  
Michael Jensen

**From:** [Irene Deutsch](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:32 PM

---

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

**From:** [David Soffa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:33:30 AM

---

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

**From:** [Angela Tickler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Antonai Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Carol Satriani](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:29:29 AM

---

My name is **Carol Satriani**

My email address is **carol@carolsatriani.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Satriani

**From:** [Jamie Kendall](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:55:12 AM

---

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

**From:** [Laura Gilmore](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ira Schneiderman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:11:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Carl Kaufman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engarddiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engarddiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Linda Bork](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:03 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gail Rutherford](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:13:48 AM

---

My name is **Gail Rutherford**

My email address is **[gail\\_rutherford@yahoo.com](mailto:gail_rutherford@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,  
Gail Rutherford

**From:** [Elyse Aylward](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:31 PM

---

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

**From:** [Catherine Madison](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:25:39 AM

---

My name is **Catherine Madison**

My email address is **catherinekmadison@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Madison

**From:** [Nickolas Mironov](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:46:20 AM

---

My name is **Nickolas Mironov**

My email address is **[nickvmironov@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Mary Innes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:30:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kathy McCovey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:43:56 AM

---

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

**From:** [Brian Adler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:54:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Curt Cournale](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:57:37 PM

---

My name is **Curt Cournale**

My email address is **cmc@cournaleco.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Curt Cournale

**From:** [Carol Faulkner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:55 PM

---

My name is **Carol Faulkner**

My email address is **artisfunn@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

**From:** [Nathanael Tico](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gina Tse-Louie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:17:42 PM

---

My name is **Gina Tse-Louie**

My email address is **Informed168@gmail.com**

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

If we are to comply with RHNA requirements we must have ingress and egress, public transportation and other. We should be forward thinking and not reactive to housing needs. Giving a major thoroughfare away and then trying to take it back will be challenging. Please consider this in anticipation of new construction. Additionally:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Gina Tse-Louie

**From:** [Beth McLaughlin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:16 PM

---

My name is **Beth McLaughlin**

My email address is **yhwyrt@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



commuters alike. There is already plenty of room on the promenade and walk and bike road that parallels the Great Highway for a bike and walking thoroughfare, while there is no easy way across the City from the Richmond District to the Sunset and Westlake without the Great Highway.

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

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity. Further, the weekend closures result in difficulty getting to the cemeteries in Colma, a trip that should take 20 minutes can take over an hour when one gets stuck trying to cross the park, and taking local roads to get to Sunset Blvd.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 McLaughlin

**From:** [Georgina Costales](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Cristina Gutterman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Popoff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:33:16 PM

---

My name is **Michael Popoff**

My email address is **sfpoaads1@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Popoff

**From:** [Daniel O'Donnell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:17 PM

---

My name is **Daniel O'Donnell**

My email address is **dodonnell88@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,  
Daniel O'Donnell

**From:** [Stephen Gorski](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:55:13 AM

---

My name is **Stephen Gorski**

My email address is **[sjgorskilaw@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [glenda.hope](mailto:glenda.hope)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:08:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Ricci](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:16 PM

---

My name is **John Ricci**

My email address is **jriccix@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Ricci

**From:** [Laine Buckingham](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:35:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nathan Sammons](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:11:30 AM

---

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

**From:** [Beatrix Lazard](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:43:57 AM

---

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

**From:** [Cameo Jones](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Peter Batanides](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:02 PM

---

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

**From:** [Marian Heath](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:29 PM

---

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

**From:** [Irene Deutsch](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:18:44 PM

---

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

**From:** [Scott Brown](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:55:54 AM

---

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

**From:** [Rick Peloquin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:24:20 AM

---

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

**From:** [Brunero Cecchetti](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:46:22 AM

---

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

**From:** [Josephine McGann](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:54:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alan Cresci](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [Charlotte McMinn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:07 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jack D'Angelo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:59:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sean McGrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:33:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [Louise Whitlock](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:15 PM

---

My name is **Louise Whitlock**

My email address is **lcwhitlock@ymail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Louise Whitlock

**From:** [stanlee.gatti](mailto:stanlee.gatti)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Andra Sadoun](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:08:46 PM

---

My name is **Andra Sadoun**

My email address is **sadounah@yahoo.com**

Please revert the use of the Great Highway to its traditional purpose, to get from north to south on the western side of the city. So many cars are diverted to 19th Avenue, that it is always overcrowded. Traffic on the way to that thoroughfare is also much higher than it need be. Traffic through the park is also way higher than it need be. And traffic along the Lower Great Highway and 48th Avenue is like on a thoroughfare, although these homeowners certainly did not buy their houses there expecting to live on a busy north-south highway.

There is a fine walkway on the east side of the Great Highway, and the entire beach on the west side. Let drivers through on the Highway itself! We also enjoy the view while driving!

Thank you. Please do not let the closure of the Great Highway be permanent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Andra Sadoun



**From:** [Karen Growney](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:54 PM

---

My name is **Karen Growney**

My email address is **karen@growney.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.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Karen Growney

Sincerely,  
Karen Growney

**From:** [romando.lucchesi](mailto:romando.lucchesi@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:58:08 AM

---

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



**From:** [ANDREW BILLS](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:10 PM

---

My name is **ANDREW BILLS**

My email address is **abills@ddphealth.com**

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

The closer of the the great Highway has made a meaningul negative impact on my day-to-day. In addition to the real concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

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

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

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

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

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise

in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 BILLS

**From:** [George Courtsunis](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:42:21 PM

---

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

**From:** [Hue Khuu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [Omar Dudum](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:46:22 AM

---

My name is **Omar Dudum**

My email address is **deepseadudum@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



**From:** [Jeffrey Fell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:55:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [George Haris](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Emanuel Langit](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:32 PM

---

My name is **Emanuel Langit**

My email address is **emanuel.langit@fastmail.fm**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Emanuel Langit

**From:** [Brian Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:42:37 PM

---

My name is **Brian Lee**

My email address is **subr8ar@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Lee

**From:** [Jonah Purinton](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Mohun](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:53:42 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gerd Mairandres](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:16:30 AM

---

My name is **Gerd Mairandres**

My email address is **gmairandres@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,  
Gerd Mairandres

**From:** [Sharon Tang](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:17 PM

---

My name is **Sharon Tang**

My email address is **wzt86@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 Tang

**From:** [Matthew Denny](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:00:20 AM

---

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

**From:** [Diana Leong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:04:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Irina Karpovich](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:56:34 AM

---

My name is **Irina Karpovich**

My email address is **ikarpovich@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,  
Irina Karpovich

**From:** [Charlotte Pope](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:08:45 PM

---

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

**From:** [William McDonnell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:53 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ken Jones](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Elinor Liberman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:28 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lawrence Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:47:24 AM

---

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

**From:** [Sandra Chan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 7:58:50 AM

---

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

**From:** [John Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:42:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [David Lewin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:18 PM

---

My name is **David Lewin**

My email address is **dickielew@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 Lewin

**From:** [Frank Tatko](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:09 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rosemary McQuaid](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:29 PM

---

My name is **Rosemary McQuaid**

My email address is **rosemaryjmcquaid@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 McQuaid

**From:** [Martin Murphy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:05:49 PM

---

My name is **Martin Murphy**

My email address is **[martymurphy04@comcast.net](mailto: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

**From:** [Michael Cerchiai](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:28 PM

---

My name is **Michael Cerchiai**

My email address is **mcerchiai@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,  
Michael Cerchiai

**From:** [Kevin Growney](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:53:33 PM

---

My name is **Kevin Growney**

My email address is **kevin@growney.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,  
Kevin Growney

**From:** [Boris Levine](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:36:44 AM

---

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

**From:** [Ashley Dalzell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Denise Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Simone Miller](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nancy Federico](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:46:11 AM

---

My name is **Nancy Federico**

My email address is **nlfederico@msnn.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Federico

**From:** [Terry McDevitt](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:16:30 AM

---

My name is **Terry McDevitt**

My email address is **dismasmcd@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.

Closed roads create longer driving distances and times which logically also creates more smog . Such closures also deny full access and use to all citizens/taxpayers .

Sincerely,  
Terry McDevitt

**From:** [Frank Keane](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:02:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Harry Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:52 PM

---

My name is **Harry Wong**

My email address is **hoarser\_aphid.0i@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 Vehicle Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

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



commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Wong

**From:** [Judi Hurabiell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:34 PM

---

My name is **Judi Hurabiell**

My email address is **jmhurabiell1@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Judi Hurabiell

**From:** [Frank Schimaneck](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:32 PM

---

My name is **Frank Schimaneck**

My email address is **feschimaneck@drydenlaw.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Schimaneck

**From:** [Michael Betz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:10 PM

---

My name is **Michael Betz**

My email address is **mbetz@allenmatkins.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Betz

**From:** [Sam Lewin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:19 PM

---

My name is **Sam Lewin**

My email address is **samwlewin@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Sam Lewin

**From:** [Michael Young](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:43:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ann Marie Porter](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:16:28 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jingwen Tan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:21:36 AM

---

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

**From:** [Lilian Lynch](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:29 PM

---

My name is **Lilian Lynch**

My email address is **[liliankim90@gmail.com](mailto:liliankim90@gmail.com)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Lilian Lynch

**From:** [Anthony Jasinski](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rebecca Tico](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:09 PM

---

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

**From:** [Debra Harrison](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:52:30 PM

---

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

**From:** [Laura Puccini](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:40:47 AM

---

My name is **Laura Puccini**

My email address is **[l\\_puccini@comcast.net](mailto:l_puccini@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 Puccini

**From:** [Deborah Taylor](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:27 PM

---

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

**From:** [Arthur Ritchie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:11 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Lum](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:11:37 PM

---

My name is **John Lum**

My email address is **[dalai\\_lumma@yahoo.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Rick Montenegro](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Kim](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:55:59 AM

---

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

**From:** [Gloria Keeley](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:56:28 AM

---

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

**From:** [Stan Erhart](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:02:15 PM

---

My name is **Stan Erhart**

My email address is **stan@erhart.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,  
Stan Erhart

**From:** [Julia Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:51 PM

---

My name is **Julia Wong**

My email address is **juliawongsf@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,  
Julia Wong

**From:** [Mary Gwynn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Frانيا Feldstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:45:32 PM

---

My name is **Frانيا 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,  
Frania Feldstein

**From:** [Joan Satriani](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:34 PM

---

My name is **Joan Satriani**

My email address is **joan@joansatriani.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Satriani

**From:** [Thomas Snow](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:16:28 AM

---

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

**From:** [Esfir Shrayber](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:26:01 AM

---

My name is **Esfir Shrayber**

My email address is **to\_fira@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,  
Esfir Shrayber

**From:** [Tom Escher](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lisa Harpenau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:36:32 PM

---

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

**From:** [William Diefenbach](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:43:11 PM

---

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

**From:** [Takako Yamashita](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [David O'Brien](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:47:57 AM

---

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

**From:** [simmone.fichtner](mailto:simmone.fichtner)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:20 PM

---

My name is **simmone fichtner**

My email address is **simmonef67@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
simmone fichtner

**From:** [Darcy Mironov](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:56:30 AM

---

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

**From:** [victoire.reynal](mailto:victoire.reynal)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:51 PM

---

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

**From:** [Richard Kawala](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:30 PM

---

My name is **Richard Kawala**

My email address is **rkawala@gmail.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Kawala

**From:** [Carolyn Hee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:52:09 PM

---

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

**From:** [So Kwong-Chan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:30:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Chris Conner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:27 PM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Roscelli](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Patricia Henshaw](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:00:51 PM

---

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

**From:** [Shu Ping Kuang](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rudy Asercion](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:21:38 AM

---

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

**From:** [Emilia Jankowski](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:11 PM

---

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

**From:** [Elizabeth Jasper](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:51 PM

---

My name is **Elizabeth Jasper**

My email address is **ejasper@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,  
Elizabeth Jasper

**From:** [Tim Runde](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:09:12 AM

---

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

**From:** [JOHN CERVANTES](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:06:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Philip Wing](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:21:38 AM

---

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

**From:** [Elizabeth Bobier](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:16:26 AM

---

My name is **Elizabeth Bobier**

My email address is **bets@amati-online.com**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

commuters alike.

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Bobier

**From:** [Ryutaro Hirota](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:56:32 AM

---

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

**From:** [Laura Horihan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:32 PM

---

My name is **Laura Horihan**

My email address is **[laura.horihan@gmail.com](mailto:laura.horihan@gmail.com)**

I oppose this nonsensical decision, which has been pushed by the self-interested bicycle coalition and bypasses the working individuals that use this HIGHWAY for transportation (as it was designed to do!!). I am sick of these rich, entitled people who work from home and take over tax-payer funded streets and highways that people RELY ON to get to work -- yes people work on weekends too!!! Ride your bike in the various parks and designated bike paths throughout the bay area...there are many! Enough of this! We are sick of people using "environmental concerns" for their own benefits and to push their own agendas. I live in this district and these activists have NO right to be taking over the streets that they don't use to get to work. Period.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Horihan  
District 1 resident and owner

Sincerely,  
Laura Horihan



**From:** [Eugene Galvin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:57:44 AM

---

My name is **Eugene Galvin**

My email address is **egggalvin@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

**From:** [Tony K](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:10 PM

---

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



**From:** [Sergey Dubenko](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Galina Rafalovich](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:59 PM

---

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

**From:** [Yuanda Zhang](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:50:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nikki Yoshikawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:00:10 PM

---

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



**From:** [Michael Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:06 PM

---

My name is **Michael Cohen**

My email address is **mcohen@saicusa.com**

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

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

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

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

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

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Valerie Pinkert](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Corinne Charlton Barbour](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:30:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [Brenda Goldstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:21 PM

---

My name is **Brenda Goldstein**

My email address is **bgoldie27@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,  
Brenda Goldstein

**From:** [Paul Dalzell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Hai Feng Wu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:50:55 PM

---

My name is **Hai Feng Wu**

My email address is **ke668@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,  
Hai Feng Wu

**From:** [Steven Eliopoulos](mailto:Steven.Eliopoulos@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:03:09 AM

---

My name is **Steven Eliopoulos**

My email address is **snwsteve@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 Eliopoulos

**From:** [Al McDonnell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:33 PM

---

My name is **Al McDonnell**

My email address is **lcdrmcdonnell@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and



commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Al McDonnell

**From:** [Walter Zhovreboff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:23 PM

---

My name is **Walter Zhovreboff**

My email address is **z@fhicda.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Zhovreboff

**From:** [Julia Fell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:50:27 PM

---

My name is **Julia Fell**

My email address is **jfell5@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,  
Julia Fell

**From:** [Jianjian Guo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:21:39 AM

---

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

**From:** [Steven Schroeder](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:19:48 AM

---

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

**From:** [Yanhui Liu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:50:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jennet Nazzal](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kaelin Dalzell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gus Zert](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:49:54 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mary Harris](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Andrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Bradd Haley](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:59:26 PM

---

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

**From:** [Donna Tuttle](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:56:33 AM

---

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

**From:** [Nancy Hinze](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:47 PM

---

My name is **Nancy Hinze**

My email address is **nanrad6@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 Hinze

**From:** [Michael Cohen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:59 PM

---

My name is **Michael Cohen**

My email address is **michael@apertureventures.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Janice Peloquin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jo Kaufman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:56:58 AM

---

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

**From:** [Deborah Thompson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:06:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jackie Svevo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Peterson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:32:50 AM

---

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

**From:** [Elizabeth Fighera](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:16 PM

---

My name is **Elizabeth Fighera**

My email address is **[lily@lilyhats.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Jeff Frankenfield](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:54 PM

---

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

**From:** [Aleksandr Kolesnikov](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:07 PM

---

My name is **Aleksandr Kolesnikov**

My email address is **aleks\_kolesnikov@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,  
Aleksandr Kolesnikov

**From:** [Bruce Giannini](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Steven Jeung](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:03:06 AM

---

My name is **Steven Jeung**

My email address is **syj1@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,  
Steven Jeung

**From:** [James Hudkins](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [BYRON HO](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:51:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ilene Fohs](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:56:55 AM

---

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

**From:** [JILL MORI](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:25 PM

---

My name is **JILL MORI**

My email address is **jkmsfog1987@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and



commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Born and raised in District 1, for over 50 years in the area and IT IS RIDICULOUS on the weekends trying to get to the other side of GG Park! Go spend a day on Saturday or Sunday at Lincoln and 41st Avenue, Lincoln and Great Highway and see for yourself the congestion in the area AND IN THE PARK itself as it is used as a shortcut now for those who don't want to wait in the Chain of Lakes exodus. Less cars on Great Highway created MORE CARS IN THE PARK.... JUST leave it the way it is supposed to be, stop listening to those who think that riding a bike will save the world!

Sincerely,  
JILL MORI

**From:** [David Ferguson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:01:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gary Kendall](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:57:13 PM

---

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

**From:** [Tammy Bee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:49:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Peter Batanides](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:21:40 AM

---

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

**From:** [Sara Anderson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:33 PM

---

My name is **Sara Anderson**

My email address is **saralee.anderson@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Sara Anderson

**From:** [Joe Schoepp](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ella Leong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Elias Degu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:48:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Erin McGrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:40:04 AM

---

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

**From:** [Kevin Martin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Patrick Skain](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:01:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [JIM MCDONALD](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:55:14 AM

---

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

**From:** [Chloe Dalzell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:53 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Magee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:57:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [rami r](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [alison.wahl](mailto:alison.wahl@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:50:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mark S. Weinberger](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:21:41 AM

---

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

**From:** [Janet Fowler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:51 PM

---

My name is **Janet Fowler**

My email address is **jfowlers@aol.com**

I strongly agree with the following email. The traffic congestion is horrendous and the both Lower Great Highway and Lincoln Avenue, as well as other linking streets are impacting the community and creating dangers.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

Increased Traffic and Accidents: The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

Elevated Air Pollution Levels: With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

Longer Commutes: For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Fowler  
Former resident of La Playa Avenue

Sincerely,  
Janet Fowler

**From:** [Michael Bordokoff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:25 PM

---

My name is **Michael Bordokoff**

My email address is **mbordokoff@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,  
Michael Bordokoff

**From:** [Bijan Yashar](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:33 PM

---

My name is **Bijan Yashar**

My email address is **bijanyashar@yahoo.com**

Let working people get to work. Stop making an already congested commute worse with this idiotic closure.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.



**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Bijan Yashar

**From:** [Todd Traina](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:57:09 PM

---

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

**From:** [Antoinette Wythes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:47 PM

---

My name is **Antoinette Wythes**

My email address is **maitsai@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,  
Antoinette Wythes

**From:** [KAREN HO](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:51:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jimmy Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Henry Kwan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47:29 PM

---

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

**From:** [Martha Angove](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mark Rand](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [mei chan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:26 PM

---

My name is **mei chan**

My email address is **ilovemydog29@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,  
mei chan

**From:** [Marlen Bekirov](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dennis Dybeck](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:22 PM

---

My name is **Dennis Dybeck**

My email address is **dennisdybeck@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.

In addition to the above, it's my observation that this (and similar ad hoc road closures) were done at the intense urging of special interest advocacy groups such as The Bicycle Coalition under the rationale of being Covid "safety measures", bypassing established procedure. And that The Bicycle Coalition exercises undue election help influence on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,  
Dennis Dybeck

**From:** [Dee Doley](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:01:54 PM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Wythes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:42:46 PM

---

My name is **Paul Wythes**

My email address is **paul@wythes.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and



commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Wythes

**From:** [John Simpson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:03:38 PM

---

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

**From:** [Debi Durst](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:35 PM

---

My name is **Debi Durst**

My email address is **dutch13@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,  
Debi Durst

**From:** [Em Chiu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:47:03 PM

---

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

**From:** [Barbara Heffernan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:48:05 PM

---

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



**From:** [Dustin Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:57:36 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sherry Lau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:51:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mady Jones](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:03 PM

---

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

**From:** [richard brandi](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:53:01 AM

---

My name is **richard brandi**

My email address is **rbrandi@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,  
richard brandi



**From:** [Leanne Young](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:44 PM

---

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

**From:** [Mikhail Keselman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [Greg Syler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Eugene Loch](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:56:41 PM

---

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



**From:** [Anita Ho](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:45:59 AM

---

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

**From:** [Brooke Perkins](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:22:55 AM

---

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

**From:** [Janet McGee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sylvia Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:53:01 AM

---

My name is **Sylvia Lee**

My email address is **linglee2004@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Sylvia Lee



**From:** [linda.sekino](mailto:linda.sekino)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:02:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [Herbert Weiner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:02:47 PM

---

My name is **Herbert Weiner**

My email address is **[h.weiner@sbcglobal.net](mailto: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

**From:** [Suzanne Schimaneck](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Evelyn Jones](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:46:37 AM

---

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



**From:** [Stan Erhart](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:53:24 PM

---

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

**From:** [Henry Shain](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:31 PM

---

My name is **Henry Shain**

My email address is **henryshain@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Shain

**From:** [Brian Bonham](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:36 PM

---

My name is **Brian Bonham**

My email address is **mayumikamon@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,  
Brian Bonham

**From:** [betty.winholtz](mailto:betty.winholtz@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lauris Jensen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:29:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [JJ Hagan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Brad McMillan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:47:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Melissa Aurand](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [Wendy Anderson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:03 PM

---

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

**From:** [Wilson Lem](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:09:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [Karen Pugay](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:27:39 AM

---

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

**From:** [JOHN CERVANTES](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [Arthur Ritchie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Aisling Crowley](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:34:27 AM

---

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

**From:** [Mark Parcella](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:03 PM

---

My name is **Mark Parcella**

My email address is **[gabriela\\_sf@yahoo.com](mailto:gabriela_sf@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.

Great Highway closure requires that we drive down residential streets. The traffic does not go away; it just moves it to residential.

The bike path that runs to the south of the great highway, which I use often to run, is plenty wide for recreational use. Widen that a bit if that's what's needed.

But the Great Highway needs to reopen at all times.

Thank you,  
Mark Parcella

Sincerely,  
Mark Parcella

**From:** [steve omori](mailto:steve.omori)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:02:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Margot Beall](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:02:58 PM

---

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



**From:** [Emanuel Langit](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:29:08 PM

---

My name is **Emanuel Langit**

My email address is **emanuel.langit@fastmail.fm**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Emanuel Langit

**From:** [Gerald Schall](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Frank Cassinell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:03:57 PM

---

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

**From:** [Robert Belli](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:45:43 AM

---

My name is **Robert Belli**

My email address is **robbelli99@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Belli



**From:** [Robert Bevc](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:32 PM

---

My name is **Robert Bevc**

My email address is **robertbevc@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,  
Robert Bevc

**From:** [Stone Melet](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:46:39 AM

---

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

**From:** [Doug McKirahan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:23 PM

---

My name is **Doug McKirahan**

My email address is **ratt57@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,  
Doug McKirahan

**From:** [Gretta Dacquisto](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:04 PM

---

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



**From:** [Terri DeSalvo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engarddiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engarddiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openethegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openethegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:21 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Dorf](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jeffrey Laffranchini](mailto:Jeffrey.Laffranchini@comcast.net)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:11:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [EDWARD KINNEY](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:22 PM

---

My name is **EDWARD KINNEY**

My email address is **EKINNEY400@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,  
EDWARD KINNEY



**From:** [Pamela Sebastian](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Joseph Bavaresco](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:36 PM

---

My name is **Joseph Bavaresco**

My email address is **josephbavaresco@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,  
Joseph Bavaresco

**From:** [James Argo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:47:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Donna Rand](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:21 PM

---

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



**From:** [Chloe Jager](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jennifer Tobiason](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:03:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Phyllis Nabhan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:45:42 AM

---

My name is **Phyllis Nabhan**

My email address is **phyllisnabhan@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Chris Fern](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:02 PM

---

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



**From:** [Kate Qvale](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:55:40 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jennifer Dougherty](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:37 PM

---

My name is **Jennifer Dougherty**

My email address is **dordy71@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,  
Jennifer Dougherty

**From:** [Karen Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:41:55 AM

---

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

**From:** [Dennis Ilog](mailto:Dennis.Ilog)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:33 PM

---

My name is **Dennis Ilog**

My email address is **dilog@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,  
Dennis Ilog



**From:** [Kevin McLoone](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:29:02 PM

---

My name is **Kevin McLoone**

My email address is **kmcloone@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 McLoone

**From:** [jennifer Yan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:47:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jann Jeung](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Mohun](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:04:21 PM

---

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



**From:** [D.F. Owen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43:04 PM

---

My name is **D F Owen**

My email address is **do97my@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.

P. S. I've been a resident on 48th Avenue for 48 years. Currently, speeding traffic on 48th Ave. due to weekend closure of the Upper Great Highway creates dangerous issues for residents and drivers. Stop signs are constantly ignored.

Sincerely,  
D F Owen

**From:** [Anjali Billa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gretel Perez](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:54 PM

---

My name is **Gretel Perez**

My email address is **breadcrumbtrail@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Aaron Goodman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:02 PM

---

My name is **Aaron Goodman**

My email address is **amgodman@yahoo.com**

I walk on the lower walkway which is not maintained and access poorly kept open and accessible. When u fix transit and u work on mobility access to the paths and their maintenance and access to transit u solve for the many and not the few. Too often temp quick fixes during covid ignored more substantive solutions to access and community uses and spaces. I sent emails and input on the trash issues which were improved with new cans but the path accessibility is not being vetted at the ends and where transit connects. Provide wheelchair proper access to the lower path and the entire beach front to ensure equitable access and proper maintenance and cleaning. It's not just a private parkway or high-line it's a civil engineered waterfront zone so invest properly in its access and use for the future. L taraval from west portal or stonestown to the beach comes to mind...

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Aaron Goodman





**From:** [Devorah Joseph](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:21 PM

---

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

**From:** [Claudia Hawkins](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:38 PM

---

My name is **Claudia Hawkins**

My email address is **claudia\_hawkins@gap.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

It's PAST TIME to open up The Great Highway! Give the residents and tax payers freedom to use the roads WE PAY FOR. STOP the SF Park & Rec dictatorship!! ENOUGH ALREADY.

Sincerely,  
Claudia Hawkins

**From:** [Mark Finigan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:56:37 AM

---

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

**From:** [Marilyn Flynn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:45:41 AM

---

My name is **Marilyn Flynn**

My email address is **lynn.flynn@realestatesf.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and



commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Marilyn Flynn

**From:** [Anne Sajdera](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:49:06 AM

---

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



**From:** [Arie Knoops](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:21 PM

---

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

**From:** [RICHERT ROBINS](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:04:24 PM

---

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**



**From:** [Robert Lim](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [JeNeal Granieri](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [Diana Kaytun](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43:03 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kelly Kitagawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46:48 PM

---

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



**From:** [Brendan VanderMei](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:28:57 PM

---

My name is **Brendan VanderMei**

My email address is **bvandermei@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Brendan VanderMei

**From:** [Patricia Arack](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:33 PM

---

My name is **Patricia Arack**

My email address is **parack@ccsf.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,  
Patricia Arack

**From:** [Perry Klebahn](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:00 PM

---

My name is **Perry Klebahn**

My email address is **perry\_k2003@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,  
Perry Klebahn

**From:** [Joe Guido](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:33 PM

---

My name is **Joe Guido**

My email address is **joejguido@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,  
Joe Guido



**From:** [Alice Shen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:06:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Alexandra Vuksich](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:47:01 PM

---

My name is **Alexandra Vuksich**

My email address is **alexandravuksich@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,  
Alexandra Vuksich

**From:** [Leslie Koelsch](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:52 PM

---

My name is **Leslie Koelsch**

My email address is **koelsvh1886@comcad.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,  
Leslie Koelsch

**From:** [Judy Wade](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:52 PM

---

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



**From:** [mimi clarke](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Willoughby](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:27 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dennis McMahon](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:04:47 PM

---

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

**From:** [tracy silva](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#);  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:33 PM

---

My name is **tracy silva**

My email address is **paravieja@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
tracy silva



**From:** [Joanna Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:38:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Madison Clell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:40:18 AM

---

My name is **Madison Clell**

My email address is **madisoncuckoo@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,  
Madison Clell

**From:** [Phyllis Nabhan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:03:54 AM

---

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

**From:** [Alanna Greenham](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:49:09 AM

---

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



**From:** [Shiva Subramaniam](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [Therese Deasy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:00 PM

---

My name is **Therese Deasy**

My email address is **dmcgovern@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,  
Therese Deasy

**From:** [Wesley Valaris](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:12:36 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jon Tolson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43:03 PM

---

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



**From:** [Barry Reder](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [Peter Billeci](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:39 PM

---

My name is **Peter Billeci**

My email address is **jumpfroginc@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Billeci

**From:** [Susan Kitchell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:28:34 PM

---

My name is **Susan Kitchell**

My email address is **zevisema@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Kitchell

**From:** [Joan Broner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:18 PM

---

My name is **Joan Broner**

My email address is **[jmbroner@gmail.com](mailto:jmbroner@gmail.com)**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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



**From:** [Susan Buckley](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46:16 PM

---

My name is **Susan Buckley**

My email address is **susan\_buckley@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,  
Susan Buckley

**From:** [Jonathan Fong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:16 PM

---

My name is **Jonathan Fong**

My email address is **[jqfong@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Stephanie Peek](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:12:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Karin Hu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:51 PM

---

My name is **Karin Hu**

My email address is **brainz\_ca@yahoo.com**

Please open the Great Highway to cars 7 days/week. Ample recreational space is available in Golden Gate 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,  
Karin Hu



**From:** [Sharon Jung-Verdi](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43:02 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Lewin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:36 PM

---

My name is **Michael Lewin**

My email address is **Lewinprop@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Lewin

**From:** [Jennifer Kloetzel](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:11 PM

---

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

**From:** [Rachel Geiger](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:18 PM

---

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



**From:** [Carmel Passanisi](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sheena Craig](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Helen Gee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:50:13 AM

---

My name is **Helen Gee**

My email address is **[helen@pooter.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Erica Pearson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:40:17 AM

---

My name is **Erica Pearson**

My email address is **elpsemail@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,  
Erica Pearson



**From:** [Noelle Song](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:37:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Robert Fliegler](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:28:19 PM

---

My name is **Robert Fliegler**

My email address is **nospam@fliegler.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,  
Robert Fliegler

**From:** [Don Climent](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:03:55 AM

---

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

**From:** [mimi clarke](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:22 PM

---

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



**From:** [Rosemary Kondy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:12:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Shelly Schaenen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Inna Belyaev](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:12 PM

---

My name is **Inna Belyaev**

My email address is **belyaevi@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,  
Inna Belyaev

**From:** [Charles Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:46:10 PM

---

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



**From:** [Matthias Buehl](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:36 PM

---

My name is **Matthias Buehl**

My email address is **baisaboy@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,  
Matthias Buehl

**From:** [Carol Chichester](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Suzanna Allen](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [DENNIS Holl](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:50 PM

---

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



**From:** [Teresa Durling](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:43:02 PM

---

My name is **Teresa Durling**

My email address is **tadurling@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,  
Teresa Durling

**From:** [Kenneth Camp](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:28:02 PM

---

My name is **Kenneth Camp**

My email address is **kennycamp@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Camp

**From:** [Darren Yasukawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:51:35 AM

---

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

**From:** [Lola Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:37:32 PM

---

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



**From:** [Jung Lau](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [S.garrett](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:57 PM

---

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

**From:** [Robert Pritchard](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:05:58 AM

---

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

**From:** [Kim Hoffman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:36 PM

---

My name is **Kim Hoffman**

My email address is **k.w.hoffman57@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Hoffman



**From:** [Delores Lavin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:15 PM

---

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

**From:** [Amanda Peltier](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:01:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Janice Fukuda](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:50 PM

---

My name is **Janice Fukuda**

My email address is **janreiko@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,  
Janice Fukuda

**From:** [shasta james](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:57 PM

---

My name is **shasta james**

My email address is **scarce.jaded0w@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,  
shasta james



**From:** [Sindhura Kodali](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:12:38 PM

---

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

**From:** [Andrew Churchill](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:48 PM

---

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

**From:** [Holly Sisson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:26 PM

---

My name is **Holly Sisson**

My email address is **hollyalexississon@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is 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

**From:** [Yvette Corkrean](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:13 PM

---

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



**From:** [Jill Silverman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:28:01 PM

---

My name is **Jill Silverman**

My email address is **jillks@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,  
Jill Silverman

**From:** [Edward Beltran](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal);  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:09 AM

---

My name is **Edward Beltran**

My email address is **garchdes@hotmail.com**

.

Sincerely,  
Edward Beltran

**From:** [wendy.kan](mailto:wendy.kan@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:55:11 AM

---

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

**From:** [DEBRA HOWARD](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:11 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lily Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:15 PM

---

My name is **Lily Lee**

My email address is **lleerph@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,  
Lily Lee

**From:** [Lauraine Edir](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:06:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [Karen Tamashiro](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:47:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Davin McAndrews](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:12 PM

---

My name is **Davin McAndrews**

My email address is **davin@alum.mit.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,  
Davin McAndrews

**From:** [shandra yoshimi](mailto:shandra.yoshimi)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:26 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Nulty](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:08 PM

---

My name is **John Nulty**

My email address is **john.nulty@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 Nulty

**From:** [Karen Breslin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:00:50 AM

---

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

**From:** [Tanya Lin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lindy Matula](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:38 PM

---

My name is **Lindy Matula**

My email address is **llmatula@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and



commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Lindy Matula

**From:** [Jimmy Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:00:26 PM

---

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

**From:** [Elizabeth Burns](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jimmy Yu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Daniel Choi](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:28 PM

---

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

**From:** [Serena Chan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:19:14 AM

---

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

**From:** [Mieke Vandewalle](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:15 PM

---

My name is **Mieke Vandewalle**

My email address is **mieke@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,  
Mieke Vandewalle

**From:** [Mark S. Weinberger](mailto:Mark.S.Weinberger@hotmial.com)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:27:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Dennis Kelly](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:08 PM

---

My name is **Dennis Kelly**

My email address is **densekelly@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,  
Dennis Kelly

**From:** [Katie Paige](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:47 PM

---

My name is **Katie Paige**

My email address is **ktschwab@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,  
Katie Paige

**From:** [Allison Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kamron Shushtar](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:00:53 AM

---

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

**From:** [Miko Maru](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:15 PM

---

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

**From:** [ed.kim](mailto:ed.kim@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:28 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nancy Benjamin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:19:15 AM

---

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

**From:** [Joseph Faulkner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:56 PM

---

My name is **Joseph Faulkner**

My email address is **joemangolf@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,  
Joseph Faulkner

**From:** [Angela Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:57:59 PM

---

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

**From:** [Gerd Mairandres](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:39 PM

---

My name is **Gerd Mairandres**

My email address is **gmairandres@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,  
Gerd Mairandres

**From:** [John Barkan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Carol Chichester](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:26 PM

---

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

**From:** [Linda Tabor-Beck](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:47:57 PM

---

My name is **Linda Tabor-Beck**

My email address is **cane\_elder@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,  
Linda Tabor-Beck

**From:** [lynn austin](mailto:lynn.austin@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:27:45 PM

---

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

**From:** [Joanne Fox](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:57:15 PM

---

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

**From:** [T. Moore](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Tim Isom](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:16 PM

---

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

**From:** [Minsik Pak](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:55 PM

---

My name is **Minsik Pak**

My email address is **mmpak@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

**From:** [Catherine Sparacino](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:25:27 AM

---

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

**From:** [PAT GRAY](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:25 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kristin Schober](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:42:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Patrice Thompson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:45 PM

---

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

**From:** [Simon Miller](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:40 PM

---

My name is **Simon Miller**

My email address is **soliddesign1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Simon Miller

**From:** [Eddy Sapiro](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Marylou Medina-Bolus](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:07 PM

---

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

**From:** [brenda austin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#);  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Grant Ingram](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Julia Lavroushin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:25 PM

---

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



**From:** [Andrew B Gottlieb](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:25:30 AM

---

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

**From:** [XiuLing Wu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [Bonnie Levitt](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:41 PM

---

My name is **Bonnie Levitt**

My email address is **brklevitt@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,  
Bonnie Levitt

**From:** [Nancy Hui](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:56:49 PM

---

My name is **Nancy Hui**

My email address is **Nchau912@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 Hui

**From:** [Lenore Yu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:07 PM

---

My name is **Lenore Yu**

My email address is **lenore.yu@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,  
Lenore Yu

**From:** [Susan Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:10 PM

---

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

**From:** [Burton Siu](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:13 PM

---

My name is **Burton Siu**

My email address is **[burttons@gmail.com](mailto:burttons@gmail.com)**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Laurie Candido](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:43 PM

---

My name is **Laurie Candido**

My email address is **lauriecandido@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,  
Laurie Candido

**From:** [Elliot Gittleman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:13 PM

---

My name is **Elliot Gittleman**

My email address is **Esh.fire@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,  
Elliot Gittleman

**From:** [Judith Parks](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:42 PM

---

My name is **Judith Parks**

My email address is **jayho1208@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Parks

**From:** [Yedi Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:23 PM

---

My name is **Yedi Wong**

My email address is **wongye@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,  
Yedi Wong

**From:** [Cole Sapiro](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:11 PM

---

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

**From:** [Deirdre Deasy-McGovern](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:54 PM

---

My name is **Deirdre Deasy-McGovern**

My email address is **dmcgovern@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,  
Deirdre Deasy-McGovern

**From:** [ryan tveidt](mailto:ryan_tveidt@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:05 PM

---

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

**From:** [Cole Ryan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:56:49 PM

---

My name is **Cole Ryan**

My email address is **cole@coleryan.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Ryan

**From:** [Jim Sutton](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:42 PM

---

My name is **Jim Sutton**

My email address is **jsutton@campaignlawyers.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Sutton

**From:** [Joseph Whitney](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Melissa Aurand](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kate English](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Tessa Sapiro](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:09 PM

---

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

**From:** [Boris Levine](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:41 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nuala Campbell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:11 PM

---

My name is **Nuala Campbell**

My email address is **nualacampbell336@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,  
Nuala Campbell

**From:** [Kit Chong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:44 PM

---

My name is **Kit Chong**

My email address is **kittsechong@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Kit Chong

**From:** [Charles Lichtman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lauren Downs](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:46 PM

---

My name is **Lauren Downs**

My email address is **cindynoodle@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,  
Lauren Downs

**From:** [Ken Mendonca](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:44:40 PM

---

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

**From:** [David Bancroft](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#);  
[chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:26:21 AM

---

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

**From:** [Mary Franz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:48:20 AM

---

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

**From:** [Joan Satriani](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:27:34 PM

---

My name is **Joan Satriani**

My email address is **joan@joansatriani.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and



commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Satriani

**From:** [Mike Staiger](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:56:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [Robert Wong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:05:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [Linda Allan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:38:45 PM

---

My name is **Linda Allan**

My email address is **[linda.claire.allan@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Shawna McGrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 3:02:33 PM

---

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

**From:** [John Ng](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:45:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [Susan McKeon](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:29:27 AM

---

My name is **Susan McKeon**

My email address is **mckeonsf@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,  
Susan McKeon

**From:** [Beth Kellenberger](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:46:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Wan Lim](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32:52 AM

---

My name is **Wan Lim**

My email address is **wanlim@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,  
Wan Lim

**From:** [Donna Dare](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:35:21 PM

---

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

**From:** [brian.kim](mailto:brian.kim@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:02:30 PM

---

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

**From:** [Meina Young](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:26:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sharon Yasukawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:11 PM

---

My name is **Sharon Yasukawa**

My email address is **[hugweevil@gmail.com](mailto: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

**From:** [Kayla Yasukawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:00:55 AM

---

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

**From:** [Mary Harvey](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:17:45 PM

---

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

**From:** [Felecia Faulkner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:24:18 PM

---

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

**From:** [Madelyn McMillian](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:43:52 PM

---

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

**From:** [Vera Swanson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:28:46 PM

---

My name is **Vera Swanson**

My email address is **vera\_swanson@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.

Cutting off direct access from neighboring cities into San Francisco by directing them to congested, sub-standard roads (19th Ave.) and away from shops, recreation and services in the Sunset, creating more pollution by

prolonging their drive into SF. Using public transit to travel to SF is NOT an option.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals.

Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness.

A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Vera Swanson

**From:** [GB Info](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** I support continuing having Great Hwy closed to cars  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:53:07 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Scott Jung 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 really enjoy being able to ride my bike on the Great Hwy without car traffic and so do thousands of others who walk there every weekend and most days when closed during the pandemic!

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 Jung

**From:** [Jonathan Howard](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** In favor of Coastal Zone Permit for Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:41:23 PM

---

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.

**From:** [Alex Kleeman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** In Support of the Great Highway Park  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:54:59 AM

---

1. [Public opinion is largely in favor](#) of closing the great highway to cars (with the exception of the Richmond district who would prefer the highway open to make their drive prettier -- but not faster -- when they leave the city),
2. The board of supervisors voted to approve the pilot.
3. [The city has set goals](#) of reducing carbon emissions.

Why would we waste tax payer's money on an appeal?

**From:** [Choku Proudfoot](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MeigarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MeigarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** In support of the Great Highway project  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 3:51:22 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Choku Proudfoot and I am a resident of Lower Haight. I live at San Francisco Zen Center.

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 regularly ride my bicycle on the Great Highway on the weekends and it is a much needed way for people to be outside together safely. I always see families and many people biking and walking and enjoying the space. We need to support more spaces like this rather than 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.

Choku Proudfoot

--

Choku Proudfoot  
Pronouns: they/them

“Freedom is not a secret. It’s a practice.”  
- Alexis Pauline Gumbs

**From:** [Matthew Conlin-Elsen](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Internship Opportunity at the California Coastal Commission  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:56:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [Matthew Conlin-Elsen-Resume.pdf](#)  
[Matthew Conlin-Elsen Cover Letter.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

My name is Matthew Conlin-Elsen and I am a current student in the Paralegal program at San Francisco State University. Currently, I am in my final semester of the program and I am interested in branching out into a semester paralegal internship at the California Coastal Commission North Central Coast Headquarters in San Francisco.

I am reaching out to you today because I was wondering if you had any availability for an undergraduate intern? I would also love to hear your experience with working at the San Francisco Public Defenders office and any advice you have for the internship process. I know you are busy and would greatly appreciate any time you have. I have also attached my resume and cover letter at the bottom of this email.

Best,

Matthew Conlin-Elsen

Public comments submitted to the Coastal Commission are public records that may be disclosed to members of the public or posted on the Coastal Commission's website. Do not include information, including personal contact information, in comments submitted to the Coastal Commission that you do not wish to be made public. Any written materials, including email, that are sent to commissioners regarding matters pending before the Commission must also be sent to Commission staff at the same time.



**From:** [Susan St. Martin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:36:58 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Susan St. Martin, and I am a resident of Glen Park.

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.

During the worst of the pandemic, the Great Highway provided a safe, car-free environment for my then 7-year-old son to learn how to ride a bicycle. One of our regular joys was to go for a bike ride on the Great Highway, without worry of dangerous collisions with motor vehicles. I loved seeing the roadway full of people getting fresh air and exercise. Car-free Great Highway extends the city's beloved recreational space that is Golden Gate Park. This is a much better use of the Great Highway than cars. A much higher density of people can use the Great Highway when it is a car-free space than when it is simply a road for cars. For cars, the Great Highway only has a north outlet and a south outlet and no access to any other cross street in between. Sand regularly blows onto the roadway and makes it inaccessible to cars, which is only a mild inconvenience to drivers who have literally any other numbered avenue in the Sunset they can use. More people can get to where they're going when we have more and safer (i.e., closed to cars) corridors for bicycles and pedestrians.

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 against it. Thank you.

Susan St. Martin

**From:** [William Salit](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** It's a treasure: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:01:07 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I'm one of those people who heads out to The Great Highway every single Friday, rain or shine. It's such a joy to be there along the ocean, and to hear only the wind and the water, not a stream of cars and trucks.

There are people there in all weathers—it's clearly well used and loved.

Please do not take away our Friday place to stroll along the ocean—where else could we do that?

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,

William Salit

**From:** [Jenna Newgard](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Great Highway closed on the weekends!  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:45:35 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jenna and I am a resident of Lone Mountain/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.

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.

Jenna Newgard

**From:** [Peter Schmitz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep Great Highway closed to cars  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:57:30 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Peter Schmitz and I am a resident of District 3 in 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.

My wife and I often bike on Great Highway on weekends and enjoy sharing with the many other families and individuals on that beautiful spot.

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 Schmitz

**From:** [Cris Arthun](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep Great Highway Closed!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:23:03 PM

---

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.

**From:** [Michael Mueller](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep Great Highway Pilot Project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:23:07 PM

---

Board of Appeals  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 416  
San Francisco, CA

Dear Commissioners,

I am a resident of Cow Hollow in 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.

The closure of the Great Highway on weekends has created a safe, beautiful, peaceful and popular space for cyclists and pedestrians to ride and walk without the risk of injury from cars. I've made several trips by car to the Lake Merced area on weekends as well and find that the closure did not affect my travel time, which is one more reason to let the pilot project run its full course.

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.

Michael Mueller

**From:** [Sarah Jones](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep public access to Great Highway Park. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:16:55 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am the Community Development Director for Marin County, and as such I am very familiar with your role and responsibilities under the Coastal Act. Today I am writing to you as an individual citizen, and as a former resident of San Francisco and former employee of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, where I served as Planning Director from 2016-2021. I am writing to ask that you uphold the San Francisco Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the CDP for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

My personal experience with Great Highway Park was similar to that of thousands of other residents and visitors in San Francisco. While we rarely visited Ocean Beach before the pandemic and avoided the walkway along Great Highway, once Upper Great Highway was closed to cars my family and I biked through Golden Gate Park to the Great Highway countless times. It's a unique and extraordinary way to enjoy the coast. People of all ages, abilities and backgrounds are out there. It has transformed the city's coastline into one of the true gems of San Francisco. It's become one of the things that I urge all visitors to San Francisco to experience.

I had the pleasure of working on the Great Highway Park effort in my capacity as SFMTA Planning Director. It want to highlight a particular feature of the effort: access for people with disabilities. Early in the planning, one of my colleagues in the Mayor's Office of Disability said "Most people don't realize how difficult it is for disabled people to just be outdoors, let alone at the beach." So many times, disabled access is an afterthought or a matter of compliance. In the case of Great Highway Park, disabled access is part of the purpose and value. I saw people with disabilities enjoying Great Highway Park almost every time I was out there, enabled by the lack of cars and width of the paved space. I even saw a group of sight-impaired runners able to safely experience the smells and sounds of the beach and feel of the wind. How cool is that?!

I know well the authentic commitment to equitable access held by your Commission and your staff. I truly believe that the Upper Great Highway Pilot Project truly enhances access and the public's ability to enjoy this resource.

Thank you,

Sarah Jones

**From:** [Fennel Doyle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep SF Coastline & Surf Culture Alive! REJECT appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:01:36 PM

---

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.

Cars on the endemic biodiverse rich coast = hazmat death zone. FULL STOP.

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. In fact, I was forced to homeschool my Western Addition kid on our city beach (UNPAID), since SFUSD closed the schools for over 365 days. 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 the safety of my entire family when we walk, skateboard, boogie board, surf, roller skate, run & bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Irie,  
Fennel

D5 Weather Reporters  
In the flower there is power & its called PEACE



**From:** [Nate Gentner](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Car-Free!  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 4:01:29 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Nate 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.

Biking and skateboarding with my 2 children on the Great Highway has been an amazing experience for our family. Please preserve the car-free Great Highway!

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.

Nate

**From:** [Michael Flagg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park -> Reject Appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:04:46 AM

---

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 a resident of the outer sunset (42nd Ave) and a frequent visitor to Ocean Beach and the Park multiple times a week - i fully support the continuation of the Great Highway Park and urge you to uphold the existing Coastal Zone Permit.

The benefits of the Park are clear - with thousands visiting every week - providing a safe space for the neighborhood and visitors to enjoy walking, biking, skating, etc AND providing more foot traffic to local businesses.

**Prioritize people and public safe spaces, not cars/traffic!**

--

Michael Flagg  
831-236-7444  
[flagg.mike@gmail.com](mailto:flagg.mike@gmail.com)

**From:** [Mark Cordes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park Compromise  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:57:24 PM

---

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,  
Mark Cordes  
Sunset District Resident

**From:** [Bailey Schweitzer](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park open  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:06:29 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

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.

Bailey Schweitzer  
bsch29@gmail.com  
205 Vicksburg St  
San Francisco, California 94114



**From:** [Kieran Farr](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise! Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:47:27 AM

---

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

**From:** [Sara Schweizer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise!! Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:30:01 PM

---

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, and one of the many residents of the Outer Sunset neighborhood, the pilot program is crucial for my and my neighbors' 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. Additionally, the permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of my neighborhood and is vital to my and my neighbors' safety.

I deeply appreciate your keeping the vision of a better and more accessible San Francisco alive.

Kindly,

Sara M. Schweizer

**From:** [Courtney White](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:57:32 PM

---

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,

Thanks,  
Courtney White



**From:** [jessica Rix](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:22:26 AM

---

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

**From:** [Jessica Jenkins](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:34:41 AM

---

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,  
Jessica Jenkins

**From:** [Emilia De Marchis](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:36:14 AM

---

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

**From:** [Karolina Östegård Branley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:02:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [Anthea Tjuanakis Cox](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:37:59 AM

---

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,

Anthea N. Tjuanakis Cox  
(347) 218-2063

"A culture populated by people whose imagination is impoverished has a static future. In such a culture there will be little change because there will be little sense of possibility." - Elliot W. Eisner

**From:** [Allison Yuen](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:22:05 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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 Yuen  
[emberhummingbird@gmail.com](mailto:emberhummingbird@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Adie Sherwood](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 7:20:02 AM

---

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. Before the pilot project, it was stressful and difficult to try to cross the upper great highway with my young son and senior mother, even though we always used crosswalks. We often would avoid walking to the area for this reason. The beach is much more accessible to our family now. We love the fresh air and safety that the park provides for running, playing, and riding bikes.

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,  
Adie Sherwood  
39th and Kirkham



**From:** [James Duffy](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:44:51 PM

---

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,

James Duffy

**From:** [Stephanie Cline](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:03:43 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:scoffaney@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Alison Worthington](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:25:14 PM

---

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,

Thanks,  
Alison

**From:** [Kendall Silva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 4:40:32 PM

---

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

**From:** [alan.perlmanguitars.com](mailto:alan.perlmanguitars.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:52:05 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I live close to the Great Highway, on 48th Avenue between Irving and Judah. I bicycle and walk on the Great highway whenever it's closed to vehicles. It has been an immense source of healthy and beautiful recreation to thousands of us. As a person who also drives, I can say that it's really not needed as a vehicle roadway and, living on 48th Avenue I am absolutely not impacted by traffic changes when the roadway is closed to vehicles. It would be a brilliant act of the imagination and civic creativity to permanently turn the Great Highway into a beautiful park by the ocean. Our precious seaside is a place for people and wildlife; vehicles can drive elsewhere.

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,  
Alan Perlman

**From:** [Daisy Allen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:22:21 PM

---

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,

Daisy Allen

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jennifer Rosdail](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:58:24 PM

---

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,

**Jennifer Rosdail**  
Realtor/Owner  
**Jennifer Rosdail Real Estate Team**  
*a KWADVISORS Partner*  
[415-269-4663](tel:415-269-4663) Direct  
[Living415.com](http://Living415.com)  
[LivingTheBay.com](http://LivingTheBay.com)

I want clients just like you – know anyone?  
CalDRE Broker# 01349379



**From:** [Nathaniel Edwards](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:51:26 PM

---

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,

Nathaniel

**From:** [Shannon Selerowski](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:08:54 PM

---

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,

Shannon Selerowski

**From:** [Seth Prisament](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:19:07 PM

---

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,  
Seth Prisament

**From:** [carlycmck](mailto:carlycmck)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:23:20 AM

---

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,

Carly McKnight

**From:** [Lauren White](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 3:43:33 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Lauren White  
[laurengallowwhite@gmail.com](mailto:laurengallowwhite@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Rachel Baer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:28:51 AM

---

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,  
Rachel Baer

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Kendall Silva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:06:36 PM

---

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



**From:** [Lynn Pearce](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:06:37 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Austin Milford-Rosales](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:38:03 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Sarah Kaufman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:43:06 PM

---

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 live on La Playa and I love seeing all the people enjoying the closed road out my window. 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,

**From:** [Caroline Fuller](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:24:41 PM

---

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,

Caroline Fuller

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Mahon McGrath](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:40:38 PM

---

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,

Mahon McGrath

**From:** [Parker Day](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 12:30:51 PM

---

Commissioners,

**I'm writing to ask that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065 and uphold the San Francisco Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coast Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway Pilot Project.**

The weekend park space has been transformative for my connection to the city, the ocean, and the community in general. It is a space that combats loneliness, is safe for families, and improves access to nature. I know I'm not alone in feeling these effects. In fact, the permit doesn't do anything revolutionary. Instead, it maintains the current compromise. This permit is in line with the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan, which call for better recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline. Rejecting this permit would be a step backward.

In addition to improving coastal access, the permit allows for traffic safety improvements in the Sunset neighborhood. These safety improvements are important and should not be delayed.

Thank you so much. I hope you will uphold the Planning Commission's determination.

Parker Day  
415-488-6812

**From:** [Brian Renz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:24:04 PM

---

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,

Sent by Brian R

**From:** [Lexy Savvides](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:19:02 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Lexy Savvides  
[alexandrasavvides@gmail.com](mailto:alexandrasavvides@gmail.com)

San Francisco , California 94116





**From:** [leslie.elwell](mailto:leslie.elwell@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:00:23 PM

---

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,  
Leslie Elwell  
Outer Sunset District

**From:** [Andrea Jadwin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:49:21 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Sean Courtney](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 4:49:56 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Sean Courtney  
[sean@seanjcourtney.com](mailto:sean@seanjcourtney.com)  
1911 34th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Jacob Esparza](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:18:32 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

For once, can tax paying San Francisco families receive something for their community.

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,

**From:** [Eric DiIulio](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:22:12 PM

---

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. Two of my children have learned to ride their bikes on Great Highway and it has become a wonderful place to exercise, recreate, and see our neighbors and friends. 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,

Eric DiIulio

Sent from my phone.

**From:** [Sonic Whenever](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:06:26 PM

---

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,  
Janet Stillman

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Liz Paley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:20:50 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Sean Leow](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:56:47 PM

---

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,

Sean Leow

**From:** [Eric Rapin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:43:30 PM

---

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,  
Eric Rapin

**From:** [Lynn A](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Supervisor Connie Chan](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:49:55 PM

---

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

**From:** [Joe Florendo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:25:44 AM

---

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,

Jose Florendo

**From:** [Hannah Greenberg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:18:21 PM

---

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,

Hannah

**From:** [Penny Mitchell](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:43:06 PM

---

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 on my bike or for a long walk to 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,

Penny Mitchell  
College Ave, San Francisco

**From:** [Steven Susaña-Castillo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:06:03 PM

---

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,  
Steven Susaña-Castillo  
San Franciscan



**From:** [Brendan King](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:51:14 PM

---

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.

I love this park and want it to be car free full time!

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,  
Brendan

**From:** [Kendall Silva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:06:45 PM

---

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

**From:** [bryn.freitag@gmail.com](mailto:bryn.freitag@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 7:06:50 AM

---

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,

Brynna

**From:** [Andrew Stutz](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:24:22 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:andrewcstutz@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Tim Courtney](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:24:44 PM

---

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,

Tim Courtney  
timcourtney.net  
+1.860.967.2468

**From:** [Nathaniel Jordan](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 3:31:34 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Sydney Simpson](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 4:24:07 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Sydney Simpson  
[sydneysimpsonrn@gmail.com](mailto:sydneysimpsonrn@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94103





**From:** [Cynsa Bonorris](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:26:55 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Please, please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

The Great Highway Park is LIFE. It's San Francisco at its finest. It is an artery of joy running to the Pacific Ocean. To see little kids rollerblading and riding little bicycles next to their parents, people walking and jogging, folks enjoying the Pacific on a warm Fall or chilly Summer day (heh) spreads joy.

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,

Cynsa Bonorris  
1247 Harrison Street #25  
San Francisco, CA 94103

This electronic communication and the information and any files transmitted with it, or attached to it, are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, legally privileged, protected by privacy laws, or otherwise restricted from disclosure to anyone else. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, copying, distributing, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please return the e-mail to the sender, delete it from your computer, and destroy any printed copy of it.

**From:** [Kalina Jordanova](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:27:16 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Kalina Jordanova  
[kalina.jordanova@gmail.com](mailto:kalina.jordanova@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Madison Norman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:08:50 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Nadya Mikhaylovskaya](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:07:51 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:nnm32@cornell.edu)

San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Andrew Seigner](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 12:27:33 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Brian Heung](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:49:12 PM

---

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,

Brian HEung

**From:** [Lauren Mizock](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:41:12 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Megan Klevze Sutter](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:24:33 PM

---

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.

My family and I visit the Great Highway park almost every weekend and have attended multiple events such as Halloween trick or treating and the Easter egg hunt. It is where my two daughters are learning how to ride their bikes and scooters. A vibrant community requires safe car-free spaces to gather in nature with each other and the Great Highway Park has been that for us as members of the outer sunset community.

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,

Megan Sutter  
District 4

**From:** [Michelle Deely](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:58:04 PM

---

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,

The Deely Family, SF residents

Michelle Deely, MFT  
Relief for Burned Out Moms  
Therapy in California  
3896 24th Street  
SF, CA 94114  
[www.michelledely.com](http://www.michelledely.com)  
[michelle@michelledely.com](mailto:michelle@michelledely.com)  
415-371-9828

**From:** [Kelly Knox](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:07:33 PM

---

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,

Kelly Knox

**From:** [Nicola Parisi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:08:11 PM

---

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've lived in San Francisco for over a decade and one of my favorite parts about it is the amazing access to outdoor 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. 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!

Nicola Parisi  
Richmond District



**From:** [Allison Gans](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:19:11 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:alliefink@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122





**From:** [Martin Munoz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:42:56 PM

---

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,

Martin Munoz  
954-756-4292

**From:** [Sergey Goder](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:17:52 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Sergey Goder  
[sergeygoder@gmail.com](mailto:sergeygoder@gmail.com)  
1634 22nd Avenue  
San Francisco , California 94122



**From:** [Alessa Moscoso](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:06:24 PM

---

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,  
Les

**From:** [Meagan McNabola](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:55:48 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Alex Gregor](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:24:02 AM

---

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. It is my personal opinion that these appeals are a spurious and dishonest attempt to use legislation designed to protect public and community access for individual and self serving desire to drive at high speed. Shame on those bringing these anti-progress appeals.

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,  
Alex Gregor  
District 9 resident  
713 376 7399  
[argregor@gmail.com](mailto:argregor@gmail.com)

**From:** [Isabela Celedon](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:49:36 PM

---

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,  
Isabella Celedon

**From:** [Steven Ray](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 3:04:41 PM

---

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 (which should be implemented in the Inner Sunset as well). 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,

Steven Ray



**From:** [Mandy Twigg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:48:54 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Linda Marquardt](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 3:41:12 PM

---

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.

In addition, we spend many weekends visiting our granddaughter and walking the Great Highway with her. We've seen that there are large numbers of people biking, running, hiking etc and enjoying the fresh air and exercise. There are also numerous children walking the highway, being able to ride their first bikes with lots of room to learn, being able to use their scooter bikes to help them learn before an actual bike and just running and playing. We got to see our granddaughter see her shadow for the first time on the broad expanse of the highway! She was so exuberant and excited!! The narrow sidewalks and trails in San Francisco or even along Ocean Beach without the Great Highway Park on the weekends do not allow for any of that. It's such a special place for families! It's also good for the environment to not have all the pollution from cars! Please do not shut this down!! It's such a special place. It's a perfect solution for everyone to allow cars during the week for commuters to get to work and then open it up to families, bikers, runners, etc on the weekends!

Thank you,

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Dave](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:48:39 PM

---

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,

David B. Farrell

**From:** [Nicholas Lipanovich](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:20:41 PM

---

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,  
Nick Lipanovich, Outer Sunset resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Bruce Osterweil](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Supervisor Connie Chan](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:08:48 PM

---

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,

Bruce P Osterweil

**From:** [Nik Kaestner](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 12:17:18 PM

---

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,

-nik

—o  
 \<,  
..... ( ) / ( )

**From:** [Kyle William Smith](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 6:44:01 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Garen Checkley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:56:49 AM

---

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.

**The city needs more parks, not highways.**

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,

Garen  
D2



**From:** [Spencer Warden](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:23:54 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Great Highway Park is simply the greatest improvement in San Francisco in the last 30 years. I live on La Playa Street in the Outer Sunset. 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,

Spencer Warden  
spencerwarden@gmail.com  
831-247-3931

**From:** [Lauren Dunford](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 12:59:54 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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 have a 10-month old and taking her in the stroller on the Great Highway is the best way for us to enjoy weekends together.

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.

Lauren Dunford  
[laurenedunford@gmail.com](mailto:laurenedunford@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Heather Bhide](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:09:07 PM

---

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,

Heather bhide

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Dane Barca](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:42:59 PM

---

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,

Dane

Sent while walking and chewing gum.

**From:** [Nancy Arbuckle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 2:58:14 PM

---

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,

Nancy Arbuckle

**From:** [Gina Price](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:42:37 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Sarah Roquemore](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:57:57 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I live on 48th avenue and use the Great Highway Park everyday it's available. My kids and I constantly long for the days when it was a park everyday. Cars regularly run the red lights on great highway and I'm always worried one of my kids will die when they walk to the beach. Please please please keep this invaluable space open to us! We run, we bike, we walk, and we meet new friends and grow our community.

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,

Sarah Roquemore



**From:** [Tracey Johnson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:10:19 AM

---

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,

Tracey Johnson

**From:** [Terry Sayre](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:06:52 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Lena Corwin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:55:36 PM

---

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.

I live a block away from the Great Highway and having the road closed to traffic has improved our quality of life immensely.

Lena

**From:** [preston.rhea@gmail.com](mailto:preston.rhea@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 3:06:11 PM

---

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,

Preston

**From:** [Mark Nguyen](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:03:52 AM

---

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, Mark N

**From:** [Kate Ursu](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:57:39 PM

---

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.

The park is now a highlight of my weekends and symbolizes a step in the right direction as we continue to create a better future for our environment and our communities.

Thank you,  
Kate Ursu

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Katie Biber](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:23:57 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

Come on guys! Are we really talking about the Great Walkway again? :)

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project, and please reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

The park is amazing. It's already a compromise. Please do not take it away. Every day the leaders at SF chip away at the quality of life but please let us keep this one. <3

Katie Biber  
[katie.chen@gmail.com](mailto:katie.chen@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94118





**From:** [Matt Hoevet](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:58:08 PM

---

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,

- Matt

**From:** [David Marquardt](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:23:52 PM

---

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.

As a father that lives on the great highway, the park is truly amazing for my family with a 2 year old daughter. A safe place to walk and play and learn, and build community with neighbors.

Thank you,  
David Marquardt

**From:** [Sonja Steck](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:46:14 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Chris Bergeron](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:19:34 PM

---

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 tens of thousands of San Franciscans and visitors who visit Great Highway Park 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, bike, or take the bus to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses and homes.

Thank you,

Chris Bergeron  
(802) 825-1874

2346 Clement St Apt 2  
San Francisco, CA 94121

**From:** [Carrie Royer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:08:25 PM

---

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,  
Carrie Royer  
Zip code: 94122

**From:** [Amira Atallah](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [catherine.stefani@sfgov.org](mailto:catherine.stefani@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:47:11 PM

---

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.

As a resident of District 2, I would visit more often if the Great Highway was available for recreation on more days during the week as well, and I have discovered (and continue to visit) many businesses in the Sunset district that I would have never otherwise have known about.

Thank you,

Amira Atallah

2201 Francisco Street #11

94123

**From:** [Amelia Essman](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 1:16:16 PM

---

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,

Amelia Essman

**From:** [Mark Grothman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:04:54 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Mark Grothman and my family and I are residents of the Outer Sunset. We are alarmed to hear of the potential for the Great Highway Park to not be closed to car traffic during the weekends. This existing compromise (only weekends/holidays, starting on Fridays at noon) has transformed the shoreline experience for both ourselves and many friends and families across the Bay Area, providing something akin to a boardwalk experience this wonderful city deserves. I do believe having the Great Highway open to car traffic on weekdays during work travel is a great compromise, and there should be no need to cut off what is a perfect balance of public space usage.

With that said, 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.

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 family's safety when we walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,  
Mark Grothman



**From:** [Martha Abbene](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:08:29 PM

---

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,  
Martha Abbene  
4316 Kirkham Street  
SF

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Sarah Cannon](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:48:10 PM

---

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,

Sarah Cannon  
San Francisco

**From:** [Elena Caceres](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:10:17 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Elena Caceres  
[elcaceres@gmail.com](mailto:elcaceres@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Boris Shkurko](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:50:42 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Jonathon Schmidt](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:06:19 PM

---

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,  
Jonathon Schmidt

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jesse Wayne](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:42:18 PM

---

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,

Jesse Wayne

**From:** [Will Tachau](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:42:32 PM

---

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,

Will Tachau



**From:** [Andrew Judd](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 3:01:35 PM

---

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,

Andrew Judd  
Strange typos compliments of autocorrect

**From:** [Yi-Li Chuang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 6:00:33 AM

---

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,

Yi-Li Chuang

**From:** [Joseph Tartakovsky](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 5:33:25 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Mike Sallaberry](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:50:03 PM

---

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,

Mike Sallaberry

**From:** [Tom Fenwick](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 2:52:46 PM

---

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. It also allows me to make bonds with neighbors and friends I often see walking, biking, strolling, or running along this wonderful park. I wish it could be 24/7, but I understand the need to do studies to figure out the long term vision for this peaceful stretch along the ocean.

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,

**From:** [Judy Tomasso](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:08:07 PM

---

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,  
Judy Tomasso  
2330 48 th Avenue

**From:** [david.english](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:21:24 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

david.english  
action.doves0w@icloud.com

San Francisco, California 94122





**From:** [Adam Cline](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:57:38 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Adam Cline  
[adamcline11@gmail.com](mailto:adamcline11@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Maxwell Gara](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:45:06 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Julie Newhouse](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 3:02:43 PM

---

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,

Julie Newhouse

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Alyssa Barnett](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:45:43 PM

---

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,

Alyssa Barnett

**From:** [Patty Esposito](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:39:38 PM

---

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,

Patty Esposito

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Timothy Ward](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:56:53 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Edward Abraham](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:06:25 AM

---

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,

Edward Abraham  
Outer Sunset Resident



**From:** [Gene Miguel](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:19:27 PM

---

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,

Gene Miguel  
(415) 294-0722

**From:** [Donna](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:02:38 AM

---

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.

I am 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.

Please keep the Great Highway car free !

Thank you,

Donna Fotoohi

**From:** [Michelle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:06:33 PM

---

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,

Best Regards,

**Michelle Fongson**

**Commercial Learning Manager | Intuitive Surgical,  
Inc. | 1020 Kifer Road, Sunnyvale, CA 94086|  
Phone: 408.482.0774**

**From:** [Joey Babbitt](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:59:46 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Joey Babbitt  
[jrbabbitt@gmail.com](mailto:jrbabbitt@gmail.com)  
23 Alta Street  
San Francisco, California 94133



**From:** [Alessa Moscoso](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:05:46 PM

---

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,  
Alessa

**From:** [Ruth Rainero](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardistaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardistaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:48:10 PM

---

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.

My husband and I are retirees and long-time residents of the Sunset District. We walk or bike along the Great Walkway nearly every weekend and wish that it were closed to vehicles more than two days per week. It's wonderful to see the number of walkers, runners, and bicyclists -- with or without dogs and kids -- enjoying the proximity to the beach and ocean without hundreds of noisy, polluting cars whizzing by. We are SO fed up with car owners attitude that their wishes dominate at the expense of everyone else.

Thank you,

Ruth Rainero & Pieter de Haan

**From:** [Sarah Boudreau](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:23:25 PM

---

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,  
Sarah Boudreau



**From:** [Lina Leon](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:42:05 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,  
I love the great highway park!!

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,  
Lina Leon

Sent from Gmail Mobile

**From:** [Lily Daniel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:19:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Emily Hittle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:57:02 PM

---

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,  
Emily Hittle  
Resident of Outer Sunset, SF

**From:** [ashley restauro](mailto:ashley.restauro@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:41:56 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

**As a resident who actually lives on Lower Great Highway,** 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 personally witness** the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, and **I can attest** that the pilot program is crucial for our 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. **Being a resident with an address on Lower Great Highway, there has not been an increase in traffic in front of my residence.** 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,

Ashley Restauro  
[Ashley.Restauro@gmail.com](mailto:Ashley.Restauro@gmail.com)

**From:** [nick.sousanis](mailto:nick.sousanis)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:20:41 AM

---

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,

Nick

Nick Sousanis  
[nsousanis@gmail.com](mailto:nsousanis@gmail.com)  
<http://www.spinweaveandcut.com>  
Tw: @nsousanis

1245 Masonic Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94117  
M: 415-745-0194

**From:** [Andrew Camp](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:17:25 PM

---

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,

Andrew Camp  
(Concerned Outer Sunset Resident on Judah)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Ellery Long](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:44:43 PM

---

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,  
Ellery Long  
D4 Outer Parkside resident

**From:** [Natalie Carnes](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:55:37 PM

---

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,

Natalie Marquardt



**From:** [Paul Greening](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:54:03 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Paul Greening  
[paulchristengreening@gmail.com](mailto:paulchristengreening@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Nancy Beam](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:08:03 PM

---

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 regularly visit Great Highway Park to walk and enjoy the Pacific Ocean without having to worry about getting hot ta car, 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,

Nancy Beam  
Sunset Resident  
District 4

**From:** [Cedric Crocker](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:59:49 AM

---

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,

Cedric Crocker  
San Francisco resident and Sunset district native

**From:** [Dara Bu Elliott](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:50:00 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Kieran Byrne](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 3:26:09 AM

---

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,  
Born 'n Raised in the Sunset,  
Kieran Byrne

**From:** [Michael Zimmerman](#)  
**To:** [EngardioStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:39:12 PM

---

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,  
Michael Zimmerman  
On behalf 47th Avenue community

**From:** [Jeb Hollingsworth](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [Jeb Hollingsworth](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:22:01 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

This is essential to the Sunset community and others who come visit to walk/bike/run etc on the weekends. All you need to do is go down and see it for yourselves. Frankly, it should be expanded on and money invested to create proper lanes and instruction for people biking running and walking, direction for flow of traffic etc. This would improve safety for those that enjoy it.

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,

Jeb Hollingsworth



**From:** [Kelly Arbuckle](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:45:24 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Kelly Arbuckle  
[arbuckle.kelly@gmail.com](mailto:arbuckle.kelly@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Jamie Williams](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 2:55:37 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

We visit the park often with our children on the weekends. They love scooting and biking down the pavement, looking for kites and planes; it's been a highlight of their childhoods and park of what makes living in the city so special.

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.

Jamie Williams  
[jamielee.williams@gmail.com](mailto:jamielee.williams@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Laura Checkley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:06:27 AM

---

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,

Laura Checkley, M.D.  
Emergency Medicine Resident, PGY-4  
University of California, San Francisco  
[Laura.checkley@ucsf.edu](mailto:Laura.checkley@ucsf.edu)

\*Please excuse the brevity of this message; it was sent from a mobile device. Thank you.

**From:** [SKIN x STONE](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:44:21 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Alfonso Embid-Desmet](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:57:00 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Siddharth Ramakrishnan](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:48:07 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Cat Sommer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:23:07 PM

---

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,

Cat Sommer  
Sunset Resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Catharine Lamb](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:03:41 PM

---

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,  
Catharine Lamb

**From:** [Carolyn Chang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:05:44 PM

---

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,

Carolyn  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Peggy Flannery](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:41:30 PM

---

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,

Peggy Flannery

Outer Sunset resident

**From:** [Susan Sutton](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:53:05 PM

---

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,  
Susan Sutton

Typed by opposable thumbs

**From:** [Brian Andersen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:05:15 PM

---

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,  
Brian Andersen

**From:** [Alexander Maldonado](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:18:15 AM

---

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,  
Sasha

**From:** [Michael Joseph](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:45:10 PM

---

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.

I live in the Outer Sunset and this issue is very important to me — if the Upper Great Highway pilot project were terminated my family and I would be less interested in living in this neighborhood.

Thank you,  
Michael



**From:** [drew.madsen](mailto:drew.madsen)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:09:12 AM

---

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,  
Drew Madsen

**From:** [Loc Thai](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:17:32 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Brett Bertocci](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:42:30 PM

---

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,  
Brett Bertocci

**From:** [Maxwell D](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:39:11 PM

---

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,  
Max Davis

**From:** [Jo Lo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:56:57 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Ryan Malabed](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:56:03 AM

---

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,

Ryan Malabed

**From:** [Michael Lynch](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:20:40 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Michael Lynch  
[lynchmg@hotmail.com](mailto:lynchmg@hotmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122





**From:** [Kali Perry](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:43:51 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Karen Scruggs](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:48:24 PM

---

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,

Karen Scruggs

**From:** [richie rifle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:16:38 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I'm a resident of the Outer Sunset, and a regular user of the Great Highway Park.

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,

**From:** [José Pablo González-Brenes](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:59 PM

---

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,

--

José P. González-Brenes  
[gonzalezbrenes.com](http://gonzalezbrenes.com)

**From:** [Lindsay Meisel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:23:02 PM

---

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,

Sent via [Superhuman](#)

**From:** [Megan Leung](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 2:09:47 PM

---

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,

Best,  
Megan

**From:** [Sanae Rosen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:07:57 PM

---

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,

Sanae Rosen

**From:** [gentle.volunteer.dn3r8@aleeas.com](mailto:gentle.volunteer.dn3r8@aleeas.com)  
**To:** [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:37:40 AM

---

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,

Donald Gentle

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.



**From:** [Софья Анисович](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:59:34 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Tarin Towers](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:41:42 PM

---

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.

The Great Highway Promenade provides increased coastal access and decreased pollution. It's good for residents' health in terms of both recreation and the environment, as well as giving a safe place for kids and adults to play and ride bikes.

This is a brilliant example of early-pandemic innovations that show how local, state, and federal government can work together to benefit the people.

I hope to see the road closure become permanent and 24/7, but in the meantime, please uphold the weekend compromise.

Best regards  
Tarin Towers  
D9 resident

**From:** [Monbureau, Marie](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 11:12:21 AM  
**Importance:** High

---

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.

I live on La Playa Street @ Judah and as such, the impact of these decisions effect my day to day significantly. While I would love to see the Great Highway be a permanent space for families like mine to use and enjoy, I am content with the compromise of at least having the space on the weekends and holidays. If that privilege were taken away from my family it would thwart my children's freedom and development significantly. When the highway is closed to cars they are allowed to adventure to the dunes on their own to play, which gives them the sort of autonomy and freedom that is hard to give to children raised in a larger city, like San Francisco. I sincerely hope that the city will not remove one of the safe and healthy places where my family, along with all residents and visitors can experience the outdoors. This would give families one more reason to be forced to move out of San Francisco and to the suburbs.

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,

Marie Monbureau

**From:** [Caitlin Stanton](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:58:48 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Bernie McGinn](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:54:25 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I have been a resident of the Outer Sunset for 12 years, and have been a homeowner on 42nd Ave for 7 years. The Great Highway park is one of the best things that has happened to for residents in the Outer Sunset in my time here.

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,

-- -- -- --

**From:** [KC Ellis](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:41:13 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I can't believe I have to write this, but 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,

Kent Ellis  
San Francisco Resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Pauline LEGENDRE](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:56:57 PM

---

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,

Pauline

**From:** [Bobi Adle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:57 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [phoca2004](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 9:12:44 AM

---

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,

Jeffrey Gray  
District 1 Resident

**From:** [Susan Witka](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:07:48 PM

---

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, Susan Witka 94121

**From:** [Sasha Ponomareva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:15:02 PM

---

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. Without exaggeration, this park has changed my life for the better. 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,  
Sasha Ponomareva

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Sabra Chambless](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:47:33 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

It's amazing to be able to walk the Great Highway. I've brought my friends, daughters and parents who have mobility issues. It's such a unique experience to be able to walk and be so close to the ocean with out having to navigate walking in the sand or contending with cars. Please don't take this away.

Sabra

**From:** [Elena Gutteridge](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:18:01 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

I grew up in the sunset and would go frequently to beach. Now 70 years later I still enjoy it. Super nice when I can quietly stroll there and not have din of traffic everyday

Elena Gutteridge  
[elenagutteridge@gmail.com](mailto:elenagutteridge@gmail.com)  
2479 31 Ave  
San Francisco , California 94116



**From:** [Kimberlee Howley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:21:48 PM

---

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,  
Kimee Howley

**From:** [Stephen McCallion](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:38:41 PM

---

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'm a man in his late 70's and Great Highway Park has become an important part of my exercise — it's ideal for older people like me. The aforementioned 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, Golden Gate Park, and nearby businesses.

Thank you,



**From:** [Pranav Harathi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:48:45 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Nicole Jung-Alexander](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:04:49 PM

---

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,

Nicole Jung-Alexander

**From:** [Julie Newbold](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:41:09 PM

---

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 to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for all San Franciscan's 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 safety for all who walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

People are more important than cars.

Thank you,  
Julie Newbold

**From:** [Kylie Stoneking](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:33:31 PM

---

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,  
Kylie Stoneking

**From:** [Ally Ochoa](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 1:52:19 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Ally Ochoa  
ochoa\_allyson@yahoo.com  
1475 18th Ave  
San Francisco , California 94122



**From:** [Zoe Phillips Williams](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:47:43 PM

---

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,  
Zoe Williams

**From:** [Sarah Katz-Hyman](mailto:Sarah.Katz-Hyman@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:15:01 PM

---

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.

Also look at this photo of my dog, literally sleeping in a bike basket on the Great Highway a few weekends ago. What a dream come true, please don't take that away.





Thank you,

Sarah Katz-Hyman

**From:** [David Enloe](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:57:37 PM

---

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 Enloe

--

David Enloe  
415-260-6332

**From:** [Kelsey Guarino](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:49:50 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [M. Valeska G-D](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:17:34 AM

---

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,

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

**From:** [Jonathan Dirrenberger](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:41:22 PM

---

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,  
Jonathan Dirrenberger

**From:** [Evelyn Ho](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:33:00 PM

---

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. As a resident of the Outer Sunset, it's sad to see other parts of the city getting traffic calming that makes biking and walking easier and none of this for us.

Thank you,

Evelyn Ho  
94116

**From:** [Eric Mar](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:20:51 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Eric Mar  
[emailericmar@gmail.com](mailto:emailericmar@gmail.com)  
825 La Playa St, #130  
San Francisco, California 94121





**From:** [Jeffrey Freschl](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:19:24 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Jeffrey Freschl  
[jlfreschl@gmail.com](mailto:jlfreschl@gmail.com)  
1447 45th ave  
San Francisco , California 94122



**From:** [Peter T.](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 1:39:54 PM

---

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,

Peter Tangprasertchai  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [tomo.Hiratsuka](mailto:tomo.Hiratsuka@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:30:44 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Kristen Daniel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:56:02 PM

---

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,  
Kristen Daniel

**From:** [Diane Lopez](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:07:22 PM

---

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,  
Diane Lopez

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Timothy Humphries](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:21:32 PM

---

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,  
Tim Humphries

**From:** [Julia Nalven](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:39:48 PM

---

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,

Julia Nalven  
[jpnalven@gmail.com](mailto:jpnalven@gmail.com)



**From:** [Jörg Fockele](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:49 PM

---

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,

Jörg Fockele  
Producer/Director

[jorg@fockele.com](mailto:jorg@fockele.com)  
917.371-8890  
[www.eclecticmedialab.com](http://www.eclecticmedialab.com)

**From:** [Steve Beyatte](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:04:21 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Dibya Mukhopadhyay](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:40:22 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Claire Jean Uy](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:35:33 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Hank Rosenblum](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:46:51 PM

---

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,

Hank

**From:** [Helen Vander Wende](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:39:03 PM

---

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,  
Helen Vander Wende

**From:** [Eric Pascual](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:45:55 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [John Espenhahn](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:49:05 AM

---

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,  
John Espenhahn



**From:** [Gabriela Vasconcellos](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:45:32 PM

---

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,  
Gabriela de Vasconcellos

**From:** [Lauren Mizock](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:39:04 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Dan Kletter](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:14:57 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of upholding 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 someone from the south peninsula who visits Great Highway Park every chance I get to walk and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. And we usually go to nearby businesses afterwards for food and fun! 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,

—dk

**From:** [William Wolf](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:45 PM

---

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,  
William Wolf

**From:** [Sasha Ponomareva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:14:46 PM

---

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. Without exaggeration, this park has changed my life for the better. 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,  
Sasha Ponomareva

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [David Simpson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:29:18 PM

---

To the Commissioners,

I urge you to support the Planning Commission's unanimous decision to grant the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to deny appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

I am one of the many San Franciscans who frequent Great Highway Park every weekend to enjoy the Pacific Ocean and its surroundings. The pilot program is essential for me to access and appreciate the coast. This permit preserves the existing compromise that the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed endorsed in 2022 and aligns with the goals of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by promoting recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and creating a safe space for kids, seniors, and the whole community to enjoy the coast. Keeping this pilot enables City agencies to gather data and engage with the community to shape the long-term vision of the Great Highway.

Moreover, the permit allows for important traffic calming measures in the Outer Sunset. This has considerably increased the safety of the neighborhood and is essential for my ability

Sincerely,

David Simpson  
Richmond District resident, 94121

**From:** [Paul Lee](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:56:17 PM

---

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,

Paul Lee  
1311 La Playa St, San Francisco, CA 94122  
415-845-4940

**From:** [Yuliya Benkhina](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:10:58 PM

---

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.

I look forward to the Great Highway opening to pedestrian traffic every weekend, and I have seen firsthand the joy it brings to San Franciscans and residents from around the Bay – as well as the foot traffic it drives to local Outer Sunset businesses. It's a shame that a minority group is aggressively pushing their vision of a car-centric city against the wishes of San Francisco voters and residents. Don't let them win.

Thank you,

Yuliya Benkhina  
Outer Sunset resident, registered voter, & frequent Great Highway Park visitor



**From:** [Carly June Haase](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:55:53 PM

---

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,  
Carly

**From:** [danial.chawkins](mailto:danial.chawkins@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:39:51 PM

---

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,  
Dania

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Alison Worthington](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:21:16 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Cole Imhoff](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 11:30:49 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am a resident of Miraloma Park, and 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 regularly enjoy the Great Highway Park every weekend to walk and enjoy the shoreline and this pilot program is crucial for my access and enjoyment of the land.

This permit 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.

Thank you,

--

Cole I.  
ci@avicora.com

**From:** [Bridget Buescher](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:29:33 AM

---

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,

Bridget Buescher-Dunbar

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Karen Kreider Yoder](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:03:09 PM

---

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,  
Karen Kreider Yoder

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Phoebe & Jason Ford](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:07:19 PM

---

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.

I am one of the thousands of San Franciscans that visit ocean beach and the Great Highway every weekend and only on the weekends. Last weekend my 3 year old and 5 year old rode their own bikes all the way to the beach, on the sidewalks until the Great Highway park, with the little guy ruining a pair of shoes instead of using a break. When we are at the beach, I can let them roam, because we aren't at the edge of high speed traffic. The weekend Great Highway closures enhance access to the shoreline for families like mine and protects the ocean from pollution generated by cars and tire dust.

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.

Thank you,

Phoebe Ford

**From:** [Maci Britt](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:32:38 PM

---

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,  
Maci Britt

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Dare Cruz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:42 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Hello! Im 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 use the Great Highway regularly on weekends to walk, run, bike, skateboard, etc. I even recently taught a friend to ride a bike on the Great Highway! It's such an incredibly welcoming and beautiful part of life in this city and I honestly can't believe there are folks who oppose it. I see so many people of all types coming out to the Great Highway to recreate — even on some of the gloomiest coldest days. There are various routes people in vehicles can take as options when the great highway is closed to car traffic. It's an incredibly reasonable compromise and I couldn't imagine life in the sunset without it.

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,  
Dariel

**From:** [Suzanne Armstrong](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:14:18 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

My daughter, husband, and I are among 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.

Suzanne Armstrong  
[zan.armstrong@gmail.com](mailto:zan.armstrong@gmail.com)  
1256 2nd Ave  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [rhian.miller](mailto:rhian.miller@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 1:52:33 PM

---

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,

Rhian Miller  
Thomas Graven

**From:** [Sandeep Tata](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:47:59 AM

---

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,

Sandeep

**From:** [Greer Monteverde](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:55:07 PM

---

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,  
Greer

--  
Greer Monteverde  
310 387 0060

**From:** [Gregor, Eugene C.](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [Eugene Gregor](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:36:57 PM

---

Commissioners --

I am writing as a senior resident of the inner Richmond 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.

This is an easy decision prompted by a meretricious effort by a small but noisy group of city residents unwilling to accept the city wide views expressed in a recent referendum vote to support converting the great highway north of Sloat from car to pedestrian and cyclist access.

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.

Best regards.

Eugene Gregor  
SF district 1 resident

**From:** [Alan Marquardt](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 11:03:18 AM

---

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,



**From:** [Adam Levin](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:21:13 PM

---

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,  
Adam

**From:** [pierre-marie Martin](mailto:pierre-marie.Martin@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:01:51 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Annie Armstrong](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:31:54 PM

---

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,

Annie Armstrong

**From:** [Sierra Barsten](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:14:53 PM

---

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,  
Sierra Barsten

**From:** [Laurel Sipes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:53:22 PM

---

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,

Laurel Sipes, San Francisco resident

**From:** [Lynn](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:06:44 PM

---

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,

--

Sent from my cell phone. Apologies in advance for typos and bad grammar.

**From:** [Jina B](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:44:32 PM

---

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,

Jina B

**From:** [Marla Landa](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 7:13:48 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

I live in lower great highway and taraval and I beg that we make the great highway more friendly to the people. I see the joy and the benefits firsthand!

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.

Marla Landa  
[marlalandagmail.com](mailto:marlalandagmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94116





**From:** [Shah, Tarang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:32:45 PM

---

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,

TArang Shah

**From:** [Hanna Pittock](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:13:04 PM

---

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,  
Hanna Pittock

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Ron Hirsch](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:38:36 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Note: I live on 46th Ave near Balboa, just blocks from the Great Highway. I own and use a car daily, and STILL I think a park is more important than a highway.

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,

ron hirsch  
714 46th Ave  
SF, CA 94121

**From:** [Ruth Jewett](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:38:41 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Meredith Nelson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:05:18 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Comcast](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:13:29 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [MALINDA WALKER](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:37:28 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Patricia Mara-Smith](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:23:24 PM

---

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,

Patricia L Mara-Smith

**From:** [Sabine Angulo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:38:38 PM

---

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,

Sabine Angulo

"Kindness is the language which the deaf can hear and the blind can see."  
~Mark Twain

**From:** [Lauren Sloss](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:41:06 AM

---

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,

Lauren Sloss

**From:** [stephanie\\_haumueller](mailto:stephanie_haumueller)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:59:34 PM

---

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,

Stephanie

**From:** [Derek Duan](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org); [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardlostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardlostaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:06:33 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Tugce Yegul](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:43:45 PM

---

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,  
Nakiye Tugce Yegul

**From:** [Julie Kessler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:54:54 PM

---

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,

Julie Kessler

**From:** [Ashlyn Kong](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:20:57 PM

---

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,

Ashlyn Kong

--

Ashlyn Kong  
[kong.ashlyn@gmail.com](mailto:kong.ashlyn@gmail.com)



**From:** [Tosca Magnus](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:44:18 PM

---

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,  
Tosca Magnus

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Avanti Mankar](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:11:39 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Pascoe, Jason](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:27:35 PM

---

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,

Dr. Jason Pascoe

**From:** [rohitvarkey@gmail.com](mailto:rohitvarkey@gmail.com)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 1:03:45 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

rohitvarkey@gmail.com

,



**From:** [Lawrence D Hammer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 10:34:22 AM

---

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.

This is of particular concern to me as I live less than 300 yards from the Great Highway.

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,

**From:** [Patricia](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:30:01 PM

---

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,

Best,  
Patricia Fonseca Flores  
San Francisco resident

**From:** [nicholas.price](mailto:nicholas.price@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:34 PM

---

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,  
Nicholas Price



**From:** [David Dunford](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 9:00:56 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

David Dunford  
[dhdunford@gmail.com](mailto:dhdunford@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Sara Barz](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:11:42 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

California would look so stupid to remove a beloved Oceanside park in favor of allowing auto access (and not even parking!) on a limited-access road against the will of the voters. Please please please deny this appeal.

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.

Sara Barz  
skbarz@gmail.com  
342 Hearst Ave  
San Francisco, California 94112



**From:** [Uzes Charm](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:06:26 PM

---

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,

Cora ♀

**From:** [John Oram](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 1:02:09 PM

---

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,  
John Oram

**From:** [Joe Fish](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:26:41 PM

---

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,

Joe Fish

**From:** [Steve Matthews](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 9:56:26 AM

---

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,  
Steve Matthews

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Max Hurley](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:33 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Kevin LaPorte](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:39:39 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Hannah Warden](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 8:58:48 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Losing this beautiful park to cars would be a travesty!

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.

Hannah Warden  
[hef.warden@gmail.com](mailto:hef.warden@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Tara McAteer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:39:34 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Frida Pensamiento](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:18:52 PM

---

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 values the importance of access to green spaces in the midst of a crowded city, 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,  
Frida Pensamiento

**From:** [Caterina Belardetti](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:37:05 PM

---

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,  
Caterina Belardetti  
2118 44th Avenue, SF

**From:** [Adelina Aramburo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:20:23 PM

---

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,

Adelina Aramburo  
1372 La Playa St.  
San Francisco, CA 94122  
415 682-7758



**From:** [Roan Kattouw](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:09:52 PM

---

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,  
Roan Kattouw

**From:** [GLORIA ROMERO](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:59:19 PM

---

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,

Gloria Romero [Romerog1222@gmail.com](mailto:Romerog1222@gmail.com)  
925.597.8993

G. Romero

**From:** [Michael Spring](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:54:50 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Sonia King](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:04:55 PM

---

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,

Sonia King  
<http://www.mosaicworks.com>

"Mosaic is hard. Art is harder."

**From:** [Frederik Nielsen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:44:10 PM

---

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,

Frederik Nielsen

**From:** [Michael Lopes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:26:14 PM

---

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,  
MICHAEL LOPES

**From:** [Kim Vinh](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:38:08 PM

---

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,  
Kim Vinh  
Outer Sunset resident, educator, parent

**From:** [Adrienne DuComb](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 1:00:28 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Kathryn Carney](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:01:00 PM

---

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.

I walk along Great Highway several times a day with my family and wheel assisted dog. Every single morning without fail I see people speeding through the red lights on Upper Great Highway. Not only is the park an amazing resource for families and neighbors to enjoy the coast, but closing the street to cars is a safety issue. As a resident of 47th I have seen the traffic calming measures ease the reckless driving that can come with street closures.

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,  
Kathryn carney, 47th Ave resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Tara McAteer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:39:25 AM

---

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,  
Tara McAteer  
Outer Sunset

**From:** [Chris Windbiel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:20:18 PM

---

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,

Chris Windbiel

**From:** [Erinne Davis](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:59:09 PM

---

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,  
Erinne Davis  
1939 47th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** [Eric Wooley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:37:33 PM

---

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 regularly 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,

Eric Wooley

**From:** [peter.munks](mailto:peter.munks)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:10:33 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

peter munks  
petemunks@gmail.com  
2266 42nd Ave.  
sf, California 94116



**From:** [Michael Grizzle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:44:07 PM

---

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,

Mike



**From:** [catherine](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:01:17 PM

---

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,

Catherine

**From:** [Sarah McLaughlin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:54:45 PM

---

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 am also a home owning resident of the Outer Sunset (I live just 4 blocks from the park) and it has greatly improved our neighborhood. 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,

**From:** [Bauer, Scott](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:37:31 PM

---

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,  
Scott Bauer, MD

---

**Scott R. Bauer, MD, ScM**

Assistant Professor of Medicine, Urology, Epidemiology & Biostatistics  
UCSF and San Francisco VA Medical Center  
4150 Clement St, Building 2, Room 135  
Office: 415-221-4810x24322  
Pager: 415-607-3598  
<https://vadgim.ucsf.edu/>  
<https://profiles.ucsf.edu/scott.bauer>  
For meetings, you can see my availability [here](#).

Pronouns: he, him, his

Anticipated out of office dates: 12/23 – 1/2 (holidays)

**From:** [Sophia Williamson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:38:05 PM

---

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,  
Shira

**From:** [Max Elman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:26:06 PM

---

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,

Max Elman

**From:** [Julia Reiff](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 9:35:24 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Dana Dunford](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 8:47:06 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

I live on Great Highway and would sell or move out of this city if you don't keep the Great Highway for the people. This city has gone downhill and having this parkway is one of the few things making it beautiful and attractive again.

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.

Dana Dunford  
[danahdunford@gmail.com](mailto:danahdunford@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122





**From:** [Tryg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:23 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Lynn](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:06:22 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Nicole Birch](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:36:53 PM

---

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,

Nicole Birch | ACD Art Director

**From:** [Julia Street](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:24:55 PM

---

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,

Julia

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Zoe Pilla](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:44:05 PM

---

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.

This is a regular reminder that cities should be designed for their people and public access, not for cars.

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, Zoe Pilla!

**From:** [Debbie Leifer and Howard Schwartz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:33:56 AM

---

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,  
Debra Leifer

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device  
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

**From:** [vanessa.altman-siegel](mailto:vanessa.altman-siegel)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:54:40 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Jon Pierucci](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:01:03 PM

---

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.

I am a native and lifelong San Franciscan who grew up close to the Great Highway—right near the zoo—and have never been able to enjoy the GH and environs as much as now with the road closed. 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,

Jon Pierucci

**From:** [Alexis Flores](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 9:00:21 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Alexis Flores  
[alexisf681@gmail.com](mailto:alexisf681@gmail.com)

San Francisco , California 94116



**From:** [Nikolas Ignacio](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:59:01 PM

---

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 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.

Furthermore, I find it offensive that detractors to this are trying to use the coastal commission as a means to circumvent the will of the voters who organized and showed up on the ballot to make their desires known. Must we all attend every coastal commission hearing on our own limited personal time to further voice our support? Please... let us have the park that we fought for.

Thank you,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Shayla L](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:22:27 PM

---

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, skateboard, 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.

I do wish there were some beautification inclusions but regardless, there should not be a highway on the beach. We voted, we won, let's put this to rest.

Thank you,

**From:** [Maxim Derbin](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:22:56 PM

---

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.

This is especially close to my heart since I'm residing at 2136 Great Hwy, San Francisco, CA 94116 and this matter will affect mine and my neighbors life significantly!

Thank you,  
Maksim Aleksandrovich Derbin

**From:** [Tyeler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:58:17 PM

---

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,  
Tyeler Quentmeyer

**From:** [Deb Wells](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:33:43 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Jan Scott](#)  
**To:** [Brian Stokle](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 5:09:45 PM

---

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 a 50-year Sunset District resident, it is very important to maintain this pilot. I strongly support the compromise approved by the mayor and the Board of Supervisors in 2022 and the re recreational uses of the Great Highway.

Thank you,  
Joanne Scott  
District 4

**From:** [Scott Bauer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:36:54 PM

---

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,  
Scott Bauer

**From:** [Colleen Beach](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:09:28 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

In addition, to allowing San Franciscans to enjoy the shoreline, 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.

Colleen Beach  
[lizardinthewires@gmail.com](mailto:lizardinthewires@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94127



**From:** [Andrea Davis](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:19:53 PM

---

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.

I live in the Outer Sunset, and traffic calming is essential. I walk and run in the neighborhood multiple times a day, and I don't think there is a day that goes by that I don't witness driving that endangers pedestrians. I've even experienced a driver yelling at me "Wait until I hit you, then you can worry."

The Great Highway offers a safe way for me as a pedestrian or a cyclist to move between the north and south parts of the neighborhood.

Thank you,

Andréa

**From:** [Van Rookhuyzen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:06:22 PM

---

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,  
Van Rookhuyzen RN

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Michelle Fliegauf](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:10 PM

---

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 a home owner on the Great Highway and 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,

Michelle Fliegauf  
1626 Great Highway  
#3  
SF, CA 94122

**From:** [Kendra Pinkerton](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:36:44 PM

---

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,

Kendra Pinkerton-Smith

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Seth Tanen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:27:21 PM

---

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.

My best,

Seth

**From:** [Gregory Condes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:17:48 PM

---

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,

Gregory Condes

**From:** [Genevieve Levin](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:36:00 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Jessica S.](#)  
**To:** [Brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:Brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [Boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:Boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:20:57 PM

---

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,

Jessica Straits  
1933 Ulloa Street

**From:** [COURTNEY HOGENDORN](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:55:51 PM

---

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,  
Suzanna Park

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Sarah Rogers](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:05:56 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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 cannot believe that we are still having to address objections from opponents who want unfettered driving access to this incredible public resource.

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.

The Great Highway park is accessible and welcoming and is a great place for me to meet friends young and old who have physical limitations that make much of San Francisco infeasible. It's a happy, welcoming, and community-oriented park on the weekends and should be celebrated.

Sarah Rogers  
[serogers@gmail.com](mailto:serogers@gmail.com)  
371 Elsie Street  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Lisa Perlmutter](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:32:36 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Caitlin Madrigal](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:36:42 PM

---

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,  
Caitlin Madrigal

**From:** [Trisha Cassidy](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 3:27:57 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Andrew Watson](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:19:47 PM

---

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,

Andrew Watson  
(443) 668-9972  
3945 Lincoln Way  
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** [Bethellen Levitan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:57:53 PM

---

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,

Bethellen Levitan

**From:** [Christy Smith](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:18:25 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Anna Cressman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:08 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Charlotte Mooney](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 7:59:55 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

Dear Joel,

I live in your district and was excited to vote for you last when, after 13 years of living in San Francisco, I finally became a US citizen. I am writing to ask for your support for a safer great highway. Specifically, 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'm a single mom, and the Great Highway is extremely important to me and my two young children. We visit regularly so that the children can practice riding their bikes, and every time I feel incredibly lucky to live in such a stunning locale, as well as a rare place in America that supports residents to develop sustainable, active and safe transport. My kids ride their bikes to school, taking one car off the road, because of initiatives like the weekend compromise. People in cars have many, many other roads to choose from. Young children have few safe options. 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 for considering,  
Charlotte, Sam (6) and Eve (9)

Charlotte Mooney  
[char.mooney@gmail.com](mailto:char.mooney@gmail.com)  
1701 25th avenue  
San Francisco , California 94122





**From:** [Leah Sakamoto](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:44:05 PM

---

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.

Kind regards,  
Leah Sakamoto  
415.828.4140

**From:** [Jim Boyer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:31:09 AM

---

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. Let's make the Great Highway a fun and safe place for visitors.

Thank you,

Jim & Judy Boyer, 2510 47th Avenue

**From:** [Laurence Delisle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:00:53 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Gene Thompson](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:20:20 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Gene Thompson  
[gthomp11@mail.ccsf.edu](mailto:gthomp11@mail.ccsf.edu)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Priscilla Choi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:05:55 PM

---

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,

Best,

Priscilla Choi

**From:** [Lola Beast](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:54:39 PM

---

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,  
Angela

**From:** [Star Beltman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:16:39 PM

---

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,

Star



**From:** [Rachel Behler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:51:19 PM

---

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,  
Rachel Behler

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Roxy Bowerman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 3:19:26 PM

---

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,

Roxana Civitello

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Gaelen Gates](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:57:49 PM

---

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,

Gaelen Gates  
530 Staples Ave.

**From:** [Kelvin Yap](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:27:27 AM

---

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,

Cheers,  
Kelvin

**From:** [Frances Elsberry](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:47:02 PM

---

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,  
Frances Elsberry

**From:** [Jonathan Gripshover](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:19:39 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Charles Whitfield](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:18:19 PM

---

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,  
Charles Whitfield

**From:** [Rachel Staff](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:25:29 PM

---

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,

Rachel Staff



**From:** [Steven Grafton](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:19:14 PM

---

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,

**From:** [SUE DRAKE](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [Elliot Drake](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:36:01 PM

---

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 weekly to walk, or 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,  
Susan Drake

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Cristina M](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:54:35 PM

---

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. The Great Highway park and the closure to cars of this space is one of the highlights of San Francisco, for the majority of residents and for visitors to our city. It is also safer for pedestrians, and more environmentally friendly.

I drive in the city as well and don't feel that the closure of the great highway hinders me at all.

Please keep the park closed to cars.

Thank you!

Maria Stan

1222 Clayton St,  
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** [Erin Mountain](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:41:58 PM

---

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,

Erin  
Sent from my iPhone.

**From:** [Elliot Schwartz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:05:54 PM

---

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,

Elliot Schwartz

**From:** [Friday Apaliski](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 7:57:54 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you please 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,  
Friday, Jason, and Everett Apaliski  
SF Residents

Friday Apaliski  
541-510-3893

**From:** [Steven Cipriano](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:35:30 PM

---

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 has visited Great Highway Park to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for 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,  
Steven Cipriano

**From:** [Paul Doerr](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:51:06 PM

---

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,  
Paul



**From:** [Cory Jircitano](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:00:15 PM

---

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,  
Cory

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [robin.kutner](mailto:robin.kutner@northcentralcoast.com)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:03:55 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

robin kutner  
[rlk\\_117@yahoo.com](mailto:rlk_117@yahoo.com)

san francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Kira Barsten](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:14:07 PM

---

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,

Kira Barsten  
San Francisco resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Hench, Kat](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:47:38 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

\*\*\*\*\*

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients any opinions or advice contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing KPMG client engagement letter.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Melissa Marfell](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:35:16 PM

---

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,

-Melissa Marfell

**From:** [eyon finney](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:41:44 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Sivan Adato](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:02:16 AM

---

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,

Sivan Adato  
Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [David Getzler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:57:51 PM

---

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.

I am a 68 year old cyclist and love enjoying the Great Highway on Friday afternoons and weekends. I take my granddaughter often and she has the freedom to ride her stryder bike alongside me without the threat and danger of cars. The enjoyment of the ocean is crucial to my health and well being and if you saw how many of us enjoy it, I think it would bring a smile to your faces knowing you are doing the right thing by upholding the Coastal Zone Permit.

I live in the Outer Sunset and the Great Highway Park has greatly improved the safety of my neighborhood when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

David Getzler  
415-816-5477

**From:** [Uchenna Okoye](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 7:30:02 AM

---

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,

Uchenna

**From:** [Carol Brownson](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 3:19:13 PM

---

Commissioners:

I'm a great lover of the Great Highway Park. I'm also disabled. I get around San Francisco on a mobility scooter and public transit. I can no longer drive.

On page 71 of the appeal packet (section E2) I read that "*many elderly and disabled people are unable to walk to Ocean Beach. They access Ocean Beach and the coast by driving along the Upper Great Highway, taking in the view and perhaps rolling down the car window and breathing in fresh air.*"

I see they want to **limit my access** to the Great Highway Park to finding someone to drive me along it and a perhaps roll down the window.

What I do now: Either I roll through Golden Gate Park to Lincoln and the Great Highway, or take the 1 California to 32<sup>nd</sup>, transfer to the 18, get off at Lincoln and Great Highway, roll right on to the Lincoln end of the Park and go! I don't have to breath gas fumes as I roll along smelling the sea air and listening to the birds and the laughter of little kids enjoying their small bikes and scooters. I can stop and watch the waves breaking. There's been some excitement there this winter. I want to take my time watching.

I didn't realize there were local businesses until I rolled along the Great Highway Park, stopped off for lunch at one of several nearby restaurants. I had fun chatting with other gardeners and bird lovers when I rolled back from Sloat Garden Center with cigar plants in my front basket. "Yes, indeed the hummingbirds like them. That's why I'm planting these."

Please reject this appeal so the pilot can gather the data that is needed.

Carol Brownson

--

*Carol Brownson*

**From:** [Lara Klemens](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:42:57 PM

---

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 have lived in the city my entire life and never witnessed so much community use and enjoy of the area until the Park was instituted.

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,

Lara Klemens

**From:** [David Alexander](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:54:11 PM

---

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,

Thank you,

Dave

**From:** [Kevin Smokler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:16:30 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Kevin Smokler, a 23 year resident of San Francisco. I write 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 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.

The permit also authorizes important traffic reduction 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,

Kevin Smokler

**From:** [Erin Smith](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:57:00 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Christy Smith](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:18:08 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Claire Vela](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:22:39 AM

---

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,  
Claire Vela

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Melissa Arioli](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:46:56 PM

---

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,  
Melissa Arioli

**From:** [Stephen Lambe](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:08:52 PM

---

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,  
Stephen Lambert

**From:** [Mathew Bittleston](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:11:27 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Mathew Bittleston  
[mbittleston@gmail.com](mailto:mbittleston@gmail.com)  
2859 Harrison St  
San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Seiken Nakama](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:35:39 PM

---

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 information in this message may be confidential, proprietary, or subject to privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you should not copy, distribute, disclose, or use this message or any information it holds (including attachments). If you have received this message in error, please let me know immediately, and permanently delete it. Thank you.

**From:** [Bea B](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:18:49 PM

---

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 (& on Fridays as I have a variable work schedule) to walk, roll, jog, bike, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is vital 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,

Bea Batz

**From:** [Jerry Reiva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:05:46 PM

---

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,  
Jerry Palarca-Reiva  
Outer Sunset Resident

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Joshua Lewis](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:47:40 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Joshua Lewis  
[joshglewis@me.com](mailto:joshglewis@me.com)

San Francisco, California 94112



**From:** [Camille Laturno](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:06:18 PM

---

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,

Camille Laturno  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Cara Eisenberg](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 7:25:07 AM

---

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 personally get to bring my disabled mom down to beach to stroll each weekend in comfort because of the park! 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,  
Cara Eisenberg

**From:** [Katie Parks](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:17:06 PM

---

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,  
Katie Parks

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Mariana Prutton](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:40:08 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Tyler Jones](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:57:30 PM

---

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,

Tyler

**From:** [Rachel Hartman](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:01:52 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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,  
Rachel Hartman, District 1 resident

Rachel Hartman  
[rachelhartman@gmail.com](mailto:rachelhartman@gmail.com)  
811 41st Ave  
San Francisco, California 94121





**From:** [Dasha Yurkevich](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:10:30 PM

---

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,

Dasha Yurkevich  
Leader of Youth Bike America

**From:** [Hwaji Shin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:05:41 PM

---

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,

Hwaji Shin

**From:** [Holly Ruxin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:34:09 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Barbara Butler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:22:31 AM

---

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,

Barbara Butler  
650-333-6953  
Sent from my mobile

**From:** [Scott Sharpe](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:34:54 PM

---

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.

I've been biking along that highway for over a decade, but only after it was closed could I actually enjoy it. Though I would prefer it stay closed permanently, the weekends it's closed are fantastic. 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,  
Scott Sharpe

**From:** [Peter Vitt](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:40:26 PM

---

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,  
Peter vitt

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [roz.arbel](mailto:roz.arbel)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:56:54 PM

---

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. And as a person with mobility issues, I see this as a perfect opportunity to practice walking and try to rehabilitate myself. Last summer BORP had adaptive vehicles, and what a wonderful program!

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,

Roz Arbel



**From:** [Kevin Starr](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 2:27:27 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I live at 1448 La Playa, on the last row of houses. We look across the Great Highway to the drones and ocean. It is a delight to see families enjoying the Great Highway on weekends.

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.

This permit, of course, simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022. I have lived on the Great Highway since 1984 and this was a huge step forward.

With the Highway closed it is an inconvenience to drive surface streets when we need to go south. We'd happily spend triple the additional time if it meant keeping the Highway closed to cars and open to families on the weekend.

Thank you,

Kevin Starr  
1448 La Playa  
(415) 999 2640

Kevin Starr, MD  
CEO  
[Mulago Foundation](#)



**From:** [Michel Lavoie](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:53:55 PM

---

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,

Merci / Thank you  
Michel D Lavoie

**From:** [Victor Cee](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:22:50 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Elan Levin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:46:48 PM

---

Hey— Keep the Great Highway for the people. the people on bikes, walking, running. I'm a driver in San Francisco and i'm the first to say that we need more spaces safe from the dangers of vehicles. JFK is amazing. The Great Highway is amazing. Please don't make them into just another car thoroughfare in SF. It's special- please help us keep it that way.

Elan (resident of D9)

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Tag Savage](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:18:49 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Jason Dewees](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:43:11 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

As a resident of the Sunset, 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,

**From:** [Andy Ia](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:06:12 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Patrick Lindley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:40:18 PM

---

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,

Patrick Lindley  
San Francisco



**From:** [Andrew Mullan](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 7:16:46 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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 Mullan  
[askmullan@gmail.com](mailto:askmullan@gmail.com)

San Francisco , California 94124



**From:** [Alexandria F](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:15:32 PM

---

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.

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 keep safe all visitors to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Alexandria

**From:** [Elliot](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:33:18 PM

---

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 local Richmond residents/home owners, our family supports the Great Highway park weekend compromise.  
A coastal park promenade increases coastal access and allows San Francisco more flexibility to protect coastal habitats by removing car pollution from the coast.**

Elliot Drake & Kwankao Bhuto

**From:** [Matt Korman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:53:48 PM

---

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,

Matt Korman

**From:** [Luisina Barba](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 2:20:25 PM

---

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, Luisina Barba

Enviado desde mi iPhone

**From:** [Terry Sayre](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:56:29 PM

---

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, Terry Sayre, Richmond District Resident

**From:** [Lucas Lux](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardistaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardistaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:05:35 PM

---

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,

Lucas Lux

sent from my smart phone



**From:** [Lillian Archer](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:04:41 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Lillian Archer  
[lillian.b.archer@gmail.com](mailto:lillian.b.archer@gmail.com)  
1578 8th Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Teo Zanella](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:34:53 PM

---

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,

Teo Zanella | <https://teoz.us>

**From:** [Gustav Lindqvist](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:18:44 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Nichole Gangitano](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:34:51 PM

---

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,

Nichole Gangitano  
Sunset resident

**From:** [Emily Voigtlander](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:21:27 AM

---

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,  
Emily Seliger

**From:** [Tim Durning](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:00:42 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Tim Durning  
[timothydurning@gmail.com](mailto:timothydurning@gmail.com)  
2760 41st Ave  
San Francisco, California 94116





**From:** [Vanessa Gregson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:46:23 PM

---

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,

Vanessa Gregson

**From:** [JS](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:56:20 PM

---

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,  
John Springer  
42nd avenue

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Elaine Perez](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:39:12 PM

---

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,  
Elaine

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Matthew Stevens](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:59:20 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am a San Francisco resident and 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,

Matt Stevens  
San Francisco Resident

**From:** [Hannah Russell](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:53:32 PM

---

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,

Best,  
Russell  
(859) 421-7899

**From:** [Katrina Sohriakoff](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 2:09:19 PM

---

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,  
Katrina Sohriakoff

**From:** [Peter O'Neil](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:31:08 PM

---

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 a neighborhood resident and 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,

Pete O'Neil  
3234 Santiago St  
SF, CA  
94116

**From:** [Lindsey Lutts](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:10:38 AM

---

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,  
Lindsey McGuire

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [ian.hespelt](mailto:ian.hespelt)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:02:41 PM

---

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.

I live in the outer sunset neighborhood and this has a massive impact on my quality of life as a resident. My family and I make use of this space for recreation every weekend, we need more car free spaces in San Francisco. Do not allow the group with the biggest lawyers to decide the outcome for the people who live here. Please allows the enjoyment of this public space to continue, free from dangerous distracted drivers and pollution.

Thank you,

Ian Hespelt

**From:** [Rick](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:56:25 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

This is like a nightmare replaying over and over again. My wife and I have been to the GREAT HIGHWAY PARK numerous times and it's always filled with people of all sorts. The people have spoken through the ballot box. Please do not let these squeaky wheels get there way. My only complaint is that it's not closed to cars 7 days!!

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Katie Chung](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 6:52:42 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

My child learned to bike ride in Great highway and it continues to be one our favorite places to ride on weekends - it is the only flat and protected place with ample space for all to enjoy in the city allows for this.

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 Chung  
katie.chung.01@gmail.com  
31 Ashton ave  
San francisco, California 94112



**From:** [Kippy Chan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:38:54 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Brent Robinson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:46:09 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am a regular voter, a civil rights lawyer, and a homeowner in Supervisor Melgar's district. I write to urge you to affirm the Planning Commission's unanimous decision 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 regularly 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 and that of my family when we walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Brent A. Robinson

**From:** [davidperrysf@gmail.com](mailto:davidperrysf@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com);  
[MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:14:59 AM

---

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.

I'm old and I walk the UGH every day it is car-free.

Thank you,  
David Perry  
2134 46th Ave

**From:** [Alex](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:14:41 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Christopher Plaskett](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:18:43 PM

---

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,  
Christopher

**From:** [Laura Wood](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:26:22 PM

---

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 to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,  
Laura Wood

**From:** [Viet-Hung Nguyen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:55:05 AM

---

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,

Viet-Hung Nguyen  
USF

**From:** [Matt Paulus](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:33:38 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing as a SF resident on 47th Ave in the Outer Parkside district 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,

Matt Paulus

**From:** [Matt Lambert](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:55:38 PM

---

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,

Matthew Lambert

**From:** [Henry Turner](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:41 PM

---

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,

HENRY TURNER

**From:** [Michelle Agbayani](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:54:01 PM

---

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,

Michelle agbayani

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Erica Simmons](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:12:07 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Erica Simmons  
[ignimbrite@gmail.com](mailto:ignimbrite@gmail.com)  
355 Nevada Street  
San Francisco, California 94110





**From:** [Steven Jacobs](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 1:55:25 PM

---

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,  
Steven Jacobs

**From:** [Christopher Pederson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:02:26 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Dario Rapisardi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:36 PM

---

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,

Dario Rapisardi

**From:** [Jason Dunford](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 5:37:03 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Jason Dunford  
[jason.dunford@gmail.com](mailto:jason.dunford@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Kelsey](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:30:22 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Adi Zimmerman](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:34:01 AM

---

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,  
Adi



**From:** [Drew McDaniel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:33:34 PM

---

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,  
Drew McDaniel

**From:** [Louis DeRosa](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:18:42 PM

---

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,  
Louis

**From:** [Arlene Waksberg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:58:24 PM

---

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.

I know this is a form letter but I wanted to add a personal note. My friend and I, two 78 year old women with knee replacements, have been walking the Great Highway every weekend since the pandemic. We both so appreciate having a flat, safe place to walk, not to mention the beautiful scenery. There are always loads of people walking, running, bicycling and teaching their children to bicycle when we are there. I can't think of a better use of the space than allowing people to enjoy the great outdoors.

Thank you,  
Arlene Waksberg

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Hanga Simon](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:30:14 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Matt Montgomery](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:54:56 PM

---

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,

Matt Montgomery  
1472 48th Ave  
San Francisco, CA

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Matt Wahl](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:54:26 AM

---

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,

Matt Wahl

**From:** [CJ Takhar](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:13:43 PM

---

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,

Cj Takhar

Sunset resident of 14 years

**From:** [David Grey](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:25:09 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

David Grey  
dgrey@gmail.com  
631 Mangels Ave.  
San Francisco, California 94127





**From:** [Siddharth Jain](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:38:44 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Brooks Ward](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:45:59 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Richmond Family Transportation Network](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:53:31 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Sarah Gilster](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:52:29 PM

---

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.

I am a proud Outer Sunset resident, avid runner, surfer, biker and mother of a toddler who LOVES riding his scooter and strider bike on the highway as well 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,  
Sarah Gilster (and Jack Kruvant, age 15 months)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Nicholai Lidow](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:53:02 AM

---

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,  
Nicholai Lidow

**From:** [Jessica Kolahi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:32:47 AM

---

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.

PLEASE KEEP THE GREAT HIGHWAY PARK OPEN!!

Thank you,  
Jessica, Claire, and Kevin Kolahi  
2555 33rd ave, San Francisco, CA 94116

**From:** [Vance Vredenburg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [Supervisor Myrna Melgar](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:13:08 PM

---

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.

Finally as a father of two children living in San Francisco I cherish the opportunity for any space in the city where cars are not allowed. Our streets are so dangerous for kids! Do we really need a 4 lane highway plus literally adjacent feeder streets along our shoreline? Please for the future of our children, for the future of our City, keep cars off the great highway permanently.

Thank you,  
Vance Vredenburg, PhD  
2326 Cecilia Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94116



**From:** [Nima Yazdani](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 12:40:52 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Nima Yazdani  
[nimayazd@gmail.com](mailto:nimayazd@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Wade P Warrens](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:17:38 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Please keep this park open. Like our city, it should be for people, not cars.

Wade Warrens  
71 Wawona St

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,

**From:** [nancy.fxcrowley.com](mailto:nancy.fxcrowley.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:32:30 PM

---

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,

Nancy Hayden Crowley

**From:** [Penny Stroud](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:45:58 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Erika Chan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:53:22 PM

---

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,

Erika Chan

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [sasha@theotheralex.com](mailto:sasha@theotheralex.com)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:47:33 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

sasha@theotheralex.com

,





**From:** [Haley Quentmeyer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:54:47 PM

---

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,

Haley Quentmeyer  
47th Ave and Lawton

**From:** [Jennifer Parker](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:11:52 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Samantha Ancona Esselmann](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:57:45 PM

---

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,  
Samantha Ancona Esselmann

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [liebekatja@yahoo.com](mailto:liebekatja@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:29:02 PM

---

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,

Katie Grote  
833 Kirkham Street  
650-245-4182

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Amy Morris](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:22:18 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Amy Morris  
[amy\\_mo\\_23@yahoo.com](mailto:amy_mo_23@yahoo.com)  
643 17th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94121



**From:** [Michael Borden](#)  
**To:** [Brian Stokle](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:38:39 PM

---

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. **It should be obvious: a coastal park promenade increases coastal access and allows San Francisco more flexibility to protect coastal habitats by removing car pollution from the coast.**

I'm a 73 old, and having access to a car free space to bike and to get to the Ocean has been wonderful. Please keep this!

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,

Michael Borden  
137 Scott St, San Francisco, CA 94117

**From:** [David Haye](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:59:51 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

David Haye  
davidhayegmail.com  
336 Pierce St  
San Francisco, California 94117





**From:** [Alyssa Cheung](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:31 PM

---

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,

Alyssa Cheung

**From:** [Sierra Fish](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 1:19:08 PM

---

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 my dog, 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,  
Sierra Fish

**From:** [Brian Sousa](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:48:04 PM

---

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,

Brian Sousa

**From:** [Alissa Hood](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:17:29 PM

---

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,  
Alissa Hood

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Monica Scott](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:28:12 PM

---

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 with my two daughters from the Mission District 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,

Monica L. Scott  
[monica.scott@gmail.com](mailto:monica.scott@gmail.com)

**From:** [Mathews Stefanie](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:57:32 PM

---

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,  
Stefanie Mathews

**From:** [SC Hebert](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:11:03 PM

---

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.

The Great Highway Park is one of my favorite places in SF, and I've been a proud resident for 23 years.

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,

Sarah



**From:** [Monica Fish](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:53:05 PM

---

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,

Monica and Roger Fish

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [John Zwolinski](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:33:02 AM

---

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,

John Zwolinski  
1296 La Playa St.

**From:** [Paul Williams](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:55:49 AM

---

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 locals who visit Great Highway Park 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,  
Paul Williams

**From:** [Lian Chang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:54:47 PM

---

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,

Lian Chang  
D1

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Nicole Berkin](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 12:51:55 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Nicole Berkin  
[nicole.berkin@gmail.com](mailto:nicole.berkin@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Don Reigrod](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:48:14 PM

---

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,

Don Reigrod and family

**From:** [kristina.barriero](mailto:kristina.barriero@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:27 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Lauren Miller](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:09:15 AM

---

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,

Lauren Miller

**From:** [Vincent Casotti](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 12:09:54 AM

---

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,  
Vincent

**From:** [Bruce Halperin](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:45:55 PM

---

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,  
Bruce Halperin

**From:** [Harper Cullen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:48:45 AM

---

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,

---

This message may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the addressee or authorized to receive this for the addressee, you must not use, copy, disclose, or take any action based on this message or any information herein. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete this message. The opinion expressed in this mail is that of the sender and do not necessarily reflect that of Whatfix Private limited and its affiliates & subsidiaries. Thank you for your co-operation.

**From:** [singlis77@yahoo.com](mailto:singlis77@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:36:47 PM

---

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,  
Sarah

**From:** [Graham Clarke](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:32:19 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Bernice Palacio](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:22:06 PM

---

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,

+

Bernice Palacio

**Studio VARA**

3130 20th St. Suite 190  
San Francisco, CA 94110

[studiovara.com](http://studiovara.com)

T. 415 826-1367  
M. 415 828-5774

**From:** [Inke Noel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:46:12 PM

---

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,

Inke

Response sent from my Phone.



**From:** [Paul DeMello](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 12:00:53 AM

---

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,

Paul

**From:** [John Capener](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:55:45 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Deborah Lee](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:25:36 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you uphold the Planning Commission's Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project. Please reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

I have lived two blocks from the Great Highway for 30 years. I drive on the street during the week and walk there every weekend. When walking, I love sharing the car-free space with the many people of all demographics on feet, bikes, wheelchairs, strollers, skates, skateboards, scooters, etc. I look forward to every Friday at noon. If I need to drive on the weekend, I choose another route: no problem.

This permit maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022. It clearly and effectively furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan. It provides clean, quiet, healthy and safe space for 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.

It's a compromise that considers diverse needs. Drivers have the road 4 1/2 days a week. We drivers have hundreds of other streets at our disposal. Can we make this small sacrifice of our favorite car route for the huge environmental, health, and social benefits of the Great Walkway? Please!

Thank you,

Deborah Lee  
4430 Balboa Street  
San Francisco

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Garrett Spiegel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:31:45 PM

---

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. My kids learned to ride their bikes on the Great Highway and the space is a lifesaver to my family. 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, which has greatly helped me as a resident on 48th avenue between Lincoln and Irving. 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,  
Garrett Spiegel  
Outer Sunset resident, father of 4

--  
Garrett Spiegel

**From:** [Corey Block](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:26 PM

---

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,  
Corey

**From:** [Barbara](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:54:39 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Benito Noyola](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:36:33 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Yvonne Socolar](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:09:27 PM

---

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. Without exaggeration, this park has changed my life for the better. 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 my neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,  
Yvonne Socolar

--

*Yvonne Socolar*  
*she/her*



**From:** [Jarrod Hsu](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:45:42 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Petia Kremen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:47:29 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Nicolas Weninger](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:48:44 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Minh Ava Chang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:10:43 PM

---

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,

Minh Ava Chang

**From:** [Chelsea Andreozzi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:27:47 PM

---

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,

Chelsea A.

**From:** [Jax Jacobs](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 12:18:20 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

As a fourth generation San Franciscan and my daughter being fifth generation this has been one of our favorite spots since the pandemic. This has been one of the most positive steps for SF and our neighborhood. 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,  
Jacqueline Jacobs  
Sunset Resident & Parent

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Mieko Yeh](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:17:26 PM

---

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,

Mieko Yeh  
(Nearby resident)

**From:** [Scott Love](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:53:02 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Kristin Tièche](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Rachel Clyde](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:30:22 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Kristin Tieche and I am a resident of D1, 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.

I ride my bike to the Great Highway every Friday and I also volunteer at community events there like The Great Hauntway. I've organized my own bike events there as well. The space is really bringing community together in a way it never did before as a space for 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,  
Kristin Tieche/94117

--

Kristin Tièche (she/her)  
323-243-1585  
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/kristintieche/>

**From:** [Radha Tomassetti](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:52:38 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Colleen Rubin-Buchalski](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:43:17 PM

---

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,

Colleen Apgar

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Carol Brownson](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:54:34 PM

---

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 someone who learned to ride their mobility scooter there, and now 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,

**From:** [Jim Bourke](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 4:54:41 PM

---

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.

**Last Sunday I went for a long run from Eureka Valley down through Golden Gate Park, and along the Great Highway Park, before turning around and running home to the Haight. It was magical: families on a stroll with prams, bike riders, rollerbladers, walkers, runners of all levels, all enjoying the salt air and the community that this promenade has encouraged while carless. This place is magical, and I have been smiling about my San Francisco Sunday all week. Please protect it for all of us to enjoy.**

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,  
James

**From:** [Michael Sacks](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:00:19 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Michael Sacks  
[michaelsacks@gmail.com](mailto:michaelsacks@gmail.com)  
1808 Vallejo St, apt 1  
San Francisco, California 94123



**From:** [Jonathan Lasso](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:37:22 AM

---

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,  
Jonathan



**From:** [Paola Brigneti](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:06:43 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Paola Brigneti  
[paola.brigneti@gmail.com](mailto:paola.brigneti@gmail.com)

San Francisco , California 94126



**From:** [Matt Paulus](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:17:18 PM

---

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 a resident on 47th Ave and 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,

Matt

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Stephen Braitsch](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:20 PM

---

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,

Stephen Braitsch

**From:** [David Adam](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:23:12 AM

---

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 Adam

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Mira](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 12:18:07 PM

---

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,

Mira Feess

**From:** [Jonathan Maguire](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:45:35 PM

---

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,  
Jonathan Maguire

**From:** [Christopher Tutino](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:31:22 PM

---

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,

Christopher Tutino



**From:** [Loren Kalm](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:31:19 PM

---

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,  
Loren

**From:** [Lori Beltran](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:54:09 PM

---

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,  
Lori Beltran

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Calum Mackay](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:27:47 PM

---

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,  
Calum Mackay  
55 Hancock Street  
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** [Lindsay Parres](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:58 PM

---

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,

Lindsay

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jason Roeslein](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:10:36 PM

---

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

**From:** [Bill](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:45:59 AM

---

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.

Restricting vehicles to weekdays on Upper Great Highway has greatly expanded actual public access to that section of the coast. Rather than only transiting it at 45mph, people like me can experience it as a place where the sights and sounds of nature is sensed and appreciated for their own sake. The current temporary configuration is a compromise that serves different uses. It has functioned well in this interim period of evaluation. It merits being continued to accurately determine the benefits and disadvantages.

Thank You,  
Bill Taplin

**From:** [Amanda Kilmer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:34:17 PM

---

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,  
Amanda

--  
ak

**From:** [Jeanne Finley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:41:53 PM

---

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,  
Jeanne

jeanne c finley  
Professor of Film and Graduate Fine Art  
California College of the Arts

<http://www.finleymuse.com/>  
<https://www.redboatcrossing.com/>  
<https://www.journeysbeyondthecosmodrome.com>  
<https://www.aradicalstitch.com/>



**From:** [Brad Wallace](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:14 PM

---

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.

This has notably improved family life in the Outer Sunset and I use it regularly with my family.

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,

Brad Wallace  
1481 38th Avenue,  
San Francisco, CA 94122  
415.819.8551

**From:** [Dan Rosenfeld](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:00:25 PM

---

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,

Dan Rosenfeld

**From:** [Laura Palmer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:30:53 PM

---

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,

Laura Palmer

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Mark & Tina Valentine](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:27:11 AM

---

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,  
Tina Valentine

**From:** [wendy.murphy](mailto:wendy.murphy@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:20:19 AM

---

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,  
Wendy Herzenberg  
1883 47th ave

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Toby Peelle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:52:07 PM

---

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,  
Toby

**From:** [Leah Hickey](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:17:13 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Jeanette Rogas](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 4:29:05 PM

---

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 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,

-Jeanette



**From:** [Radha Tomassetti](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:50 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Chris](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:26:49 PM

---

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,  
Christopher Goy

**From:** [Lana Porcello](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:36:14 AM

---

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,  
Lana Porcello  
Outer Sunset Resident

**From:** [Kristyn Grunick](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 11:59:49 AM

---

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,  
Kristyn Grunick  
2023 42nd Ave in Outer Sunset

**From:** [Alex Greene](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:45:28 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Alex Greene, and 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,

Alex Greene  
190 27th Ave, San Francisco  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Samantha McIntosh](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:10:27 PM

---

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, and simply enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is crucial for my family's access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. As you know, 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.

A strong emphasis on child safety mentioned above. Anyone with a stroller and small children attempting to cross the great highway knows the stress associated with the act of attempting to simply enjoy the beach. The agreed upon compromise has been a blessing

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.

In gratitude,

Samantha

**From:** [bekki.jean@gmail.com](mailto:bekki.jean@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:39:10 AM

---

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,  
Rebecca Bolthouse  
San Francisco 94118

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Molly Shambo](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:34:29 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Molly Shambo  
[molly.shambo@gmail.com](mailto:molly.shambo@gmail.com)  
260 30th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94121





**From:** [Whitney Greswold](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:30:39 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Kimberly Swan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:40:24 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone - embrace my brevity.

**From:** [Thomas Hower](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:54:15 PM

---

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,  
Thomas Hower

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Christina Stephen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:09 PM

---

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,  
Christina Stephen

**From:** [Noah DeWald](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 4:26:59 PM

---

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,

Noah

**From:** [Harini Madhavan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:17:13 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Victor Vasquez](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:34:59 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

I have lived in the outer sunset my entire life and have seen how much the hybrid closure has helped revitalize businesses and increased safe family access to the shoreline. This combined with finalizing the MUNI improvements along the L Taraval Line should be a priority to enable increased commerce and future added residences.

Victor Vasquez  
[vic.vasquez416@gmail.com](mailto:vic.vasquez416@gmail.com)

san francisco, California 94116





**From:** [Todd Eichel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 11:58:20 AM

---

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,

Todd Eichel  
1266 9th Ave Apt 301  
SF CA 94122

**From:** [David Marwick](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:32:09 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

David Marwick  
[dmarwick@gmail.com](mailto:dmarwick@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94110



**From:** [Nancy Benjamin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:37 PM

---

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.

If I might make a suggestion. Stop messing with our street and concentrate on repairs and programs to improve living in SF.

Thank you,

Nancy Benjamin  
Voter

**From:** [Jonathan King](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:55:53 PM

---

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.

Thanks,  
Jonathan

**From:** [Theresa Von D](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:30:52 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Pamela Morse](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:26:16 PM

---

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 a neighbor and 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,  
Pam Campbell



**From:** [Elaine Brannigan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:09:55 PM

---

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,

Elaine Brannigan

**From:** [Emerson Eichler](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:26:18 AM

---

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,

EE

**From:** [Madeleine Zayas](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:51:50 PM

---

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,

Sent from Samsung Galaxy smartphone.  
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

**From:** [isao Kaji](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:28:31 PM

---

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,

Isao Kaji

**From:** [Andria Borba](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:53:55 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Gabor Melli](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:45:03 PM

---

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,

Gabor Melli  
2919 Pacific Ave  
San Francisco, CA  
94115

**From:** [Lisa Ferragano](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:48:07 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Helen Segal](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:40:14 PM

---

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,

Helen Segal



**From:** [Kim Morrison](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:57:54 PM

---

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,

Kim Morrison  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jessica Kench](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:39:21 PM

---

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,

Jessica Kench

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Géraldyne Masson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:30:21 PM

---

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,

----

Géraldyne Masson

**From:** [Chris Diani](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:09:35 PM

---

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,  
Chris Diani  
145 Crestlake Drive  
San Francisco, CA 94132

**From:** [richard.ahumada](mailto:richard.ahumada@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:56 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Kevin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:04:07 PM

---

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,

Kevin Smithly

**From:** [Haley Baron](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:54:50 PM

---

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.

I was born and raised in the Sunset and am currently a homeowner in the Outer Sunset. The walkable Great Highway is one of the best parts of our neighborhood. It provides community gathering spaces, and has been invaluable as I recover from surgery and can't walk on the beach with my newborn. Friends regularly come to our neighborhood on the weekends specifically to enjoy the Upper Great Highway without cars.

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.

Please don't let this special space be taken away. It brings so much joy to our community.

Thank you,

**From:** [Sarah Woods](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 11:43:15 AM

---

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,

Sarah Woods  
1900 45th Ave  
SF Ca 94116  
415-310-0868

Warmly,

Sarah Woods  
415-310-0868



**From:** [Jen De Melo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:37:10 AM

---

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,

Jen De Melo  
[jendemelo8@gmail.com](mailto:jendemelo8@gmail.com)  
+1.650.207.4532

**From:** [Ruth Selby](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:24:36 AM

---

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 an Outer Sunset resident at 41st Ave and Kirkham, I support the Great Highway Park. It brings profound value to our neighborhood and is a much safer use of space.

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,

Ruth Selby

**From:** [Tim Dufka](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:31 PM

---

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.

We are 40 year residents of San Francisco, and have been enjoying the Great Highway since its inception. To be able to walk and enjoy this resource without auto traffic is one of our greatest joys.

Thank you,  
Tim Duka and Marie-Pierre Carlotti  
76 Potomac Street  
San Francisco CA  
94117

**From:** [Tim Reilly](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 4:02:13 PM

---

Dear Neighbors & Commissioners,

Connecting our city to effective means of transportation by creating a robust network of safe mobility is a powerful tool to support the growth of San Francisco.

Please help keep the park a safe place to be as a pedestrian. Consider optimizing the beauty and access of our coast.

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 many weekends 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,  
Tim, Katie, Quinn and Louisa Reilly - Zip 94129

**From:** [Patrick Mack](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:16:57 PM

---

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,

Patrick Mack  
479 Waller Street  
San Francisco

**From:** [Dani Marone](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:25:22 PM

---

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.

I live a few blocks away and the having the Great Highway closed to cars on the weekend is one of the biggest joys of our neighborhood. People are more active and elderly people especially enjoy a safe walking environment. Please take into consideration the healthy effects of having less cars on the highway during the weekends.

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,

Danielle Marone  
2274 45th Avenue

**From:** [Jason Sherba](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:27:47 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Bob Thawley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [Supervisor Myrna Melgar](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:53:42 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

We are 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 some 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, made it a destination for us and the out-of-town visitors we often host. Additionally I feel it is vital to my safety and that of neighbors and friends here, when we walk and bike to Ocean Beach.

Thank you,

Bob Thawley, Marian Doub  
15 Mirabel Ave.  
SF. CA 94110



**From:** [Seth Golub](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:30:56 AM

---

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.

In a city of a million people, there are very few places a child can ride a bike for more than a block without navigating car traffic. We've surrendered the rest of the city to car traffic. Let us continue to enjoy a short stretch of the coast, even if only two days a week.

**From:** [Clementine Marie](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:23:12 AM

---

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,

Clementine Daniel

**From:** [Ben Ewing](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:47:43 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Ben Ewing  
[bewing91@gmail.com](mailto:bewing91@gmail.com)  
1683 Fulton st  
San Francisco, California 94117



**From:** [Dan Federman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:47:04 PM

---

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,

Best,  
- Dan Federman (he/him)

D5 resident

**From:** [Ezra Trener](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:30:06 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Annie Stroud](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:46:04 PM

---

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,  
Annie Stroud

**From:** [Andrew Rivas](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:49:22 PM

---

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,

Andrew



**From:** [paul.greer](mailto:paul.greer@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:26:21 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Neville Hemming](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [Jane Ji](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:43:07 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

We are 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 and to later make the park permanent.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park on the 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. To be honest, it is one of our favorite parts of living in SF and cannot wait until it is a permanent fixture with more infrastructure. We live in Duboce and would not visit the Sunset as often as we do or at all without this pilot program. 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 our safety when we walk, bike, and take the N to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,  
Neville & Yao Hemming

**From:** [Kate Jenkins](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:16:32 AM

---

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,  
Kate Mercado  
Glen Park resident

Sent via [Superhuman](#)

**From:** [Helena Viets](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:17:38 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Ian Hopping](mailto:Ian.Hopping@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:27:49 AM

---

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 pilot has so greatly increased the number of people accessing and enjoying Ocean Beach. It is one of the best things I've seen the San Francisco government do to improve the recreational experience of residents in the city.

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,

Ian

--

[Ian.Hopping@gmail.com](mailto:Ian.Hopping@gmail.com)

631-457-0254

@ihopping

**From:** [Rita Evans](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:54 PM

---

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,

Rita Evans  
San Francisco

**From:** [Andrew Klimenko](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:20 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Richard Weld](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 4:02:05 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Richard Weld  
rgweld@gmail.com  
4327 California Street  
san francisco , California 94118





**From:** [Leslie Batz](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:21:18 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

Dear Supervisor Melgar,

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.

This pilot program has been a boon for both residents like myself and others who wish to enjoy Ocean Beach without the stress of automobile traffic. 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,  
L Batz

Leslie Batz  
[baetzli@gmail.com](mailto:baetzli@gmail.com)  
4026 Ulloa St  
San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Jennifer Urbain](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [Jennifer Urbain](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:16:50 PM

---

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,  
Jennifer Urbain  
2141 Kirkham Street  
San Francisco, CA 94122

**From:** [John Elliott](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:03:11 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Great Highway Park is my favorite place in the world.

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,  
John

**From:** [Kayle Barnes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:37:43 PM

---

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,  
Kaylé Barnes

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Glen Moy](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:09:26 PM

---

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,

**From:** [paul.morrow](mailto:paul.morrow@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:53:42 PM

---

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,  
Paul Morrow, RN

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Dustin Palmer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:16:56 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Amy Lessler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:24:00 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Trish](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:29:52 PM

---

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,  
Trish Gump

San Francisco Resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Alexandra Bogdan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:46:56 PM

---

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,  
Alexandra Bogdan  
SF District 4

**From:** [Mario Salinas](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:48:37 AM

---

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,

Mario Salinas

**From:** [Zachary Slobig](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:15:52 AM

---

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,

Zach Slobig

--

Zachary Slobig  
[www.zacharyslobig.com](http://www.zacharyslobig.com)  
415-590-1962  
[@slobig](#)

**From:** [Steph Chan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:56:15 AM

---

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,

Stephanie

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Seth Rosenblatt](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 9:07:42 AM

---

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,  
Ezra, Juliana, and Seth Rosenblatt



**From:** [Bronagh Hanley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:44 PM

---

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,  
Bronagh Hanley

**From:** [eric.lubeck@gmail.com](mailto:eric.lubeck@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:41:42 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Graham Anand](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:15:49 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Justin Street](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:23:54 PM

---

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.

Please have the courage to be the leaders we need for a transit first city, that aspires to achieve vision zero, in the middle of a climate crisis.

Thank you,

Justin Street

**From:** [James Webb](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:02:59 PM

---

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, run bike along Ocean Beach, 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.

It is also one of the few car free spaces that we have in the city and is already a compromise that has been put in place until the access along Ocean Beach is removed entirely due to the issues with the erosion at the south end of Ocean Beach,

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,

James Webb

**From:** [paul.greer](mailto:paul.greer@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:26:06 PM

---

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,

Paul

**From:** [Nicholas Rademacher](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:16:36 PM

---

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.

I am a senior who lives alone. My Outer Parkside neighborhood offers no safe and accessible outdoor space. 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,

**From:** [Sara](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:09:13 PM

---

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,

Sara Kim

(510) 303-5192  
1421 10th Ave  
San Francisco, CA 94122



**From:** [Julia Boesch](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:53:24 PM

---

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,  
Julia Boesch (45th Ave. & Noriega)

**From:** [Marie Mika](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:42:48 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Marie Mika  
mariemika8@gmail.com  
2414 47th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Louis Magarshack](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:19 PM

---

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.

Lastly, as someone who lives 1 block from the park, I miss having it on weekday. Now every morning and every evening I'm forced to dodge around red light runners to access the beach at Vicente & great highway.

Thank you,  
Louis Magarshack

**From:** [Heather Brady](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:37:13 PM

---

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,

Heather Brady

**From:** [Theresa Carper](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:29:44 PM

---

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,

-Theresa

**From:** [Nora McConnell](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:45:10 AM

---

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,

Nora McConnell

**From:** [Allan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:40:26 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Although the copy below was not written by me, I could not agree more. I live 2 blocks from the Great Highway and the access on the weekend means everything to us.

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,

Allan Gersten



**From:** [Claudine RL Co](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:52:54 PM

---

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,

**From:** [F. Tizedes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 8:22:31 AM

---

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,

Frank Tizedes  
Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Julie Gengo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:15:44 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone so please pardon the Siri errors...

**From:** [Peter Casey](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:22:41 PM

---

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,

Peter Casey

**From:** [Emily](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:06:18 PM

---

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,  
Emily

**From:** [Katherine Roberts](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:58:10 PM

---

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 to some extent furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline — even though it's only on weekends — and providing safe space on weekends for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast, even though it's currently on weekends only. Maintaining this pilot even though it's on weekends only allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of the Great Highway, which hopefully will be closed to cars completely every day of the week instead of on weekends only as it now is.

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, even though this is true on weekends only, and the rest of the week it's just as dangerous as ever for everyone who's not inside a car, which is supposedly antithetical to all the values San Francisco espouses, but nonetheless, there you have it.

Most sincerely yours — and please don't make this situation any worse than it already is by infringing even more on basic pedestrian safety than you're already doing —

Katherine Roberts

Sent from my iPod

**From:** [Leslie Batz](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:15:24 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

This park has been a boon for both residents like myself and visitors wishing to enjoy recreating safely by the ocean. The pilot program shouldn't be dismantled as it has been and continues to be a success. The 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,  
L Batz

Leslie Batz  
[baetzli@gmail.com](mailto:baetzli@gmail.com)  
4026 Ulloa St  
San Francisco, California 94116





**From:** [Willett Moss](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:27:55 PM

---

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,

Willett Moss  
SF District 8 Resident

**From:** [Andrew Klimenko](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:10 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Liana Krakirian](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:14:31 AM

---

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,  
Liana Krakirian

As a Chair, Board member (Chair and Deputy) and Board member, I am writing to ask that you update the Planning Commission's memorandum recommendation to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you request approval of the project and that you request approval of the project and that you request approval of the project.

PLA 2025

As a member of the Board of Supervisors, I am writing to ask that you update the Planning Commission's memorandum recommendation to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and that you request approval of the project and that you request approval of the project and that you request approval of the project.

In addition, the great outdoor spaces (parks, trails, etc.) in the area have been a great asset to the community and it is important to ensure that these spaces are maintained and that they are accessible to all.

Thank you.

Respectfully,







**From:** [Alex Avery](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:02:50 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

PLEASE DO NOT CLOSE THE GREAT WALKWAY! Every friend I bring to it, whether from SF or elsewhere, is in awe of this hidden gem. Closing it would go against the values I understand SF to stand for: forward-thinking, environmentally conscious, people-first.

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,

**From:** [Gene X Hwang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:40 PM

---

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,

---

**Gene X Hwang**

[genex@orangephotography.com](mailto:genex@orangephotography.com)

<https://orangephotography.com>





**From:** [corbinmuraro@gmail.com](mailto:corbinmuraro@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:20:58 PM

---

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,

Corbin Muraro

**From:** [Christoph Krumm](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:26:01 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Christoph Krumm  
ckrumm@gmail.com  
645 44th Ave, Unit B  
San Francisco , California 94121



**From:** [Rosalind Wellbelove](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:21:04 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Rosalind Wellbelove  
[rosalindwellbelove@gmail.com](mailto:rosalindwellbelove@gmail.com)

San Francisco , California 94116



**From:** [Audrey Liu](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:ChanStaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:29:38 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Alison Warner](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 7:43:41 AM

---

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 safe access to and enjoyment of the shoreline with my family. 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,

Alison Warner  
916-704-2214

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Kendall Silva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:22:26 PM

---

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



**From:** [Taylor Emerson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:40:01 PM

---

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,  
Taylor Emerson  
37 year resident of D1

**From:** [Laura Davenport](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:15:33 PM

---

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,

Thanks,

Laura Davenport  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Satish Mahalingam](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:52:02 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Christopher Roach](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:02:37 PM

---

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,

Christopher Roach

**From:** [Sietze Vermeulen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:13:33 AM

---

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 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, Sietze Vermeulen

**From:** [Thad Herold](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:17:48 PM

---

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,

From,  
Thaddeus Herold

**From:** [Kush Mittal](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:52:49 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Alison Mutter](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:36:35 AM

---

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,  
Alison Mutter  
1951 Clement St, 94121



**From:** [jeanine.long](mailto:jeanine.long)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:05:58 PM

---

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,

Jeanine Tuohy  
Geriatric Care Manager  
650-290-2526

**From:** [Mark Bober](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:52:28 PM

---

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,  
Mark Bober

**From:** [Mary Andritsakis](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:11:25 AM

---

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,

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Joe Merer](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:32:15 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Joe Merer  
[joemerer@gmail.com](mailto:joemerer@gmail.com)  
3915 Lawton street  
San francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Noah Omdal](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:31 PM

---

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,

Noah O

**From:** [Lindsey Pollock](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:24:59 PM

---

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,  
Lindsey

**From:** [Cliff Bargar](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 5:41:50 AM

---

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,

Cliff Bargar  
Dogpatch



**From:** [Ben Porterfield](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:15:04 PM

---

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,

Ben Porterfield

Outer Sunset Resident and Homeowner

**From:** [Graham Smith](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:04:10 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

The Great Highway Park draws myself and thousands of others to the Outer Sunset, where we can freely travel and recreate without the dangers associated with mixed car and pedestrian traffic. It enhances the walkability of the surrounding neighborhood and draws people to local businesses. It is a great public space befitting of the city of San Francisco and the Pacific coast of California, and it's continued use and success will serve as a model for other cities.

Graham Smith  
[graham.douglas.smith@gmail.com](mailto:graham.douglas.smith@gmail.com)

SF, California 94110



**From:** [Adam Bennes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 8:18:11 PM

---

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,

Adam Bennes  
SF resident and avid bicyclist

**From:** [Elena Cáceres](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:20:35 PM

---

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,  
Elena Cáceres

**From:** [Jason Wicklund](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:51 PM

---

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,

Jason Wicklund and Agnes Tam  
1619 48th Ave

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Athena Pappas](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:31 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Dorin Ciobanu](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:29:14 PM

---

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,  
Dorin



**From:** [Gayathri Soundranayagam](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:49:39 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Melissa Bolandi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:39:10 PM

---

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.

Finally, more people are coming to enjoy the beach because of the pilot, increasing a greater sense of community, a healthier environment for children and increasing opportunities for supporting small businesses in the Sunset district. The city's history always had a promenade, including Playland, the Cliff House and other landmarks that would create the same access and enjoyment of the beach that the pilot is recreating on a smaller scale today.

Thank you,

Melissa Bolandi

**From:** [Thomas Perez](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:52:02 PM

---

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,

Thank you, Thomas

This message was sent from my mobile phone.

**From:** [Alexandra Klimova](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:10:08 AM

---

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,  
Alexandra

**From:** [Jim Garrett](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:04:06 PM

---

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,

Jim Garrett

2500 Great Hwy

SF, CA 94116

**From:** [Tim Marcus](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:02:15 PM

---

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,

- Tim

Tim Marcus  
Milkman Sound, Inc  
San Francisco, CA  
[www.milkmansound.com](http://www.milkmansound.com)

•sent from mobile

**From:** [Chrissy Brady-Smith](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:23:29 PM

---

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,  
Christina Brady-Smith  
son Cody 10months

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Krista Judge](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:12:59 PM

---

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.

Best,  
Krista Judge



**From:** [vanessa.altman-siegel](mailto:vanessa.altman-siegel)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:50 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Leah Worthington](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:26 PM

---

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,

Leah

**From:** [Chri Fri](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:51:52 PM

---

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,  
Christoph Friess

**From:** [Jonathan Perel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:38:54 PM

---

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,

—  
Cheers,  
jP

**From:** [Elena Rios](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:21:34 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Christopher Schreiber](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:28:01 PM

---

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,

Christopher Schreiber  
CSchreiberSTX@icloud.com  
(305)510-0096

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Brett Critchlow](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:04:05 PM

---

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,  
Brett

**From:** [Edgar Twigg](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:20:23 PM

---

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,



**From:** [A Chow](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:07:47 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Karen Kirschling](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:03:01 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Karen Kirschling  
[kumasong@icloud.com](mailto:kumasong@icloud.com)  
633 Oak  
SF, California 94117



**From:** [Richard Sestokas](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:12:20 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Sean Rourke](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:14:40 PM

---

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,

Sean Rourke

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Neal Gutierrez](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 7:40:21 PM

---

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,

**[Neal-Avery Barcelona Gutierrez](#)**  
(209) 596 0095

**From:** [Patrick Linehan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:02:13 PM

---

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,  
Patrick

**From:** [Cindy Lutz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:23:05 PM

---

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,  
Cindy Lutz  
2034 30th Avenue  
94116



**From:** [Dominic Templar](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 5:11:43 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Dominic Templar  
[dominictemplar@outlook.com](mailto:dominictemplar@outlook.com)

San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Tim Haines](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:02:51 PM

---

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,

**From:** [David Solomita](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:49 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Brian Quan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:54:59 AM

---

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,

Brian Quan

**From:** [Penny Stroud](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:28:01 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Devorah Zehring](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:01:52 PM

---

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,  
Devorah Zehring

Sent from my iPad  
If you want peace, work for justice

**From:** [Irina Naumova](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:13:47 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Meghan Warner](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:11:03 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I live on 47th and Vicente, right near the Great Highway, and 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 with my toddler in my neighborhood.

Thank you,  
Meghan Warner, SF D4

**From:** [eileengshanahan@gmail.com](mailto:eileengshanahan@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:18:47 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [ledamast@gmail.com](mailto:ledamast@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:51:15 PM

---

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,  
Leda Bashi

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Cora Palmer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:44:11 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Jim Stephenson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:20:29 PM

---

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,

Jim Stephenson

**From:** [Nicholas Erickson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:02:30 AM

---

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,

Nick Erickson

PS: The Great Highway Park is essential for creating a livable community in San Francisco for those who choose to not live with a climate destroying motor vehicle.

**From:** [Corey Busay](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 7:07:17 PM

---

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,  
Corey Busay

**From:** [Jeremy Stoppelman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 7:11:52 PM

---

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,  
Jeremy Stoppelman



**From:** [Nick Brown](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:18:54 PM

---

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,  
Nick (resident of the Richmond)

**From:** [Camila Mize](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:38:53 PM

---

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,

Camila

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Donna Howe](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:01:41 PM

---

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,  
Donna Keuper Howe

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Gail Avila](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:54:50 AM

---

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,  
Gail Avila

**From:** [Gino Fortunato](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:02:45 PM

---

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,

Gino Fortunato  
233 26th Ave  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [sam.galison](mailto:sam.galison)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:27:35 PM

---

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.

Ever since the Upper Great Highway closed to cars during COVID, it has been a much-needed escape for my family. Our one-year-old loves to walk in safety on the street, picking up rocks and pointing out seagulls. We regularly meet up with other families on the Upper Great Highway whenever it's closed to cars, and it's a rare resource in an otherwise car-focused city.

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,  
-Sam

**From:** [Mark Haley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:10:25 PM

---

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.

I also live on the Great Hwy and our block does beach clean up's and then go hang out on the Hwy on weekends.

Thank you,  
Mark Haley

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Chelsea Stoklas](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:12:31 PM

---

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,

Chelsea Stoklas

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Edward Smith](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:17:51 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Emily Raganold](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:43:56 PM

---

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,  
Emily Raganold

**From:** [andrew.harding](mailto:andrew.harding@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:50:21 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Giana Calvello](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:10:54 PM

---

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!!

**From:** [Kati Amberry](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 6:34:17 PM

---

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.

My family and I are part of the thousands of San Franciscans who are afforded better access to the coast through the pilot program.

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 my neighborhood and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,  
Kati Amberry

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Tony](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 11:01:30 AM

---

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,

Tony Anaya

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Aggie Zau](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:18:39 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [ALAN HERRO](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 6:51:06 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Anthony Bernheim](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:38:27 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

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, 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,

Anthony.

**Anthony Bernheim, FAIA**

**LEED® Fellow**

Sustainable Built Environments

38 Samoset Street

San Francisco, CA 94110

Mobile: 415.312.2065

[abernheim@sbcglobal.net](mailto:abernheim@sbcglobal.net)



**From:** [Elizabeth Holoubek](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:49 PM

---

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,

Elizabeth Holoubek  
29th Avenue resident

**From:** [Anu Kotay](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:08:43 PM

---

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,  
Anu Kotay  
Outer Sunset Resident

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone  
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

**From:** [Vorani Davis Khoonsrivong](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:08:27 PM

---

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,

Vorani Davis Khoonsrivong

**From:** [Adrien Apollon](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:43:55 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Bowen Tretheway](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:12:05 PM

---

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,

Best,  
Bowen Tretheway  
SF Resident

Sent from my pocket computer.

**From:** [Josh Ellinger](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 6:31:04 PM

---

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,

Joshua Ellinger  
<http://twitter.com/JoshEllinger>

**From:** [Donald F. Robertson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:16:51 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

The idea that a highway walling off the coast from the city improves coastal access is patently absurd.

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. The idea that a highway walling off the coast from the city

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,

--

Donald F. Robertson  
San Francisco

DonaldFR@DonaldFRobertson.com  
(415) 595-0338

The known is finite, the unknown is infinite. Intellectually, we stand on an islet in the midst of an illimitable ocean of inexplicability. Our business in every generation is to reclaim a little more land.

-- Thomas Huxley.

Sent from my iPhone via Spark Mail.



**From:** [Samantha Puth](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:36:02 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Malone, Ruth](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:01:34 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Great Highway Park is one of the very BEST things to come out of the pandemic and has been reaffirmed by voters! As a Richmond District resident whose son lives in the Sunset, 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 that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

Maintaining this pilot allows City agencies to collect data and perform community engagement to help determine the long-term future of this space. It also allows people like me, a senior, to experience safely what it is like to get around the city car-free. We know we have to change. Our climate is dictating that we must. Providing beautiful car-free places for people to enjoy helps them try out alternative modes of transportation. We cannot continue car dominance everywhere.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend, the car-free use 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.

The permit also 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. Again, please reject these appeals and support the car-free weekend compromise.

Thank you,

Ruth Malone

**From:** [Meena Ghiya](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:57:55 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Meena Ghiya  
[mghiya83@gmail.com](mailto:mghiya83@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Martha Sutherlin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:50:11 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Ashley Hildred](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:01:44 PM

---

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,

Ashley Hildred

**From:** [ALAN HERRO](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 6:49:54 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Elroi Carpenter](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:17:49 PM

---

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. 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,

San Francisco resident.



**From:** [Eric Chen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:27:12 PM

---

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,  
Eric Chen

**From:** [Shane Swenson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:54:19 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Lori Banks](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:48 PM

---

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,  
Lori

**From:** [Ian Wallace](#)  
**To:** [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal:boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:01:04 PM

---

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,

Ian Wallace

2590 Great Highway

**From:** [Christopher Ulrich](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:50:07 PM

---

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,  
Christopher Ulrich

**From:** [Sandy Aylesworth](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 6:02:24 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Sandy Aylesworth  
[sandy.aylesworth@gmail.com](mailto:sandy.aylesworth@gmail.com)

SF, California 94110



**From:** [Josh Berry](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:55:35 AM

---

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,

Josh Berry  
Resident of San Francisco.  
At Pacheco St and 44th Ave.

[joshberry@me.com](mailto:joshberry@me.com) | [www.byjoshberry.com](http://www.byjoshberry.com)



**From:** [Molly Burke](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:16:32 PM

---

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,

Molly Calcutt

**From:** [Alison Worthington](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:12:03 PM

---

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.

My family of 3 uses the Great Highway Park from Friday evening through Sunday. It is such a gift to the very urban Sunset district residents. While I myself would prefer that we keep it free of cars everyday. I'd prefer we take the time to (like was done with the Embarcadero so successfully years ago) and invest in efforts to protect our coastline from erosion and beautify ocean access. However, I understand that others feel it is important mid week for car transport in the short term. So the weekend pilot seemed like the right compromise.

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,  
Alison

**From:** [Rick Cox](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:15:07 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Marie](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:43:43 PM

---

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,

Marie Mika

**From:** [Ira Kaplan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:01:26 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Edward Lesmes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:53:45 AM

---

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,  
Edward Lesmes

**From:** [Nancy Arbuckle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:08:01 PM

---

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,  
Nancy Arbuckle  
SF

**From:** [Sarah Gudernatch Smith](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 11:01:35 PM

---

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.

I'm a proud Outer Sunset home owner and we LOVE our neighborhood, city, community and especially this the Great Highway Park! My 5yo learned how to ride her bike on the park, my neurodiverse 8yo gets to get his energy out, and I walk or run in it every weekend, even in the rain. It is such a blessing to our family and community.

Thank you,  
Sarah



**From:** [ALAN HERRO](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 6:49:46 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Celia Dattels](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Please reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:40 PM

---

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,

Celia Dattels

**From:** [Erica Fox](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:35:06 PM

---

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,

Erica Fox

**From:** [David Apgar](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:27:10 PM

---

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,  
David Apgar

**From:** [Joanna Levin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:49:58 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Harold Findley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:00:12 PM

---

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 regularly, the pilot program is crucial for my enjoyment of the shoreline – and the well-being of everyone outside of a car. 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,

Harold

**From:** [Laura Coleman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:56:25 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

The great highway weekend closure is extremely important to me. I believe the nature of compromise is that it to not ever be overturned, and I am dismayed to write this email at all. We are desperate for community in the outer sunset, do not take the (literal) small strip we have away from us.

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,  
Laura Coleman of Irving St & 39th

**From:** [annadib@pacbell.net](mailto:annadib@pacbell.net)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:34:57 PM

---

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,  
Anna Dibble

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Sue Williard](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:16:31 PM

---

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,

Sue Williard  
1319 48th Avenue  
San Francisco, CA, 94122

As you press on for justice, be sure to move with dignity & discipline, using only the weapons of love.

- Martin Luther King Jr.

**From:** [Patty Corwin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:11:32 PM

---

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,  
Patty Corwin

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [mich and cameron shared](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:36:06 AM

---

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,  
Cameron (Outer Sunset resident and homeowner)

**From:** [John Bartlett](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:01:09 PM

---

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,

John Bartlett

**From:** [impermanence](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:12:59 PM

---

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,

Noriko Nakano

**From:** [ronald whang](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:55:33 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

ronald whang  
ronwhang@gmail.com  
1560 7th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Riley Broughten](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:43:36 PM

---

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,



**From:** [James Le](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:27:08 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Kendall Silva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 4:40:54 PM

---

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

**From:** [Heather Tahl](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:07:26 PM

---

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,

Heather Tahl

**From:** [Rohan Kurse](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:18 PM

---

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,

Thanks,  
Rohan Kurse

**From:** [Joshua Kelly](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:26:04 AM

---

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.

I live in the Sunset and the Great Highway Park is a treasure for all San Franciscan's to enjoy. Here is a picture of my 9 year old daughter and I enjoying a ride home after visiting the Ortega library.



I have lived in SF for 21 years and I visit the beach more now that we have the Great Highway Park. I never needed to drive down the upper great highway, but today I use the great highway park to ride my bike to our local businesses. It's a great way to visit local businesses on Irving & Noriega.

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,

Josh Kelly  
Outer Sunset

**From:** [Rachel Logan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:55:17 PM

---

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,  
Rachel Logan

**From:** [James Cutler](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:10:31 PM

---

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,

James Cutler  
389 Silver Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112



**From:** [ERNEST SCHOLZ](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:58:41 PM

---

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, ERNEST J. SCHOLZ

**From:** [Terry Sayre](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:53:51 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Terry Sayre  
[tcsayre@gmail.com](mailto:tcsayre@gmail.com)  
261 26th ave  
San Francisco , California 94121



**From:** [Cole Brinsfield](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:57:39 PM

---

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,  
Cole Brinsfield

**From:** [Nicole LaPorte](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:13 PM  
**Attachments:** [image431450.png](#)

---

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,  
Nicole



**Nicole LaPorte**  
Program Associate

One Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400 | San Francisco, CA 94111  
T: (415) 733-8529 | F: (415) 477-2783  
[nlaporte@sff.org](mailto:nlaporte@sff.org)

Celebrating 75 years of centering People, Place, and Power  
[sff.org/anniversary](https://sff.org/anniversary)



Pronouns: She, Her, Hers

**From:** [Raphael Mauro](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:01:01 PM

---

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 and all of the City's 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 to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Raphael Mauro  
San Francisco Resident of 32 years

**From:** [Ethan Bold](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:27:03 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Samantha McNabola](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:12:01 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Dima Litin](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:43:28 PM

---

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,

Dima L. Litin | 617-669-7626 | <http://www.linkedin.com/in/litin>

**From:** [Wirt Lewis](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:16:23 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Calvin Landrum](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:49:51 PM

---

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,

Calvin Landrum

**From:** [Blade Corwin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:32:03 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Robbie Vivat](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:53:39 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Zoe Landis](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:00:53 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Wai Yip Tung](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:16:07 PM

---

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.

I have been visiting Great Highway regularly since 2020. It is one of the few bright spot in San Francisco from the pandemic. These low intensity, recreation use it most appropriate in the coastal area vulnerable to climate change. Please keep it this way. In the hindsight, it is not even an appropriate location to build a highway so close to the ocean in the first place. Please reject the appeal.

Thank you,

**From:** [Sylvana Tunesi](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:23:52 AM

---

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,  
Sylvana  
Sunset Resident



**From:** [rescue8@gmail.com](mailto:rescue8@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:43:25 PM

---

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,

Richard Perry

**From:** [Patrick Gallagher](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:10:58 PM

---

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,

Patrick J. Gallagher  
(925)-286-0285  
[pjgallagher2010@gmail.com](mailto:pjgallagher2010@gmail.com)

**From:** [Francesco](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:02 PM

---

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,  
Francesco

**From:** [Robert R.](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:32:02 PM

---

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,  
Robert Rockefeller

**From:** [Gabriel Shapiro](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:26:54 PM

---

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,  
Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro

**From:** [Boone Ashworth](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:57:19 PM

---

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,

Boone Ashworth  
Outer Sunset resident

**From:** [Rich Gunn](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:53:47 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

As a resident of the Outer Sunset, and daily bicycle commuter on the Great Highway & Great Highway Park. 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.

Rich Gunn  
[RichieRifle@gmail.com](mailto:RichieRifle@gmail.com)  
31 Meadowbrook Drive  
San Francisco , California 94132





**From:** [Camilla Mahon](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:10:24 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Robin Pam](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:56:50 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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,  
Robin Pam  
District 7 resident

Robin Pam  
[rsvprobin@gmail.com](mailto:rsvprobin@gmail.com)  
643 Mangels Ave  
San Francisco, California 94127



**From:** [Patricia Castillo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:49:04 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Kristan Elman](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:51:10 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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 wish it was every day -- I avoid biking Great Highway with my kids during the week because it's so unpleasant!)

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.

Kristan Elman  
[kristansartor@gmail.com](mailto:kristansartor@gmail.com)  
1230 5th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [David Sakamoto](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:54:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nicholas Waters](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:08:44 PM

---

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,

Nick

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Daniel Fuchs](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:43:21 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Lynne Carberry](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:15:49 PM

---

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,

Lynne Carberry

**From:** [Chantal Jolagh](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:00:08 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Thomas Beutel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:51:01 PM

---

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,  
Thomas Beutel  
San Francisco and Sunset District Resident

**From:** [Halle Yungmeyer](mailto:Halle.Yungmeyer@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:27:04 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Emily Retemeyer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:53:16 PM

---

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,

Emily Retemeyer

**From:** [Dalan McNabola](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:26:48 PM

---

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,

Dalan McNabola

**From:** [Marian Email](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:56:37 PM

---

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,

Sent from Marian Sherwood



**From:** [Lauren Robertson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:48:13 PM

---

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,  
Lauren Robertson

**From:** [Erik Jones](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:10:20 PM

---

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,  
Erik Jones

**From:** [Matthew Zlatunich](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:09:59 PM

---

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,

Matthew Zlatunich  
749 8th Ave  
San Francisco

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [C.G](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:05:23 PM

---

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,  
Chetana Guliani

Regards,  
Chetana Guliani.  
W: [LinkedIn](#)

**From:** [Kenneth Russell](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:47:13 AM

---

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,

Kenneth Russell  
SF District 7 resident

**From:** [Donna Egan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:50:45 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

We live on Great Hwy and on behalf of our 5 year old twins, dog, and surfer husband, we please ask you to keep the great hwy park weekends, which we use all the time!! We love it!

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,

**From:** [Shannon Cairns](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:26:24 PM

---

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,

Shannon

Shannon Cairns  
415-816-8730

**From:** [Doug Lohf](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:26:16 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Menasche, Steve](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:42:58 PM

---

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,

**From:** [edwrdunn@gmail.com](mailto:edwrdunn@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:59:49 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Lisa Duhigg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:56:18 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [G](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:46:32 PM

---

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,

-Geoff

**From:** [Eliza Panike](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:54:38 PM

---

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,

Eliza Panike  
D4 Resident

**From:** [Jesse Gibbs](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:45:39 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Melina Wyatt](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:14:33 PM

---

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,

Melina

**From:** [Michael Gallagher](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [Info@greathighwaypark.com](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#);  
[boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardlostaff@sfgov.org](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:59:18 PM

---

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,



**From:** [Kevin Utschig](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:42:53 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Arnel Bautista](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:01:58 PM

---

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,  
Arnel Bautista  
Resident, District 4

**From:** [James Ausman](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:43:00 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

James Ausman  
ausman@gmail.com  
198 Precita Ave  
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94110



**From:** [Geraldine Harding](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:26:24 PM

---

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,

Geraldine Harding  
Outer Sunset Resident

**From:** [jenifer.twiford](mailto:jenifer.twiford@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:42:32 PM

---

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.

I absolutely love being able to ride my bike across town from the Mission and ride along the great highway along the ocean with my fellow walkers, skaters, bikers and everyone who joins in celebrating this amazing place along the ocean in our beautiful city!!

Thank you,

Jenifer Twiford

**From:** [Laurie Bauer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:55:36 PM

---

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,

Laurie Bauer

**From:** [Jonathan Bünemann](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [EngardioStaff@sfgov.org](#); [Info@greathighwaypark.com](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:09:48 PM

---

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,



**From:** [William Cline](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:50:09 PM

---

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,  
William Cline  
San Francisco

**From:** [Lila Butler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:13:12 PM

---

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. I am appalled that this important compromise is under threat.

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.

PLEASE HONOR THIS AGREEMENT AND REJECT APPEALS 23-062, 23-064, 23-065!

Thank you,  
Lila Butler

**From:** [Noam Scott](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:26:15 PM

---

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,

**From:** [liz.odonoghue@yahoo.com](mailto:liz.odonoghue@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [ghappeal@proton.me](mailto:ghappeal@proton.me)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:50:58 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Please 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 a resident of Supervisor District 1 in the Richmond, and one of the thousands of San Franciscans who delights in visiting Great Highway Park often 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 frequent nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Liz O'Donoghue

**From:** [Tim Duester](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:45:06 PM

---

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 many 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,  
Tim Duester

**From:** [Gabriel Goffman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:59:17 PM

---

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,

Gabriel Goffman CFA  
Paragon Energy Capital  
202-445-0878

**From:** [Jeff Daniel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 1:10:40 PM

---

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,

-Jeff Daniel  
2586 Great Highway  
SF CA 94116  
District 4

**From:** [Elena Curnyn](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:00:41 PM

---

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,  
Elena Curnyn



**From:** [Edie Schaffer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:45:00 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I write to urge you to uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to urge you to reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

As one of many thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, roll, jog, bike, and enjoy the Pacific Ocean, the pilot program is critical 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. The pilot also allows City agencies to collect data and conduct community engagement to 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.

Frankly, I wish this area was permanently open to such access every day — not only on weekends and holidays. Having the ability to recreate in this much larger area has been especially impactful for me in this age of COVID, as I am immunocompromised and there are few safe areas to recreate in public without a mask.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Edith Schaffer

---

**Edie Schaffer, JD, CEM, CA-PEM**  
415-999-2011  
[edie.schaffer@gmail.com](mailto:edie.schaffer@gmail.com)

**From:** [Mark Luskus](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:26:20 PM

---

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.

Things like this make our city incredible. I go every single weekend and see hundreds if not thousands of people walking, biking, laughing, scooting, running, etc etc. What an incredible loss it would be if it just went back to cars.

If we want to be a transit first city then let's act like it.

**From:** [Laura Boss](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:50:04 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Laura Skelton](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:55:01 PM

---

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,

Laura Yakovenko

**From:** [Sean Murphy](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:37:12 AM

---

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,  
Sean Murphy

**From:** [Jeffbeck674@gmail.com](mailto:Jeffbeck674@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:48:23 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Noel McNabola](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:41:54 PM

---

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,

Noel McNabola  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jay Manzo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:11:43 PM

---

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,

Jay Manzo



**From:** [Julie Beck](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:26:01 PM

---

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,  
Julie Beck

**From:** [Justin Elliott](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:44:48 PM

---

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,

Justin Elliott  
(510) 552-6309

**From:** [Jenna McNulty](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:41:18 PM

---

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,

Jenna

**From:** [Kathryn MacDonald](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:59:09 PM

---

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,

Kathryn MacDonald

[macdonaldphoto.com](http://macdonaldphoto.com)

Please excuse my brevity. Sent from my iPhone.

Kathryn MacDonald

Please excuse my brevity. Sent from my iPhone.

**From:** [Doug Heymann](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:54:10 PM

---

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,

Doug Heymann

**From:** [Nazia Stevens](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:26:15 PM

---

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,  
Nazia Stevens

**From:** [Kristen Tate](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:00:34 PM

---

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,  
Kristen Tate

**From:** [Hazel O'Neil](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:32:01 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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, including smart planning for sea level rise, erosion, and decarbonization of our city's transportation emissions.

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.

A coastal park promenade increases coastal access for families, kids, and all San Franciscans, and allows San Francisco more flexibility to protect coastal habitats and adapt to climate change by removing car pollution from the coast. I urge you to uphold the spirit of the Coastal Act by rejecting the appeals, as voters did in 2022 when they rejected Prop I.

Thank you.

Hazel O'Neil  
[oneil.hazel@gmail.com](mailto:oneil.hazel@gmail.com)

SAN FRANCISCO, California 94116





**From:** [Alice Hsu](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:26:01 PM

---

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,

Thanks  
Alice

**From:** [Carlton Fleming](#)  
**To:** [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:09:02 PM

---

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,

Carlton Fleming  
Outer Sunset and Great Highway Resident

**From:** [AMELIA WALIANY](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:49:47 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [alec.hawley](mailto:alec.hawley)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:58:48 PM

---

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,

Alec Hawley  
(415)418-9073

**From:** [Riah Evin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:25:47 PM

---

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, 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,

Mariah Evin

**From:** [Devon Bella](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:22:57 PM

---

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,  
Devon Bella

**From:** [John R Manning](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:53:01 PM

---

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,

John Manning  
94121



**From:** [sara.ashley27@yahoo.com](mailto:sara.ashley27@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:44:37 PM

---

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,

Best,  
Sara Herold

**From:** [bodymindwork \(null\)](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:40:58 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jenny Chou](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:49:39 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Gerald](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:40:07 PM

---

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,

Gerald Kangelaris

**From:** [Kate Walsh](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:49:34 PM

---

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,

Kate Walsh

**From:** [Matt Hill](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:58:41 PM

---

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 often 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,  
Matt Hill  
D9 Resident  
Great Highway Park Lover

**From:** [Elaine Lee](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 6:39:27 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Elaine Lee  
[elainer337@yahoo.com](mailto:elainer337@yahoo.com)

San Francisco, California 94110





**From:** [Adam Hall](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:25:33 AM

---

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,

Adam Hall  
42nd Ave

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Brendan Pipkin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:30:15 PM

---

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,  
Brendan

**From:** [Amy Bradac](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:43:42 PM

---

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.

I live in the Sunset, and 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,

Amy Bradac

**From:** [RICHARD EHRLING](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 10:26:15 PM

---

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,

Rick Ehling

P.S. I honestly think the road, or at least the outer half, should be closed to cars all week. This beach and the dunes are a natural wonder. Reworking street traffic to unidirectional flow is under used in San Francisco, it needs to be done more.

**From:** [Kate Bueler](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:33:45 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:kate.bueler@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94121



**From:** [Amy de Boisblanc](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:49:34 PM

---

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,  
Amy

**From:** [Jessica Dunne](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:46:18 PM

---

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

I live on the Great Highway. I go to the beach several times a day. I would prefer to have no cars on the highway but I accept the compromise. Please honor it.

Thank you,

Jessica Dunne  
2506 Great Highway  
San Francisco, CA 94126

Jessica  
[www.jessicadunne.com](http://www.jessicadunne.com)  
2506 Great Highway  
San Francisco, California 94116  
415 902-4619

Sent from an Apple gadget that fancies itself an author and creates humiliating typos.



**From:** [Mitzi Chavez](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:25:23 PM

---

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,

Mitzi C  
Resident on Great Highway

**From:** [Katrina](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:58:37 PM

---

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,  
Katrina

**From:** [Samantha Grillo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:07:52 PM

---

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,

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Charles Ma](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:52:37 PM

---

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,

Sent from Gmail Mobile

**From:** [Peter Belden](#)  
**To:** [Stokle, Brian \(REC\)](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardistaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardistaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 12:52:50 PM

---

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,  
Peter Belden  
Potrero Hill

**From:** [Stephen Canham](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:31:58 AM

---

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. My son and his family now live in the home I owned in the Sunset District and although I no longer reside in San Francisco, I and I am quite familiar with the pilot project and support it enthusiastically.

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,

Stephen Canham

**From:** [Kendall Silva](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 4:40:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Florinda Battad](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:00:04 PM

---

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



**From:** [Cole Blaney](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:09:07 PM

---

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,

**From:** [jon.winston](mailto:jon.winston@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 7:47:03 AM

---

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,  
Jon Winston

**From:** [Emma Shlaes](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:42:23 AM

---

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](mailto:emmashlaes@gmail.com)

**From:** [Lily Foucault](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:57:32 PM

---

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. My boyfriend was hit by a car riding on a raised bike lane on Masonic after they took a right into the lane without any awareness of his presence. He broke his wrist. He could've been seriously injured as he flipped over the car and thankfully only landed on his wrist. There are very few genuinely safe places to ride your bike in this city. We need to keep this as one of them.

Thank you,  
Lily Foucault

**From:** [Elias Zamaria](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 5:21:47 PM

---

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.

**From:** [James Wiater](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:23:43 AM

---

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,

**From:** [Ann Hess](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 8:22:44 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Emily Herman](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:00:47 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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





**From:** [Gea Gurun](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:17:18 AM

---

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

**From:** [Barbara Butler](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:14:07 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

My family and I use the Great Highway Park every weekend. It's a local treasure to have such access to the Ocean - please do not return it to the cars. I drive and I'm happy to drive in other roads. This is a treasure to be preserved!

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.

Barbara Butler  
[barbara@barbarabutler.com](mailto:barbara@barbarabutler.com)  
2051 45th Ave  
San Francisco, California 94116



**From:** [Michael Woods](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 12:44:08 PM

---

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,  
Michael Woods  
Downey St, San Francisco, CA

**From:** [Katie Herman](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:01:22 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:katieherman25@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94121



**From:** [Alex Avery](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:37:24 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:alex.flinn.avery@gmail.com)  
1825, 44th Ave.  
San Francisco, California 94122





**From:** [Nicole Van Abel](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:38:28 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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](mailto:nicolevanabel@yahoo.com)

San Francisco, 94131



**From:** [David Bauer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:59:35 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Timothy Randol](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 10:41:32 PM

---

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 a 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,

Tim Randol

**From:** [Cole Rose](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 4:38:24 PM

---

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.

Personally, I've visited the beach and the local businesses in the Outer Sunset so much more often these last four years now that I can safely bike with my children to our beautiful shoreline. We often make a low-cost, low-carbon day trip out of biking from our neighborhood to the beach. The Upper Great Highway project has opened up a whole side of San Francisco to me and my family by creating a safe and lively open space at the beach.

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,

Cole Rose

**From:** [Matt Wright](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 8:45:38 PM

---

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 a neighbor living blocks from the park and 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,  
Matt Wright

**From:** [David Young](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:01:21 PM

---

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



**From:** [Emily Havens](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park!!  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:21:28 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am a resident of the outer sunset and a mother of two young kids who absolutely LOVE the great highway park, and use it every week.

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,

Emily

**From:** [John Barkis](#)  
**To:** [ChanStaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](#)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 8:12:37 AM

---

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.

I live a few blocks from the Great Highway and visit the Great Highway Park every weekend to walk, run, and bike along 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 my neighborhood and is vital to the safety of me and my family when we walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,  
John

**From:** [Justin Hubbard](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MeigarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MeigarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep The Great Highway useful for people without cars!!!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20:46 PM

---

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

**From:** [jill.ellefsen](mailto:jill.ellefsen)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep UGH Closed!!  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:21:21 AM

---

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

**From:** [jill.ellefsen](mailto:jill.ellefsen)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep UGH closed!  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:21:59 AM

---

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

**From:** [ANDREW LEWIS](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Let's make San Francisco an example to the world.  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:20:12 AM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

Let's make San Francisco an example to the world, not only by making the entire coastline beautiful walkable car-free disabled-friendly parks, but also, with intelligent planning, provide the energy needs for our community, through solar, wind, and tidal resources along our car-free west coast.

ANDREW LEWIS  
drclock@gmail.com

San Francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Chris Brophy](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** letter in support of Upper Great Highway Pilot Project  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:45:47 PM  
**Attachments:** [Save the GHWY Park - C Brophy comment 2-6-2024.pdf](#)

---

Dear Commissioners,  
Please see attached letter in connection with the 2/7/2024 Board of Appeals meeting.  
thanks,  
Chris Brophy



**From:** [Scott Rittman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MeigarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MeigarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:12:42 PM

---

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

**From:** [Jason Gonzales](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:40:32 AM

---

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

**From:** [Samarth Vasisht](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org);  
[MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:53:54 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Samarth Vasisht and I am a resident who lives in the 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.

The great highway is an absolute gem of a walking zone to have on weekends and opens up an otherwise crowded and fast-moving traffic zone into a pedestrian and bike friendly environment that helps everyone enjoy the beauty of SF's western coast without concern of getting hit by a car.

If you've ever had the pleasure of being out there on the weekends you could see how many people are out there enjoying the space it provides. Please let me know if there's anything I can do to help push this through (and if not - I would love to know why you think that the road should be re-opened and the feedback that led you to that decision).

Thank you,  
Samarth

**From:** [Sarah Buecher](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20:43 PM

---

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

**From:** [Evan Minamoto](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Maintain the Coastal Zone Permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:24:04 PM

---

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

**From:** [Nan Zerner](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** OPEN THE GREAT HIGHWAY to CARS again --especially ON FRIDAYS!!!!!!  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:35:04 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you absolutely reconsider OPENING THE GREAT HIGHWAY on Fridays and Saturdays if not 24/7.

As one of the 20,000 plus residents of the Sunset and Richmond who rely on that part of the city to commute to work, see family and travel North and South daily. We are forced DRIVE and the Great HIGHWAY is a respite Monday- Thursday for the incredibly frustrating time I spend trying to get home from work on Friday afternoons from my teaching job in Daly City. When I do want to walk, ride a bike or enjoy time with friends and family I use the many beautiful parks and beach front. We would never want to sit on a cement highway when so many beautiful parks are within walking distance of the Sunset and Richmond districts. Reopening the road again to cars is crucial for our access to and from work, getting to family quickly and avoiding the horrible back up of traffic on 19th ave and Sunset which ends at Lincoln Ave forcing all cars onto Lincoln and then on a long line of traffic to get across the park.

Thank you,  
Nancy Zerner

Fernando Rivera Librarian and 32 year resident of the Westside of SF.

**From:** [Asumu Takikawa](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please \*reject\* the appeal of the Great Highway Park permit (Appeal No. 23-062/64/65, Feb 7)  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 11:46:20 AM

---

Dear SF Board of Appeals,

I'm writing to you as an SF resident to strongly urge you to \*reject\* the appeal of the coastal zone permit for the Great Highway pilot project (and therefore uphold the pilot project's permit).

As the SF planning memo (No. 21437) outlines, the pilot project is consistent with the city's planning. In addition, it's consistent with the city's goals such as the transit-first policy and also its environmental commitments. On a personal level, I've greatly enjoyed the increased bicycle/walking access to the coast and it's also helped provide a safer bike route for me to visit family members.

With regards to the appeal itself, the appellants' arguments are quite specious. For example, on the topic of public access to the coast the argument is made that access to the coast is only possible for certain populations by \*driving along (not even stopping to park at) the Great Highway\*. Even if this were true, the northern half of the road remains open to vehicular traffic and a leisurely drive for "breathing in fresh air" is quite possible there.

The appellants frame their argument in this narrow way because it would be ridiculous to claim that the project truly restricts automobile access to the coast. The vast majority of the beach parking is in the unrestricted north part of the Great Highway, for example. There also remains huge amounts of automobile parking along the lower Great Highway (compare this with the amount of bicycle parking).

Another example is the appellants claim that neighborhood commercial areas will be harder to reach with the pilot. Again, this is quite a strange claim as the vast majority of neighborhood streets do not directly connect to the Upper Great Highway. Traveling along the Sunset's street grid would be a far more direct trip for most.

Overall, these arguments are a stretch and you would have to ignore the huge benefits to the city's other goals (lowering carbon emissions, increasing non-automobile trips, etc.) to accept this appeal. So again, please \*reject\* the appeal and uphold the permit.

Thank you,  
Asumu Takikawa  
Richmond district resident

**From:** [shellyhorton@yahoo.com](mailto:shellyhorton@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please end the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Approve appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:21:43 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you approve approve appeals 23-602, 23-064 and 23-065

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who use Great Highway for its intended purpose ... driving quickly and safely along the west side of San Francisco.

The ongoing closure of this vital roadway has pushed heavy weekend traffic into our neighborhoods increasing pollution, noise and danger to pedestrians. Please open the highway for its intended use.

Beach users already have a walkway that parallels the highway at all times and of course easy access to the beach it's self for all recreational activities.

Thank you,

Shelly Horton

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [Christopher guichet](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please Keep and Expand Great Highway Park  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:34:32 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Chris Guichet here, I live in Nopa and bike to Great Highway Park on the weekends.

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.

The levels of joy on this park on a sunny day are off the charts. The shoreline of our city is one of our most valuable resources. We should make it a place that people can enjoy, not a car sewer. It also makes the beach more accessible for people too young, old, or disabled to drive.

We learned that tearing down the Embarcadero freeway was the right move, the same is true for the great highway park.

Thank you for your time,  
Chris

**From:** [candice.lin](mailto:candice.lin)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please Keep the Great Highway Open for Walking and Biking!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:18:20 PM

---

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

**From:** [Whitney Taylor](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:15:02 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I moved to the Outer Sunset in 2017 to take advantage of the ocean access and greenspace present in our district. Since the pandemic hit in 2020 and the Great Highway was opened to pedestrians, I have spent hundreds of hours walking, running, and generally enjoying the Great Highway Park. My husband and I believe that this is a world class space that should remain open not simply for us, but for people outside of our District who are looking for valuable greenspace and nature to explore within the confines of San Francisco's city limits. There is no other park quite like the Great Highway and I believe it is incredibly shortsighted to give vehicles priority for a short stretch of highway that is not a main artery for a majority of Bay Area residents from a commuting stand point.

Therefore, 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 our 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. I live on 45th Avenue and consistently witness speeding cars that make crossing intersections increasingly dangerous -- the Great Highway Park is one respite to increasing traffic, reckless driving, and unpredictable drivers. Limiting the park's availability to pedestrians as a car-free zone on weekends limits more than our right to access to healthy living and greenspace -- it puts us in greater danger when forced to take our walks on busy, overused neighborhood streets. The Great Highway is not going to solve traffic issues for the whole of San Francisco. As a park, it does not negatively impact the neighborhood, but does the opposite -- it brings people together to enjoy their shared community.

Thank you,  
Whitney Taylor

**From:** [chrisrfetz@gmail.com](mailto:chrisrfetz@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 1:59:42 PM

---

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 Bay Area residents 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 to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,  
Chris

**From:** [Andy Collier](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); Info: [Supervisor Myrna Melgar](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise & reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:09:12 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing to urge you to uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and further request that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, and 23-065.

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park on weekends for recreation and to visit nearby small businesses, 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 in the vicinity of Ocean Beach and nearby businesses. Please do not capitulate to a vocal minority who will never be satisfied with any change from the historical status quo. That is not the way forward for society.

Thank you,

Andy Collier  
San Francisco District 7 resident (Golden Gate Heights)

**From:** [Jo N](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** PLEASE Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 9:09:29 PM

---

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,  
Joseph Ng  
Sunset resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Rohit Sarathy](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise and reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:16:21 PM

---

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. It also furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline and by providing a safe space for children, 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 measures in the Outer Sunset. This has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and is vital to my personal safety when I walk and bicycle to Ocean Beach and to patronize nearby businesses in the vicinity.

Thank you,

Rohit Sarathy  
District 8

**From:** [Tracey Harding](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [EngardioStaff \(BOS\)](#); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** PLEASE Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise -- it's made my neighbor amazing! Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 2:49:05 PM

---

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,

Tracey Harding  
Outer Sunset Resident



**From:** [Andrea Romano](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** PLEASE keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:36:26 PM

---

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.

And I hope that you consider making it a permanent 24/7 park once the pilot is complete!

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,

Andrea Romano  
Outer Parkside Homeowner  
[andrearoseromano@gmail.com](mailto:andrearoseromano@gmail.com)

**From:** [Jason](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Please Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:44:42 AM

---

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

**From:** [Paula Katz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:28:55 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I love walking on the Upper Great Highway on weekends when it is closed to cars, as do thousands upon thousands of other SF residents and visitors. I want the weekend closure to cars to continue. So 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 to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Paula Katz  
District 4 resident who lives 4 blocks from the Great Highway Park

**From:** [Teresa Hammerl](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 3:17:27 PM

---

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.

I recently walked there with my mom who came to visit from Europe and both of my kids enjoy spending time on the Great Highway.



Thank you,  
Teresa and family

**From:** [Sarah B](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MeigarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MeigarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise! Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:29:07 PM

---

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.

The space is so incredibly magical when used on foot or by bike. Please help keep it that way!

Thank you,  
Sarah

**From:** [Mark Aaker](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway Park.  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 7:01:04 PM

---

Dear Coastal Commissioners,

Please continue the Great Highway Park in San Francisco. I live two blocks from the Great Highway, and use the closed roadway on weekends for walking. I am impressed with the number of people who use the closed roadway to walk, jog, bike, stroll, and otherwise enjoy the car-free coastal access. When car-free, the Highway is much safer, and free of the car exhaust and noise.

Thank you,

Mark Aaker  
3535 Wawona St Unit 417  
San Francisco, CA 94116  
[markaaker@yahoo.com](mailto:markaaker@yahoo.com)  
(408)857-4329

**From:** [Rachel Hall](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep the Great Highway pedestrian-only on weekends  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:29:33 PM

---

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



**From:** [Thomas Christianson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please keep weekends at the Great Highway Park & reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:20:04 AM

---

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 regularly 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. It is in fact, the terminus of the only safe pedestrian route that goes through GGP - connecting to Page Street, the wiggle and my home. Please protect it.

Thank you,  
Thomas Lorne Christianson

**From:** [Dlo Nanni](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please open the highway  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 11:59:34 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Please open the highway, it's effecting first responders, traffic is terrible and the traffic calming on other streets is making people drive so erratic!!!

**From:** [Katie Duerr](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Please preserve the Great Highway compromise by rejecting appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 4:31:27 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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 a resident of Russian Hill in District 3 - but I find myself walking or riding on the Great Highway Park almost every weekend, along with thousands of my neighbors and visitors to the city. This program is crucial for the city's access to and enjoyment of the shoreline and one of the few truly safe places in San Francisco to walk, roll, and ride for people of all ages and abilities.

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 Duerr  
[duerr.katie@gmail.com](mailto:duerr.katie@gmail.com)  
1175 CHESTNUT ST, APT 301  
SAN FRANCISCO, California 94109



**From:** [Krish Sigler](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** PLEASE protect the Great Highway Park  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 11:18:15 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Krish Sigler and I am a 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.

Throughout the past several years, biking has been incredibly important to my health -- both physically and mentally. Having a safe space to bike, without having to deal with the stress and danger of cars, is a crucial component of building a city that prioritizes the health of its citizens. And I personally would be far worse off if the Great Highway is taken away from us and given back to the 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.

**From:** [Jeffrey Trull](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please reject appeal of Coastal Zone permit for weekend Great Highway project  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:31:36 PM

---

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)

**From:** [nathansibon@gmail.com](mailto:nathansibon@gmail.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065 and keep the sunset safe  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 6:44:45 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project by rejecting appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This appeal is a distraction and a waste of city resources to continually entertain the tiny minority of the city that is opposed to this great asset.

I use the weekend park regularly and the conversion to a pedestrian only experience has greatly enhanced the ocean beach area. I love bringing out of town visitors, who are always amazed and can't believe this beautiful park was once wasted as an arterial road. This park has also helped nearby local businesses. I visit the outer Taraval/noriega area far more often now because of the park, and so do many residents that travel from outside the sunset to enjoy the park.

The appeals claim of "environmentalism" is absurd. Reducing combustion and tire/break emissions near important native habitat is a positive change that should be upheld.

On the topic of traffic calming in the Outer Sunset, one has to only look at the failure of vision zero to know we need to take all the steps possible now to reduce pedestrian death and injury. I visit the weekend park and do all of my travel in the sunset by walking biking and transit. I have had enough close calls with drivers to know the traffic calming provided by this permit is essential to the neighborhoods health.

Thank you,

-Nathan Sibon

**From:** [Luke Swartz](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please reject the appeal of the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:44:49 PM

---

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



**From:** [Selin Jessa](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:04:17 PM

---

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

**From:** [ThinkKEVIN](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold Coastal Zone Permit Great Highway  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:37:37 AM

---

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

**From:** [Brad Jacobson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold Great Walkway permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:11:59 PM

---

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](tel:+14152147276)



**From:** [Laurie Rittman](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for Great Highway / Board of Appeals  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 5:35:29 PM

---

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 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94116  
[laurie@taylorlombardo.com](mailto:laurie@taylorlombardo.com)

--

Laurie Rittman, Office Manager  
**Taylor Lombardo Architects**  
40 Hotaling Place  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
tel. (415) 433-7777 x 22  
fax (415) 433-7717  
[laurie@taylorlombardo.com](mailto:laurie@taylorlombardo.com)



**From:** [Elizabeth Young](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:32:49 PM

---

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

**From:** [Kevin Barnard](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:34:25 PM

---

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](mailto:kevin@barnardgraphics.com)  
415-672-8137

**From:** [Susan Green](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 2:41:00 PM

---

Dear Commissioner,

I'm a resident of Noe Valley. I typically walk or ride my bike to get around San Francisco and I frequently bicycle and walk along the Great Highway on weekends. Having recently been hit by a car on San Francisco streets while riding my bike, I especially value San Francisco's designated slow streets and streets that are closed to car traffic.

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.

Susan Green



**From:** [Mike Lee](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Rachel Clyde, SF Bicycle Coalition](#); [Supervisor Myrna Melgar](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:52:32 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Michael Lee and I am a resident of Midtown Terrace 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 pilot has been great for me and my family along with the diverse groups of people I see using it. The city and its leaders should support this further by encouraging businesses to setup shop close by to further enhance the experience when users are down there. A good model to follow might be what Joel Engardio implemented with the night market in the Sunset.

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.

Michael Lee  
32 Farview Ct.  
San Francisco, CA 94131  
415-430-7676

**From:** [Zack Subin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org)  
**Subject:** Please uphold the permit for the Great Highway Park  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 2:22:14 PM

---

I'm writing as a resident of Ocean View that regularly bikes on the Great Highway when it is open on Friday afternoons and weekends. This park helps me form a low stress, safe biking loop along with JFK Promenade and the bikeway in the western half of Golden Gate Park.

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.

--Zack

---

Zack Subin  
San Francisco, CA 94112  
He / him

[https://sfba.social/@zack\\_subin](https://sfba.social/@zack_subin)  
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/zack-subin-9b6435bb/>

**From:** [Zan Armstrong](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** please uphold the Planning Commissions' coastal zone permit  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:22:37 AM

---

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

**From:** [gary.gregerson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](#); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [rclyde@sfbike.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#)  
**Subject:** Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal zone Permit for Upper Great Highway pilot  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:28:23 PM

---

My name is Gary Gregerson and I am a resident of the Tenderloin.

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.

Sincerely,  
Gary Gregerson

**From:** [Ellen Koivisto & Gene Thompson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [Joel Engardio](#); [Rachel Clyde](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Connie Chan](#)  
**Subject:** 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.  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 10:10:14 PM

---

My name is Ellen Koivisto and I live on the Great Hwy (between K and L), and have lived here for 36 years.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's unanimous determination to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and please, please, please reject the appeals against it.

The Great Highway is a fantastic park, and a great resource for people from all over the bay area. It is also an area we will be losing to the ocean, an area that suffers greatly from pollution from automotive traffic, a very dangerous straightway (originally a racetrack) that allows cars to try to double or triple the posted speed limit, and as a road for cars it is a silly waste of money and resources requiring SF to literally sweep sand off the beach, a la The Walrus and The Carpenter.

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  
the outer, outer Sunset, SF

**From:** [Nick Lanham](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** PLEASE: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 5:32:16 PM

---

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.

I live close to Great Highway Park, and use it every weekend, along with the thousands of others who 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 (although there's a long way to go) and is vital to my safety when I walk and bike to Ocean Beach and nearby businesses.

Thank you,

Nick Lanham

**From:** [Jennifer Patricia Jordan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Pls save the great highway weekend closures for bikers, runners, and families  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:53:16 PM

---

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.

**From:** [Erik Pawassar](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Preserve car-free weekends on the Great Highway PLEASE!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:20:58 PM

---

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



**From:** [theazajac](mailto:theazajac)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Protect Our Park. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:10:57 PM

---

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,

Thea Zajac  
3515 Judah St  
408-605-6044

**From:** [Annette Bistrup](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org)  
**Subject:** Public Comment - Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit: Board of Appeals Meeting Wednesday, February 7, 2024  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:05:01 PM

---

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

**From:** [Craig Persiko](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Rachel Clyde, SF Bicycle Coalition](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Public comment on Coastal Zone Permit for Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:19:04 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Craig Persiko and I am a resident of the Castro district of San Francisco. I've lived here for over 20 years, and I bicycle for my primary transportation.

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 husband and I bike along the Great Highway almost every weekend. It is our favorite bike ride in the city on weekends when it is car-free, full of people enjoying the beautiful coast, while exercising safely! There are far more people using the Great Highway on these car-free weekends than I have ever seen there in cars. It's a great use of the coastline.

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.

Craig Persiko  
621 Castro St.  
San Francisco, CA 94114

**From:** [daryl.rogers](mailto:daryl.rogers)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org)  
**Subject:** Public comment: Please continue and expand the Great Hwy pilot program  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 7:51:32 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Daryl Rogers and I am a resident of the Lower Haight 94117.

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 is a valued space that my family (partner, daughter, and dog) visit multiple times a week. Usually Friday evenings and Saturday or Sunday mornings. We walk, run, ride bikes, on the closed hwy. It is truly a unique space and would be a huge addition to San Francisco public spaces if it were to become permanent. Because of this space we travel from our neighborhood to spend money in outer sunset businesses for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. We also do our grocery shopping in the area on our way back from the great highway.

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, Daryl Rogers 94117

**From:** [Jim Steichen](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [MandelmanStaff](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Great Highway Park - Please Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 31, 2024 6:53:24 PM

---

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,

Jim Steichen

**From:** [Alex Avery](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Re: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 10:54:42 AM

---

Just following up as this is very important to me, my family, and my neighborhood.

Please reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

I cannot imagine what special interests or out-of-towners support converting some of SF's limited outdoor space back into a permanent roadway, but I hope it doesn't sway your gut feeling that we crave more spaces in SF to walk side-by-side with one another.

> On Jan 31, 2024, at 3:02 PM, Alex Avery <alavery2@icloud.com> wrote:

>

> Dear Commissioners,

>

> PLEASE DO NOT CLOSE THE GREAT WALKWAY! Every friend I bring to it, whether from SF or elsewhere, is in awe of this hidden gem. Closing it would go against the values I understand SF to stand for: forward-thinking, environmentally conscious, people-first.

>

> 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,

>

**From:** [MALINDA WALKER](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [Info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:Info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Re: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 9:53:00 PM

---

> On Jan 31, 2024, at 3:36 PM, MALINDA WALKER <malindawal@aol.com> wrote:

>

> 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,

>

**From:** [Rexing, Stephanie@Coastal](mailto:Rexing.Stephanie@Coastal)  
**To:** [ExecutiveStaff@Coastal](mailto:ExecutiveStaff@Coastal); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Matella, Mary@Coastal](mailto:Matella.Mary@Coastal)  
**Subject:** RE: Public Comment: Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:30:20 AM

---

Anything re: this Wildfire Project out of Tomales Bay State Park needs to go to Mary Matella.

---

Stephanie R. Rexing

---

**From:** ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 2, 2024 10:29 AM  
**To:** NorthCentralCoast@Coastal <NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Rexing, Stephanie@Coastal <Stephanie.Rexing@coastal.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment: Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan

---

**From:** Abby <[abbywords@gmail.com](mailto:abbywords@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 29, 2024 4:53 PM  
**To:** ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <[ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Public Comment: Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Abby** <[abbywords@gmail.com](mailto:abbywords@gmail.com)>  
Date: Mon, Jan 29, 2024 at 4:13 PM  
Subject: Public Comment: Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan  
To: Hardcastle, Bree@Parks <[Bree.Hardcastle@parks.ca.gov](mailto:Bree.Hardcastle@parks.ca.gov)>, Shafer, Cyndy@Parks <[Cyndy.Shafer@parks.ca.gov](mailto:Cyndy.Shafer@parks.ca.gov)>  
Cc: <[Effie.Turnbull-Sanders@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Effie.Turnbull-Sanders@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[dayna.bochco@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:dayna.bochco@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Caryl.Hart@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Caryl.Hart@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Susan.Lowenberg@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Susan.Lowenberg@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Ann.Notthoff@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Ann.Notthoff@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Linda.Escalante@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Linda.Escalante@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[mike.wilson@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:mike.wilson@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Katie.Rice@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Katie.Rice@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Paloma.Aguirre@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Paloma.Aguirre@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Meagan.Harmon@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Meagan.Harmon@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Roberto.Uranga@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Roberto.Uranga@coastal.ca.gov)>, <[Justin.Cummings@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Justin.Cummings@coastal.ca.gov)>, René Voss <[renepvoss@gmail.com](mailto:renepvoss@gmail.com)>, Chad Hanson <[cthanson1@gmail.com](mailto:cthanson1@gmail.com)>, Jinesse Reynolds <[jrey94925@gmail.com](mailto:jrey94925@gmail.com)>

Hi Bree,

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to comment on the Tomales Bay State Park Forest Health and Wildfire Resilience Plan.

We all have a vested interest in getting things right when it comes to protecting this beautiful,



magical, spectacular place!

Chainsaws, chippers and pesticides are no way to go.

I trust you're receiving lots of public feedback on this important issue.

Thanks for all you do,

Abby Cunningham

**From:** [SMC\\_SupMueller](#)  
**To:** [Ken](#); [Lisa Sulzinger](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [Gina Quiney](#); [Michael O'Neill](#); [Callagy, Mike@San Mateo County](#); [Policicchio, Melba@Coastal](#); [Luo, Yunsheng@DOT](#)  
**Cc:** [mccgreggd@gmail.com](#); [midcoast.claire@gmail.com](#); [midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastside - Permit Application 2-24-0002  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:54:06 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Outlook-2iffw1py.png](#)

---

Thank you!

**Gina Quiney** (she/her/ella)  
Chief of Staff  
Board of Supervisors - District 3  
[gquiney@smcgov.org](mailto:gquiney@smcgov.org)



---

**From:** Ken <ken@blueskydesignsinc.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 3, 2024 1:29 AM  
**To:** Lisa Sulzinger <lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org>; [NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov) <[NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov)>; [SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](mailto:SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org) <[SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](mailto:SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org)>; Gina Quiney <[gquiney@smcgov.org](mailto:gquiney@smcgov.org)>; Michael O'Neill <[MJOneill@smcgov.org](mailto:MJOneill@smcgov.org)>; Michael Callagy <[MCallagy@smcgov.org](mailto:MCallagy@smcgov.org)>; Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov <[Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov)>; Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov <[Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** [mccgreggd@gmail.com](mailto:mccgreggd@gmail.com) <[mccgreggd@gmail.com](mailto:mccgreggd@gmail.com)>; [midcoast.claire@gmail.com](mailto:midcoast.claire@gmail.com) <[midcoast.claire@gmail.com](mailto:midcoast.claire@gmail.com)>; [midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com](mailto:midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com) <[midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com](mailto:midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastside - Permit Application 2-24-0002

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

---

Great  
Thanks

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Lisa Sulzinger <lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 2, 2024 4:54:49 PM  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov) <[NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov)>; [SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](mailto:SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org) <[SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](mailto:SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org)>; [gquiney@smcgov.org](mailto:gquiney@smcgov.org)

<gquiney@smcgov.org>; MJOneill@smcgov.org <MJOneill@smcgov.org>; mcallagy@smcgov.org  
<mcallagy@smcgov.org>; Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov <Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov>;  
Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov <Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov>

**Cc:** mccgreggd@gmail.com <mccgreggd@gmail.com>; midcoast.claire@gmail.com  
<midcoast.claire@gmail.com>; midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com  
<midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastside - Permit Application 2-24-0002

Hello,

The attached letter is being sent on behalf of Chris Mickelsen President, Board of Directors Coastside County Water District in Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastside – Permit Application 2-24-0002.

Thanks and regards,

Lisa Sulzinger

Administrative Analyst

Coastside County Water District

650-726-4405

[lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org](mailto:lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org)



**From:** [Ken](#)  
**To:** [Lisa Sulzinger](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](#); [gguiney@smcgov.org](#); [MJOneill@smcgov.org](#); [Callagy, Mike@San Mateo County](#); [Policicchio, Melba@Coastal](#); [Luo, Yunsheng@DOT](#)  
**Cc:** [mccgreggd@gmail.com](#); [midcoast.claire@gmail.com](#); [midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastside - Permit Application 2-24-0002  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 5:29:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Great  
Thanks

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Lisa Sulzinger <[lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org](mailto:lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 2, 2024 4:54:49 PM  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov) <[NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov)>; [SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](mailto:SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org) <[SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](mailto:SMC_SupMueller@smcgov.org)>; [gguiney@smcgov.org](mailto:gguiney@smcgov.org) <[gguiney@smcgov.org](mailto:gguiney@smcgov.org)>; [MJOneill@smcgov.org](mailto:MJOneill@smcgov.org) <[MJOneill@smcgov.org](mailto:MJOneill@smcgov.org)>; [mcallagy@smcgov.org](mailto:mcallagy@smcgov.org) <[mcallagy@smcgov.org](mailto:mcallagy@smcgov.org)>; [Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov) <[Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Melba.Policicchio@coastal.ca.gov)>; [Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov) <[Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Yunsheng.Luo@dot.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** [mccgreggd@gmail.com](mailto:mccgreggd@gmail.com) <[mccgreggd@gmail.com](mailto:mccgreggd@gmail.com)>; [midcoast.claire@gmail.com](mailto:midcoast.claire@gmail.com) <[midcoast.claire@gmail.com](mailto:midcoast.claire@gmail.com)>; [midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com](mailto:midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com) <[midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com](mailto:midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastside - Permit Application 2-24-0002

Hello,

The attached letter is being sent on behalf of Chris Mickelsen President, Board of Directors Coastside County Water District in Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastside – Permit Application 2-24-0002.

Thanks and regards,  
Lisa Sulzinger  
Administrative Analyst  
Coastside County Water District  
650-726-4405  
[lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org](mailto:lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org)



**From:** [Calum You](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Reject appeals against Upper Great Highway pilot  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:42:50 PM

---

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

**From:** [AJ Cho](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Reject the City of Pacifica's Coastal Armoring Program  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 11:14:30 PM

---

Dear California Coastal Commission Chair Donne Brownse,

I am writing to express my opposition to the City of Pacifica's Land Use Plan update, particularly its proposed coastal hazard policies. The City should pursue coastal planning solutions that address the long-term impacts of sea level rise in a manner protective of public resources - our beaches, bluffs and waves. More effective alternatives consistent with California Coastal Commission recommendations and the Coastal Act include strategic relocation, consideration of living shoreline options and avoidance of hard armoring. Proactive planning is essential for avoiding costly disasters such as the condemned blufftop apartment building on Esplanade Ave due to storm damage and bluff erosion.

As a local beachgoer, I support long-term solutions that benefit my right to beach access, protect coastal resources and habitats and preserve the coast from rising seas as required within the California Coastal Act. The City's plan will erode our beaches over time and make access impossible. The City's plan could be devastating for popular surf and recreational beaches such as Linda Mar, Rockaway and Sharp Park Beach. By failing to consider alternatives, it also dooms the beaches fronting Beach Boulevard, Esplanade and Palmetto to permanently drown as seas rise.

One third of the City's six miles of coast are already armored. More coastal armoring will fundamentally alter our remaining waves and beaches by exacerbating beach erosion and eventually drowning our beaches and waves.

Please reject the City's plan and approve the entirety of Coastal Commission staff's suggested modifications to protect our public resources and preserve our precious coast.

Sincerely,  
AJ Cho  
[amenoartemis@gmail.com](mailto:amenoartemis@gmail.com)

United States

**From:** [Victoria Norman](#)  
**To:** [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Save GHW  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:25:33 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Victoria Norman and I am a resident of the 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.

The Great Highway has been such a critical space for safe walks on weekends and bike rides, healthy habits I developed during the pandemic. I recently became an American citizen (earlier this year actually) because I *feel* Californian and San Franciscan, because I am proud of living in this amazing city that is NOT car centric, that HAS spaces for people - pedestrians and cyclists alike. Ensuring the Great Highway stay open to humans rather than cars is something I feel very strongly about, as a new voting member of our society.

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 Norman

**From:** [Joe Bryan](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save Great Highway for people, not cars  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:55:21 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Joe Bryan and I am a 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.

I use the Great Highway for running, and biking every weekend! The wide road makes for safe running with friends and family. We've developed healthy habits and community through access to this space. We meet up with friends from across town here to run, jump in the ocean if we're brave, and then go get breakfast and coffee in the neighborhood nearby.

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.

Joe Bryan



**From:** [Pete Mulvihill](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save Great Highway pilot!  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:33:36 AM

---

## 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 Pete Mulvihill and I am a resident of the Outer Sunset and a Legacy Business owner with locations in the inner Richmond, inner Sunset, and Fillmore.

**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 walk or run on the Great Highway most weekends, gather with friends at the end of Noriega to watch sunsets, and appreciate the safety it provides for my kids when they 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.

--

Pete Mulvihill, co-owner  
(he/him)

**Green Apple Books**

506 Clement San Francisco, CA 94118

(415) 387-2272 (then press zero and ask for me)

**& Green Apple Books on the Park**  
1231 9th Avenue, SF, CA 94122

**& Browser Books**  
2195 Fillmore Street, SF, CA 94115

[our website](#), [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [Instagram](#), [LinkedIn](#)

**From:** [Lauren Galanes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save Great Highway!!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 6:29:56 PM

---

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

**From:** [Erin Coull](#)  
**Subject:** Save the GHWY Park !!!  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:34:54 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Erin Coull and I am a resident of the Mission District. I ride my bike with my family from our home in the Mission all the way out to the Great Highway a couple times a month specifically because it is car free (we never went there before). Now it's become one of our favorite in-city destinations and ways to enjoy riding a bike safely to and through our city.

I 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.

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.

Concerned and long time citizen of San Francisco,  
Erin Coull (& Family)

**From:** [Cathy Sun](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the GHWY Park  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:37:26 AM

---

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.

**From:** [Amela Alijagic](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org)  
**Subject:** Save the GHWY Park  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 9:53:59 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Amela Alijagic 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 great highway is a safe place for sustainable modes of transportation, and a place where i can take my young child to run, bike, play safely when we 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.

**From:** [Peter Fenczik](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [membership@sfbike.org](mailto:membership@sfbike.org); [Kristina Isberg](#)  
**Subject:** Save the GHWY Park  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:16:08 PM

---

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

**From:** [owace SF](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the GHWY Park  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:16:20 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

I am a resident of Corona Heights along with my wife and 8 year old son.

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 closure of the roadway has allowed our family to spend countless hours, walking and watching our son learn how to bike and become comfortable being amongst several people.

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.

Syed Owais Ahmad



**From:** [Brooke Kuhn](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the Great Highway for pedestrians and cyclists  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:21:14 PM

---

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

**From:** [Ivonne Molina](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the Great Highway Park!!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:31:23 PM

---

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

**From:** [Evan Owski](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the Great Highway Pilot Project!  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 3:06:44 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Evan Owski 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 often take trips out to the Ocean Beach and the Great Highway with my wife and my friends. When I've been to the Great Highway when it's been car free, the difference is marked. I see more families, more children, and quite possibly more dogs in the area than when it's a busy thoroughfare for vehicles. It's a night and day difference, just as Car Free JFK has been. Let's keep investing in car free spaces in 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.

Sincerely,  
Evan Owski

**From:** [Christopher Dawe](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the Great Highway Pilot Project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:06:10 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Christopher Dawe and I am a resident of Miraloma.

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 really enjoys the connectivity The Great Highway provides when it is car free to travel by foot and bicycle up and down the coast.

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.

Christopher Dawe  
99 Agua Way  
SF, CA 94127

415-517-7905  
[dawecj@gmail.com](mailto:dawecj@gmail.com)

**From:** [Ellen Koivisto & Gene Thompson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [Joel Engardio](#); [Rachel Clyde](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Connie Chan](#)  
**Subject:** Save the Great Parkway!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 11:27:06 PM

---

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

**From:** [Cassius](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the Great Walkway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:30:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [Brian Reyes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [Charles Whitfield](#)  
**Subject:** Sierra Club: Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:21:54 AM  
**Attachments:** [final Sierra Club GHP Letter 03182023 .pdf](#)

---

Dear Commissioners,

On behalf of its over 6,000 members, on March 18, 2023, Sierra Club San Francisco Group sent a letter to the Mayor, BOS, SFMTA, Rec and Park, and Planning Commission in support of a 24/7 Great Highway Park (see attached letter). We strongly urge you to continue that drive to transition this 17-acre community space into a full time community and climate resilient space by **rejecting appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065**

Undoing the pilot compromise will undo the environmental and community gains we have tangibly experienced thus far. Namely, putting us on track to:

1. Address our City's commitment to solve our climate emergency
2. Reduce VMTs and congestion
3. Improve traffic safety
4. Improve habitat for wildlife
5. Increase access to outdoor educational experiences especially for youth, and
6. Allow more exploration, enjoyment and protection of wild spaces such as Ocean Beach.

Best,

**Brian Reyes, D4**  
Vice Chair, Sierra Club SF Group

Charles Whitfield, D2  
Chair, Sierra Club SF Group



**From:** [Sarah Kho](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Support for Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:04:12 PM

---

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

**From:** [Justin Fraser](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Support for the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 2:42:20 PM

---

Dear Supervisor Melgar and Commissioners,

My name is Justin Fraser and I am a resident of the 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.

My family lives car-free in the Sunset neighborhood. We get around primarily by bike and MUNI and enjoy biking on the car-free stretch of the Great Highway several weekends a month.

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

Justin Fraser  
1762 9th Ave  
SF 94122

**From:** [Abbey Levantini](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Support for Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:01:50 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Abbey and I am a resident of the outer sunset in District 4.

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 enjoys biking and walking the Great Highway every weekend! It is a safe and beautiful area for people of all ages to recreate. It has become a beloved part of our San Francisco community!

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.

Abbey Levantini  
D4 resident

**From:** [Lisa Sulzinger](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [SMC\\_SupMueller@smcgov.org](#); [gguiney@smcgov.org](#); [MJO'Neill@smcgov.org](#); [Callagy, Mike@San Mateo County](#); [Policicchio, Melba@Coastal](#); [Luo, Yunsheng@DOT](#)  
**Cc:** [mccgreggd@gmail.com](#); [midcoast.claire@gmail.com](#); [midcoastcommunitycouncil@gmail.com](#)  
**Subject:** Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastsides - Permit Application 2-24-0002  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 4:55:33 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastsides - Permit Application 2-24-0002.pdf](#)

---

Hello,

The attached letter is being sent on behalf of Chris Mickelsen President, Board of Directors Coastsides County Water District in Support of State Plans to Extend MMBI Coastsides – Permit Application 2-24-0002.

Thanks and regards,

Lisa Sulzinger

Administrative Analyst

Coastsides County Water District

650-726-4405

[lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org](mailto:lsulzinger@coastsidewater.org)



**From:** [Zafarali Ahmed](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:52:11 AM

---

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.

The Great Highway Park is by far my favourite place in San Francisco. Despite San Francisco being surrounded by the ocean, there are very few ways to enjoy it without being surrounded by car traffic. I bike to it every other week and I love both foggy and sunny conditions. The permit authorizes important traffic calming in the Outer Sunset which has greatly improved the safety of the neighborhood and are vital to my safety when I bike to Ocean Beach and patronize nearby businesses.

**The Great Highway Park is a GEM and I wish to celebrate my birthday there every year.**

As one of the thousands of San Franciscans who visit Great Highway Park 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 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](#) and enhances recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline by 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.

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Thank you.  
Zafarali Ahmed

**From:** [Timothy French](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [ghappeal@proton.me](mailto:ghappeal@proton.me)  
**Subject:** Support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 3:23:24 PM

---

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.

--

Tim French  
Brand Manager @ Equinix Inc.  
[trfrench1@gmail.com](mailto:trfrench1@gmail.com)  
262-617-6433

**From:** [Emily Huston](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 12:56:44 PM

---

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 that you reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

I'm 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. This pilot program is crucial so that I can continue to access and enjoy the shoreline.

The permit simply maintains the existing compromise approved by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Breed in 2022. It also furthers the objectives of the Coastal Act and San Francisco's Local Coastal Plan by enhancing recreational use of the Ocean Beach shoreline. It's important to provide a safe space for kids, seniors, and the entire community to benefit from the coast.

Thank you,  
Emily Huston  
San Francisco resident, 94115

**From:** [Dylan Gattey](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:50:43 AM

---

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



**From:** [Robin Pam](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [Great Highway Park](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Support the Upper Great Highway Coastal Zone Permit. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 8:42:34 AM

---

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,

Robin Pam  
District 7 resident

**From:** [Adam Archer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Support to keep Great Highway a Park!  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 12:30:38 PM

---

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.

**From:** [Esther Jeong](#)  
**To:** [esther.jeong](#)  
**Subject:** The Board of Appeals Meeting - Feb 7 - the great highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 9:32:37 PM

---

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

**From:** [Colin Dyer](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org)  
**Cc:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** The Great Highway promenade / Coastal Zone Permit  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:53:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [laura.folger](mailto:laura.folger)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** The great highway the great experiment... may it continue?  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 8:50:34 PM

---

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

**From:** [susan\\_george](mailto:susan_george)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** The Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 4:59:33 PM

---

Hello!

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

**From:** [Victoria Cheng](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MeigarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MeigarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** The Great Highway  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:55:28 AM

---

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



**From:** [Ivan Gonzalez](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** The Great Walkway  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 11:44:03 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Ivan Gonzalez 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.

I love having a safe place to take my baby as well as my elderly parents.

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.

**From:** [Ann M. Foley](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Uphold permit for the Great Highway pilot project!  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:26:16 AM

---

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

**From:** [Tim Eichenberg](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Uphold the Coastal Permit for the Upper Great Highway Pilot Project  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 7:41:39 PM

---

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

**From:** [GoodStuffnow](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:39:00 PM

---

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

**From:** [Lourdes Gomez](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway!  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:39:10 AM

---

## 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

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Lourdes Gomez and I am a resident of the Inner Richmond, 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!*

Since moving to the city, one of my favorite activities has become biking through Golden Gate Park and down The Great Highway. I am a California native, but spent several years on the East Coast for graduate school, where I fell in love with the accessibility that bike lanes and public transit (trains and subway) options provided. I was hesitant to move back to California for a job offer, fully aware that our transit system is severely lacking. Thankfully, I fell in with a group of coworkers who have encouraged me to bike as often as possible- sharing favorite routes, and helping me gain confidence biking through San Francisco. Biking in and around the city has quickly become one of the greatest joys and advantages of living here for me. I feel such gratitude for all those who have lobbied to set aside safe spaces for pedestrians and cyclists to enjoy our great city, and I feel compelled to do everything within my power to keep these spaces open and accessible for all to enjoy, now and in the future.

The Coastal Zone 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. *These should be values that San Francisco champions!* 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,  
Lourdes Gomez

This e-mail is private and confidential and is for the addressee only. If misdirected, please notify us by telephone, confirming that it has been deleted from your system and any hard copies destroyed. You are strictly prohibited from using, printing, distributing or disseminating it or any information contained in it save to the intended recipient.

**From:** [Susan Rifkin](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 2:20:35 PM

---

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

**From:** [kash](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeal  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:30:19 PM

---

Please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals.

Last Halloween, I rode my bike down to the Great Hauntway celebration. I figured it would be a couple of sad folding tables and a few parents dragging their children out, making the best of it in the wind and the cold.

I could not have been more wrong.

The event was so big you could not see all of it at once. It was curb to curb people, from the end of Golden Gate Park, all the way to Sloat. There were no corporate sponsors, only a few commercial tables. It was just a bunch of parents in the Sunset with an idea. And a whole lot of people who liked it.

The western edge of the city is going to fall into the Pacific eventually. The people who are appealing this permit and trying to get cars back onto the road are literally trying to hold back the ocean. They're idiots who can't face reality. And they don't like wholesome fun. Don't listen to them.



**From:** [Matt Kamenski](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 10:47:15 PM

---

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

**From:** [Paul Wermer](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Uphold the Great Highway Park Pilot Project & Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 4, 2024 4:56:32 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I urge you to uphold San Francisco Planning Commission's decision granting a Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project, rejecting Appeal Nos. 23-062 23-064 and 23-065 (items 5A, 5B and 5C on your Feb 7, 2024 agenda, for the following reasons:

1. Appellants claim that the Planning Commission lacks the authority to issue a retroactive permit, entitling an action that has already started or happened. From personal experience at both Planning and DBI, I know that this retroactive process is in fact commonplace. It is used to legalize situations where appropriate permits were not obtained before work commenced, but the work complies with existing codes, or is modified to comply with existing codes.
2. 23-062 in Sec E.2 asserts that public access will be reduced, and E.4.B asserts that access to the Neighborhood Commercial Districts will be adversely impacted. Yet there is no parking anywhere along the Great Highway between Lincoln and Sloat – there is no place to exit a vehicle to access the either the beach to the west, or the businesses to the east. On the other hand, when the Great Highway is closed, I have public transit access to numerous points: the 18 at Lincoln and Great Highway, as well as numerous stops on 46<sup>th</sup> (only 3 blocks from the Great Highway); the N at Judah and Great Highway, the 7 at Noriega/Ortega, the 48 at Rivera, the 43 and 18 at 47<sup>th</sup>/Wawona. Not only do I have beach access, but I also have much better access to the restaurants, cafes, and retail in the neighborhood – and now I actually have patronized some of those small businesses. The claims of reduced access are not supported by the actual experience.

And a shout-out to SFMTA operators – they are absolutely outstanding in helping mobility impaired passengers – be they using walkers, wheelchairs, or just a cane. And I have talked to wheelchair bound persons who arrived at the Great Highway on public transit – an existence proof that cars are not needed for access.

3. The appellants assert that there are significant adverse traffic impacts. A key point of this pilot is to assess the actual traffic impacts and identify mitigations. Neighborhood traffic in San Francisco has long been hazardous, but finally SFMTA is able to implement mitigations. I have seen firsthand how well Slow Streets programs have calmed traffic; I am very impressed at the ways Berkeley has reduced traffic flows on residential streets. This pilot is essential to understand how the closures affect traffic flows, and so design appropriate mitigations.
4. The appellants assert environmental damage to the dune ecosystems. Yes, absent interventions/mitigations, that would be a problem. Once again, the pilot is intended to help understand usage patterns and implement appropriate controls to protect the dunes. The good news is that we have seen how good management practices – signage and simple fences – protect sensitive beach areas. One excellent local example is the beach area along the Presidio waterfront, along Crissy Marsh and the Crissy Field beachfront, where this simple approach has kept the very large number of visitors from trampling on sensitive restoration sites.

In short, many of the Appellants assertions do not stand up to the actual experience of using the car-free Great Highway. And the other major concerns are issues that the pilot is intended to identify, so that appropriate mitigations can be put in place. Please uphold the Planning Commission approval of the pilot so that we can gather the data necessary to make appropriate plans.

Sincerely,

Paul Wermer

--

2309 California Street  
San Francisco, CA 94115

[paul@pw-sc.com](mailto:paul@pw-sc.com)

**From:** [Troy Peters](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Upper Great Highway pilot project Coastal Zone permit  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 12:22:41 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Troy Peters and am a resident of the Miraloma Park neighborhood.

I strongly encourage you to uphold the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project. Please REJECT the appeals against this permit.

As a regular user of the Great Highway when it is closed to motor vehicle traffic, the benefits of this car-free recreational space for a wide variety of activities is abundantly clear. From the moment the gates close on Friday afternoon through the weekend, the space is filled with walkers, bikers, kids, seniors -- people with a wide range of mobility and interests. This singular space provides dramatic and deep benefit to the residents and visitors of San Francisco.

The Great Highway pilot project will show the long-term value of this space as open space enjoyed and used as a respite from the speed and pressure of our urban transportation environment. What better place for it?

Please REJECT the appeals to the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and uphold the issuance of the permit.

Thank you,

Troy Peters

**From:** [Stephanie Gladney](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Upper Great Highway pilot  
**Date:** Friday, February 2, 2024 2:10:56 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Stephanie Gladney and I am a 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.

I have enjoyed biking, walking and attending a yoga class on the Great Highway. It is much more peaceful to enjoy the sounds of the ocean without the noise of 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.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Jim Stephenson](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Upper Great Highway  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 6, 2024 1:11:26 PM

---

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

**From:** [Sandy Carter](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** We need the Great Highway Park. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2024 6:47:16 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

Hello. I am asking 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.

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.

Sandy Carter  
[carters989@gmail.com](mailto:carters989@gmail.com)

San Francisco, California 94128





**From:** [Deborah Lardie](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 12, 2024 7:49:39 PM

---

My name is **Deborah Lardie**

My email address is **dlardie@dlardie.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Lardie

**From:** [Ed Dobranski](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 12, 2024 4:17:16 PM

---

My name is **Ed Dobranski**

My email address is **[ejdobranski@aol.com](mailto:ejdobranski@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,  
Ed Dobranski

**From:** [Michele Skootsky](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 11, 2024 7:28:55 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Carolyn Power Perlstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 11, 2024 6:58:48 PM

---

My name is **Carolyn Power Perlstein**

My email address is **carolynpow@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,  
Carolyn Power Perlstein

**From:** [Richars Webb](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 11, 2024 12:02:01 PM

---

My name is **Richars Webb**

My email address is **webblocke@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,  
Richars Webb

**From:** [Merrill Bronstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 11, 2024 9:13:58 AM

---

My name is **Merrill Bronstein**

My email address is **budbronstein@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Merrill Bronstein

**From:** [Allison Kozak](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 10, 2024 4:49:26 PM

---

My name is **Allison Kozak**

My email address is **voter@axmk.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Kozak

**From:** [Eric Small](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 10, 2024 6:15:39 AM

---

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,

Eric Small and family  
1683 32nd Avenue  
San Francisco

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Maura Lewis](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 10:29:57 PM

---

My name is **Maura Lewis**

My email address is **maura.a@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Maura Lewis



**From:** [Hilary Skehan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 8:54:02 PM

---

My name is **Hilary Skehan**

My email address is **hilaryskehan@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Hilary Skehan

**From:** [Paul Petterson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 8:42:22 PM

---

My name is **Paul Petterson**

My email address is **[captainsquid56@aol.com](mailto:captainsquid56@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.

I have to use more gas to go around the detours to get to the Richmond district, that is not reducing my carbon foot print. It hurts businesses in the Richmond and outer Sunset district because of traffic issues it is easier for people to go shopping or out to eat in Daly City.

Sincerely,  
Paul Petterson

**From:** [KenH H](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 4:45:39 PM

---

My name is **KenH H**

My email address is **intel678@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,  
KenH H

**From:** [Kelsey Schur](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 3:36:49 PM

---

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,

Kelsey Schur  
94116 resident

**From:** [Mary Guttman](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastalchanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastalchanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 2:43:49 PM

---

My name is **Mary Guttman**

My email address is **maryguttman@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 Guttmann

**From:** [Jim Moore](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Upper Great Highway Pilot Project  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 1:45:39 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jim Moore and I am a resident of Cow Hollow 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 family and I ride bicycles on the Great Highway on most weekends. It has been one of the safest and most enjoyable experiences we have had in the City. On the whole, SF is not a safe bicycle city and we need safe places like the (closed to vehicle traffic) Great Highway to ride.

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,  
Jim Moore

**From:** [Marie Acheritogaray](mailto:Marie.Acheritogaray@sf.gov)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 9:26:16 AM

---

My name is **Marie Acheritogaray**

My email address is **marie\_pierrette@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 Acheritogaray


**From:** [Liz Goebel](#)  
**To:** [Bryan Waters](#); [Rosalind Girard](#); [SPI-LandDev-Referrals](#); [PermitSonoma-NaturalResources](#); [FirePrevention](#); [Marcia Belforte](#); [Steve Mosiurchak](#); [Steve Mosiurchak](#); [Mark Cleveland](#); [Steve Ehret](#); [Steven Schmitz](#); [WEBSCTA](#); [Erich Lynn](#); [Tracy Lyons](#); [Eric Koenigshofer](#); [Eric Koenigshofer \(P\)](#); [Webster Marquez](#); [Jerry Roy Jr.](#) ([JRoyJr@recology.com](#)); [LDIGR-D4@DOT](#); [KoppmanNorton](#); [Julia@Coastal](#); [Henningesen, Luke@Coastal](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [Rexing, Stephanie@Coastal](#); [Dougherty, Mona@Waterboards](#); [Rue Furch](#) ([pqrst@monitor.net](#)); [Landuse.CoastIMAC](#); [Condon, Cecily](#); [Emi Theriault](#); [Katerina Mahdavi](#); [Scott Orr](#); [Tennis Wick](#); [Bradley Johnson](#); [Ethan Brown](#); [Lauren Cartwright](#); [Christine Sosko](#); [Jennifer Lyle](#); [Leslye Choate](#); [Lisa Steinman](#); [Jennie Bruneman](#); [Fort Ross School Dist](#) ([ftross@mcn.org](#)); [Earls, Lareina A.@Waterboards](#); [WB-DWPDIST25](#); [WB-DWPDIST18](#); [O'Neil, Brendan@Parks](#); [Shannon, Gary@Parks](#); [Dixon, Jackie@Parks](#); [Benjamin Macias](#); [Patricia Hermosillo](#); [Chris Wright](#); [Sherri Smith, THPO](#); [Buffy McQuillen](#); [Tribal Heritage Preservation Officer \(THPO\)](#); [Donald Duncan](#); [Anthony Macias](#); [Dino Franklin](#); [Andy Mejia](#); [Brenda Tomaras](#); [Tribe Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians \(THPO@middletownrancheria.com\)](#); [Scott Gabaldon](#); [Charlene Nijmeh](#); [Monica Arellano](#); [Leona Willams](#); [Beniakem Cromwell](#)  
**Cc:** [Jacob Sedgley](#)  
**Subject:** CPN23-0004 Completeness Referral Packet Resubmission - Respond by February 23, 2024  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 8:34:33 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[CPN23-0004 Resubmittal Referral Packet.pdf](#)

---

Good morning,

Please review the attached **revised** documents for CPN23-0004 including the biological survey, grading plan, and septic plan. **Note that both the older initial referral documents and the new resubmittal materials are included in this e-mail.** The initial referral materials, linked below, may contain outdated information if items were revised by the resubmittal documents. If that is the case, the resubmittal materials should be considered the most up-to-date. Please note that this project was initially referred out on February 28, 2023, by Chris Wendt and has been reassigned to Jacob Sedgley for processing. As of today, Permit Sonoma has record of the Natural Resources Division and the Building Division responding to the initial referral with comments or conditions. If you have already responded and have record of it, please feel free to forward that information to Jacob Sedgley at [jacob.sedgley@sonoma-county.org](mailto:jacob.sedgley@sonoma-county.org). Otherwise, we appreciate your review of this permit application. Please respond by February 23, 2024.

Original packet: <https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/QzUz1b6ex2Q/>




**permit  
SONOMA**

**Liz Goebel (she/her)**  
**Administrative Assistant**

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
[www.PermitSonoma.org](http://www.PermitSonoma.org)

**o:** (707) 565-1900  
**d:** (707) 565-1947  
[liz.goebel@sonoma-county.org](mailto:liz.goebel@sonoma-county.org)



SONOMA COUNTY  
AGRICULTURE  
INDUSTRY  
RECREATION  
CALIFORNIA

Lobby hours: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Wednesday 10:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

**From:** [Chetan](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Rachel Clyde, SF Bicycle Coalition](#);  
[boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 7:06:11 AM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Chetan Maha and I am a resident of 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.

The closing of great highway for cars has been extremely valuable for me to bicycle in peace without the need for being afraid of speeding cars. This place brings the community together.

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.

Chetan

**From:** [Jonas Mueller](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Save the Great Highway Park!!  
**Date:** Friday, February 9, 2024 12:16:28 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Jonas Mueller 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 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,  
Jonas



**From:** [Sabine Angulo](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 8:41:21 PM

---

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,

Anthony Angulo

"Kindness is the language which the deaf can hear and the blind can see."

~Mark Twain

**From:** [Sage Wright](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 6:11:46 PM

---

Honorable North Central Coast Coastal Commission,

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.

Sage Wright  
[sagekw@gmail.com](mailto:sagekw@gmail.com)

San francisco, California 94122



**From:** [Subash Giri](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Temporary permit for an event at Tomales Bay Resort (Inverness, CA)  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 5:07:39 PM

---

Hello,

I've been trying to reach someone at the coastal commission for a while now and I'm hoping you can help or point me to the right person :)

We're trying to run a pilot program for a small musical event at Tomales Bay Resort (12938 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, Inverness, CA 94937) on July 5 & 6th this year. Our planning is on hold because we want to make sure to go through the proper channels and see if we can get a permit for this event first. Below are a few details about the event. Happy to discuss further as needed.

Goal is to create a weekend getaway for people that live in the bay area to go out to Inverness, CA and stay at tomales bay resort (owners are already on board). This will be a community driven event, we're here to support local and growing artists, bands, food vendors, arts and crafts etc.

Total attendees: **Around 150 people** and planning to have them all book rooms at the resort. Activities: Outdoor stage on the private property, Kayaking, hiking, yoga, arts and crafts, outdoor sports etc. We're also planning to have a medic on site during this whole time.

It is a pretty small scale event for this first year but I want to make sure that we're following the right protocols for this to happen. Our main goal is to be able to have music outdoors past the 60decibal range during the day and provide a safe environment for the attendees to be able to enjoy music and activities for the weekend.

Let me know if we can talk about it a bit more or if there is any more information you need from me.

Thank you!

--

Subash Giri  
Senior Product Designer // **Intuit TurboTax**

**From:** [Josephine Murphy](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 4:05:17 PM

---

My name is **Josephine Murphy**  
My email address is **jomurphysf@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,  
Josephine Murphy

**From:** [Lesley Pierce](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 3:18:44 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Kiley Rundle](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 3:03:59 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to ask that you please 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 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,

Kiley Rundle



**From:** [bill bisesto](mailto:bill_bisesto@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 2:50:27 PM

---

My name is **bill bisesto**

My email address is **bbisesto@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
bill bisesto

**From:** [Lopez\\_Cale@CALFIRE](mailto:Lopez_Cale@CALFIRE)  
**To:** [Ardis\\_Chris@CALFIRE](mailto:Ardis_Chris@CALFIRE); [Backes\\_Kim@Wildlife](mailto:Backes_Kim@Wildlife); [Bane\\_David@CALFIRE](mailto:Bane_David@CALFIRE); [Baumgartner\\_Steven@Wildlife](mailto:Baumgartner_Steven@Wildlife); [Bawcom\\_James@CALFIRE](mailto:Bawcom_James@CALFIRE); [Bernheisel\\_Angela@CALFIRE](mailto:Bernheisel_Angela@CALFIRE); [Bey\\_Ryan\\_A\\_@Waterboards](mailto:Bey_Ryan_A_@Waterboards); [Bosma\\_Mitch@CALFIRE](mailto:Bosma_Mitch@CALFIRE); [Brand\\_Patrick@DOC](mailto:Brand_Patrick@DOC); [Vitorelo\\_Brian@CALFIRE](mailto:Vitorelo_Brian@CALFIRE); [Brown\\_Kevin@Waterboards](mailto:Brown_Kevin@Waterboards); [Bullock\\_Scott@CALFIRE](mailto:Bullock_Scott@CALFIRE); [Burgess\\_Traci@CALFIRE](mailto:Burgess_Traci@CALFIRE); [Burke\\_James@Waterboards](mailto>Burke_James@Waterboards); [Butcher\\_Jason@CALFIRE](mailto:Butcher_Jason@CALFIRE); [Cahill\\_Jessie B\\_@Waterboards](mailto:Cahill_Jessie_B_@Waterboards); [CALFIRE MEU Resource Management](mailto:CALFIRE MEU Resource Management); [Camarena\\_Jayden@CALFIRE](mailto:Camarena_Jayden@CALFIRE); [CDFW\\_CDFW Bay Area Timber Unit](mailto:CDFW_CDFW Bay Area Timber Unit); [Coombes\\_Julie@Wildlife](mailto:Coombes_Julie@Wildlife); [Curtis\\_Chris@CALFIRE](mailto:Curtis_Chris@CALFIRE); [Longstreth\\_David@DOC](mailto:Longstreth_David@DOC); [Deem\\_Adam@CALFIRE](mailto:Deem_Adam@CALFIRE); [Deshais\\_Janelle@Wildlife](mailto:Deshais_Janelle@Wildlife); [Doherty\\_Kevin@DOC](mailto:Doherty_Kevin@DOC); [Dunleavy\\_Carley J\\_@Waterboards](mailto:Dunleavy_Carley_J_@Waterboards); [Esposito\\_Michael@CALFIRE](mailto:Esposito_Michael@CALFIRE); [Fazio\\_Jay@CALFIRE](mailto:Fazio_Jay@CALFIRE); [Fehrenbach\\_Anne@DOC](mailto:Fehrenbach_Anne@DOC); [Fitt\\_Justin@Waterboards](mailto:Fitt_Justin@Waterboards); [Forrester\\_Colby@CALFIRE](mailto:Forrester_Colby@CALFIRE); [Fortescue\\_Forest@Waterboards](mailto:Fortescue_Forest@Waterboards); [Foster\\_Lori@Waterboards](mailto:Foster_Lori@Waterboards); [Fowler\\_David@Waterboards](mailto:Fowler_David@Waterboards); [Fuller\\_Terra@Parks](mailto:Fuller_Terra@Parks); [Gallagher\\_Sara@DOC](mailto:Gallagher_Sara@DOC); [Geppert\\_Joelle@Waterboards](mailto:Geppert_Joelle@Waterboards); [Goldsworthy\\_Matt](mailto:Goldsworthy_Matt); [Gryszan\\_Christopher@CALFIRE](mailto>Gryszan_Christopher@CALFIRE); [Hanisko\\_Merissa@Wildlife](mailto>Hanisko_Merissa@Wildlife); [Harrington\\_Daniel@Wildlife](mailto:Harrington_Daniel@Wildlife); [Harris\\_Ben@CALFIRE](mailto:Harris_Ben@CALFIRE); [Hawkins\\_Robert@Wildlife](mailto:Hawkins_Robert@Wildlife); [Hayashi\\_Bianca@Wildlife](mailto:Hayashi_Bianca@Wildlife); [Haynes\\_David@Wildlife](mailto:Haynes_David@Wildlife); [Headley\\_Shawn@CALFIRE](mailto:Headley_Shawn@CALFIRE); [Hedge\\_Eric@CALFIRE](mailto:Hedge_Eric@CALFIRE); [Kunstal\\_Heidi@Del Norte County](mailto>Kunstal_Heidi@Del Norte County); [Hein\\_Kelcey@CALFIRE](mailto:Hein_Kelcey@CALFIRE); [Hendrix\\_Jon@Wildlife](mailto:Hendrix_Jon@Wildlife); [Henry\\_Jack@Wildlife](mailto:Henry_Jack@Wildlife); [Holliday\\_Tim@CALFIRE](mailto:Holliday_Tim@CALFIRE); [Howard\\_Valerie@CALFIRE](mailto:Howard_Valerie@CALFIRE); [Huff\\_Eric@CALFIRE](mailto:Huff_Eric@CALFIRE); [Huma\\_Michael@Waterboards](mailto:Huma_Michael@Waterboards); [Hunter\\_John](mailto:Hunter_John); [Hutchins\\_Adam@Wildlife](mailto:Hutchins_Adam@Wildlife); [CALFIRE HUU Resource Management](mailto:CALFIRE HUU Resource Management); [Russo\\_Izaac@Waterboards](mailto:Russo_Izaac@Waterboards); [Jacks\\_Sandra@Wildlife](mailto:Jacks_Sandra@Wildlife); [Janssen\\_David@CALFIRE](mailto:Janssen_David@CALFIRE); [Rebellino\\_Devon C\\_@Waterboards](mailto:Rebellino_Devon_C_@Waterboards); [Heckman\\_Josh@Wildlife](mailto:Heckman_Josh@Wildlife); [Klug\\_Richard@Wildlife](mailto:Klug_Richard@Wildlife); [KoppmanNorton\\_Julia@Coastal](mailto:KoppmanNorton_Julia@Coastal); [Kraemer\\_Melissa@Coastal](mailto>Kraemer_Melissa@Coastal); [Land\\_Jan\(CNR\)@CALFIRE](mailto:Land_Jan(CNR)@CALFIRE); [Leonard\\_Lathrop@Parks](mailto:Leonard_Lathrop@Parks); [Lindsay\\_Don@CALFIRE](mailto:Lindsay_Don@CALFIRE); [Longcrier\\_Jeff@CALFIRE](mailto:Longcrier_Jeff@CALFIRE); [Longstreth\\_Aaron@Wildlife](mailto:Longstreth_Aaron@Wildlife); [Longstreth\\_David@DOC](mailto:Longstreth_David@DOC); [Lopez\\_Cale@CALFIRE](mailto:Lopez_Cale@CALFIRE); [Ma\\_Amanda@Wildlife](mailto:Ma_Amanda@Wildlife); [Madsen\\_Douglas@CALFIRE](mailto:Madsen_Douglas@CALFIRE); [Margiott\\_Ken@CALFIRE](mailto:Margiott_Ken@CALFIRE); [McNicholas\\_Michael@CALFIRE](mailto:McNicholas_Michael@CALFIRE); [Meyers\\_Tim@CALFIRE](mailto:Meyers_Tim@CALFIRE); [Minx\\_Benjamin A\\_@Waterboards](mailto:Minx_Benjamin_A_@Waterboards); [Rehse\\_Angela@Wildlife](mailto:Rehse_Angela@Wildlife); [Moroney\\_Ryan@Coastal](mailto:Moroney_Ryan@Coastal); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [Oswald\\_John@DOC](mailto>Oswald_John@DOC); [Ozard\\_Gwyndolyn@CALFIRE](mailto>Ozard_Gwyndolyn@CALFIRE); [Ozard\\_Nochella](mailto>Ozard_Nochella); [Poli\\_Chris@CALFIRE](mailto>Poli_Chris@CALFIRE); [Rexing\\_Stephanie@Coastal](mailto:Rexing_Stephanie@Coastal); [Salisbury\\_Robert@Santa Clara County](mailto:Salisbury_Robert@Santa Clara County); [Robinson\\_Maggie@Waterboards](mailto:Robinson_Maggie@Waterboards); [Rodgers\\_Brandon@CALFIRE](mailto:Rodgers_Brandon@CALFIRE); [Rueger\\_Daniel@CALFIRE](mailto:Rueger_Daniel@CALFIRE); [Sampson\\_Richard@CALFIRE](mailto:Sampson_Richard@CALFIRE); [Sanville\\_Cheri@Wildlife](mailto:Sanville_Cheri@Wildlife); [Schultz\\_Gabriel@CALFIRE](mailto>Schultz_Gabriel@CALFIRE); [Sciocchetti\\_Lou@CALFIRE](mailto:Sciocchetti_Lou@CALFIRE); [Simpson\\_Nicholas@wildlife](mailto:Simpson_Nicholas@wildlife); [Sipes\\_Sarah@CALFIRE](mailto:Sipes_Sarah@CALFIRE); [Sniado\\_Susan@Wildlife](mailto:Sniado_Susan@Wildlife); [Sone\\_Kim@CALFIRE](mailto:Sone_Kim@CALFIRE); [Spohrer\\_Chris@Parks](mailto:Spohrer_Chris@Parks); [Stockwell\\_Carrie@CALFIRE](mailto:Stockwell_Carrie@CALFIRE); [Strong\\_James@CALFIRE](mailto:Strong_James@CALFIRE); [Swan\\_Robynn@Wildlife](mailto:Swan_Robynn@Wildlife); [Teraoka\\_Jason@NPS](mailto:Teraoka_Jason@NPS); [Titus\\_Lucas@CALFIRE](mailto:Titus_Lucas@CALFIRE); [Walcott\\_Timothy@Waterboards](mailto:Walcott_Timothy@Waterboards); [Watkins\\_Spencer@DOC](mailto:Watkins_Spencer@DOC); [Wilder\\_Carey@Waterboards](mailto:Wilder_Carey@Waterboards); [Wildlife R3 Timber](mailto:Wildlife R3 Timber); [Woessner\\_Jonathan@CALFIRE](mailto:Woessner_Jonathan@CALFIRE); [Womble\\_Julian](mailto:Womble_Julian); [Bean\\_Zeke@City of Santa Cruz](mailto:Bean_Zeke@City of Santa Cruz); [Zuluaga\\_Yanik@CALFIRE](mailto:Zuluaga_Yanik@CALFIRE)  
**Subject:** 1st Review Summary: 02-02-2024  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 2:14:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[Summary 02-08-2024.pdf](#)

Please see attached.



## Cale Lopez – RPF #3154

Timber Regulation & Forest Restoration  
Forester

135 Ridgway Ave. Santa Rosa, CA 95401

707-576-2940 (office)

707-608-8020 (cell)

[Forest Practice \(fire.ca.gov\)](https://fire.ca.gov)



**From:** [Dave Roorda](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 2:10:52 PM

---

My name is **Dave Roorda**

My email address is **wdogs@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,  
Dave Roorda

**From:** [Alana O'Brien](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 12:18:04 PM

---

My name is **Alana O'Brien**

My email address is **alanasf@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,  
Alana O'Brien

**From:** [alex.sadovnikov](mailto:alex.sadovnikov@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 12:18:04 PM

---

My name is **alex sadovnikov**

My email address is **sadovnikov@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,  
alex sadovnikov

**From:** [Curtis Gardner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 12:18:03 PM

---

My name is **Curtis Gardner**

My email address is **cgardner@jspllc.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Curtis Gardner

**From:** [Braden Edwards](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 11:05:09 AM

---

My name is **Braden Edwards**

My email address is **BRADENEDWARDS@GMAIL.COM**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Braden Edwards

**From:** [Judith Capellino](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 10:43:38 AM

---

My name is **Judith Capellino**

My email address is **judithcapellino@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,  
Judith Capellino

**From:** [Enrico Dell'Osso](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 10:43:36 AM

---

My name is **Enrico Dell'Osso**

My email address is **chworks@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,  
Enrico Dell'Osso

**From:** [Alison Forrestel](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 10:31:33 AM

---

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,  
Alison Forrestel  
Outer Sunset Resident

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Daragh Powers](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 8:20:26 AM

---

My name is **Daragh 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,  
Daragh Powers

**From:** [David Smee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 8:10:49 AM

---

My name is **David Smee**

My email address is **dsmee@shanti.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,  
David Smeed

**From:** [Zach Georgopoulos](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 7:49:38 AM

---

My name is **Zach Georgopoulos**

My email address is **zachgeo@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,  
Zach Georgopoulos



**From:** [Rosalie Gift](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 6:07:16 AM

---

My name is **Rosalie Gift**

My email address is **rosiegift591@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Rosalie Gift

**From:** [Loretta Wasacz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 1:27:29 AM

---

My name is **Loretta Wasacz**

My email address is **lwasacz@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,  
Loretta Wasacz

**From:** [Max Wasacz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 1:27:27 AM

---

My name is **Max Wasacz**

My email address is **maxwasacz@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,  
Max Wasacz

**From:** [sherman d'silva](mailto:sherman.d@silva)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 1:06:36 AM

---

My name is **sherman d'silva**

My email address is **srdsilva@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,  
sherman d'silva



**From:** [Richard Goodwin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 12:57:18 AM

---

My name is **Richard Goodwin**

My email address is **rgoodwin3000@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Goodwin

**From:** [Lori BWasscz](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 12:57:01 AM

---

My name is **Lori BWasscz**

My email address is **lmwasacz@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Lori BWasscz

**From:** [Erin Lam](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 12:06:23 AM

---

My name is **Erin Lam**

My email address is **erinlam108@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,  
Erin Lam

**From:** [William Griffith](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 11:24:23 PM

---

My name is **William Griffith**

My email address is **wgriffith415@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Griffith



**From:** [Paul Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 11:24:22 PM

---

My name is **Paul Lee**

My email address is **kwonglee223@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 Lee

**From:** [Michael Bertinetti](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 11:24:22 PM

---

My name is **Michael Bertinetti**

My email address is **mbmsuchet0@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Bertinetti

**From:** [Baxter Smith](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:50:56 PM

---

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,

Baxter  
Outer Sunset

Regards,

**Baxter Smith** | Real Estate Advisor  
*Creating Remarkable Real Estate Experiences*  
mobile: 415.841.3041 | [LurieGroup.com](https://www.lurielgroup.com) | DRE: 01954904

Top 1% of San Francisco Agents  
WSJ Ranked Top 100 Team in California  
Over \$1 Billion Sold



**From:** [Judith Goldstein](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 10:22:45 PM

---

My name is **Judith Goldstein**

My email address is **judgold22@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,  
Judith Goldstein

**From:** [Nikita Van beek](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:40:04 PM

---

My name is **Nikita Van beek**

My email address is **snwag2000@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,  
Nikita Van beek

**From:** [marlen.bekirov](mailto:marlen.bekirov)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:39:32 PM

---

My name is **marlen bekirov**

My email address is **marlen.bekirov63@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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

**From:** [Anita Lim](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:20:29 PM

---

My name is **Anita Lim**

My email address is **Anita.lim14@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Lim

**From:** [Megan Miller](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 9:04:08 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

As an Outer Sunset homeowner, 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,  
Megan Miller & family

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Helen Galvin](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:49:45 PM

---

My name is **Helen Galvin**

My email address is **helengal@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

We in the Outer Richmond have been totally compromised in these unfair road restrictions, especially the combination of the Great Highway AND Lake Street. Those people in SFMTA making decisions for we who have paid dearly to live in this neighbourhood, don't even live in the City !!

Helen Galvin MD

Sincerely,  
Helen Galvin



**From:** [Kevin Brunner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:49:44 PM

---

My name is **Kevin Brunner**

My email address is **kevin@brunnerco.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Brunner

**From:** [Kira Gaber](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:49:43 PM

---

My name is **Kira Gaber**

My email address is **kiki@kiragaber.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Kira Gaber

**From:** [paper@swclabs.com](mailto:paper@swclabs.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:46:44 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Robert Davis](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:16:44 PM

---

My name is **Robert Davis**

My email address is **rwd.relax@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Davis

**From:** [Leslie Ferguson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:16:20 PM

---

My name is **Leslie Ferguson**

My email address is **lesferguson@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,  
Leslie Ferguson

**From:** [Peter Billeci](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:39 PM

---

My name is **Peter Billeci**

My email address is **jumpfroginc@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Billeci

**From:** [Claudia Hawkins](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:38 PM

---

My name is **Claudia Hawkins**

My email address is **claudia\_hawkins@gap.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

It's PAST TIME to open up The Great Highway! Give the residents and tax payers freedom to use the roads WE PAY FOR. STOP the SF Park & Rec dictatorship!! ENOUGH ALREADY.

Sincerely,  
Claudia Hawkins

**From:** [Jennifer Dougherty](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:37 PM

---

My name is **Jennifer Dougherty**

My email address is **dordy71@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,  
Jennifer Dougherty

**From:** [Joseph Bavaresco](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:36 PM

---

My name is **Joseph Bavaresco**

My email address is **josephbavaresco@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,  
Joseph Bavaresco

**From:** [Brian Bonham](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:36 PM

---

My name is **Brian Bonham**

My email address is **mayumikamon@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,  
Brian Bonham

**From:** [Debi Durst](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:35 PM

---

My name is **Debi Durst**

My email address is **dutch13@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,  
Debi Durst

**From:** [Bijan Yashar](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engarddiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engarddiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:33 PM

---

My name is **Bijan Yashar**

My email address is **bijanyashar@yahoo.com**

Let working people get to work. Stop making an already congested commute worse with this idiotic closure.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Bijan Yashar

**From:** [Sara Anderson](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:33 PM

---

My name is **Sara Anderson**

My email address is **saralee.anderson@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and



commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Sara Anderson

**From:** [Al McDonnell](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:33 PM

---

My name is **Al McDonnell**

My email address is **lcdrmcdonnell@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Al McDonnell

**From:** [Laura Horihan](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:32 PM

---

My name is **Laura Horihan**

My email address is **[laura.horihan@gmail.com](mailto:laura.horihan@gmail.com)**

I oppose this nonsensical decision, which has been pushed by the self-interested bicycle coalition and bypasses the working individuals that use this HIGHWAY for transportation (as it was designed to do!!). I am sick of these rich, entitled people who work from home and take over tax-payer funded streets and highways that people RELY ON to get to work -- yes people work on weekends too!!! Ride your bike in the various parks and designated bike paths throughout the bay area...there are many! Enough of this! We are sick of people using "environmental concerns" for their own benefits and to push their own agendas. I live in this district and these activists have NO right to be taking over the streets that they don't use to get to work. Period.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Horihan  
District 1 resident and owner

Sincerely,  
Laura Horihan



**From:** [Richard Kawala](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:30 PM

---

My name is **Richard Kawala**

My email address is **rkawala@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Kawala



**From:** [Lilian Lynch](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:29 PM

---

My name is **Lilian Lynch**

My email address is **[liliankim90@gmail.com](mailto:liliankim90@gmail.com)**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Lilian Lynch

**From:** [Rosemary McQuaid](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 6:15:29 PM

---

My name is **Rosemary McQuaid**

My email address is **rosemaryjmcquaid@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 McQuaid

**From:** [Matt Hoevet](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:58:08 PM

---

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,

- Matt

**From:** [Nicola Parisi](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:08:11 PM

---

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've lived in San Francisco for over a decade and one of my favorite parts about it is the amazing access to outdoor 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. 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!

Nicola Parisi  
Richmond District



**From:** [Abbey Levantini](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Support for Upper Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5:01:50 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Abbey and I am a resident of the outer sunset in District 4.

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 enjoys biking and walking the Great Highway every weekend! It is a safe and beautiful area for people of all ages to recreate. It has become a beloved part of our San Francisco community!

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.

Abbey Levantini  
D4 resident

**From:** [Mikayla Chang](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Great Highway pilot project  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:54:50 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Mikayla 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.

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.



**From:** [Megan Klevze Sutter](#)  
**To:** [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:24:33 PM

---

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.

My family and I visit the Great Highway park almost every weekend and have attended multiple events such as Halloween trick or treating and the Easter egg hunt. It is where my two daughters are learning how to ride their bikes and scooters. A vibrant community requires safe car-free spaces to gather in nature with each other and the Great Highway Park has been that for us as members of the outer sunset community.

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,

Megan Sutter  
District 4

**From:** [leslie.elwell](mailto:leslie.elwell@sfgov.org)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 4:00:23 PM

---

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,  
Leslie Elwell  
Outer Sunset District

**From:** [Brian Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:42:37 PM

---

My name is **Brian Lee**

My email address is **subr8ar@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Lee

**From:** [Sean McGrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:33:22 PM

---

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

**From:** [Michael Popoff](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:33:16 PM

---

My name is **Michael Popoff**

My email address is **sfpoaads1@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Popoff



**From:** [BRUCE BOURNE](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openhighway.com](mailto:info@openhighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:43 PM

---

My name is **BRUCE BOURNE**

My email address is **BWBOURNE@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.

The Bicycle Coalition has gone from "Share The Road" to "Give us the whole damn road" and I think that is a travesty. Please don't give in to this sort of pressure from a special interest group.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
**BRUCE BOURNE**

**From:** [ciara.piron](mailto:ciara.piron)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:39 PM

---

My name is **ciara piron**

My email address is **sfishome@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
ciara piron

**From:** [Shawna McGrew](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:38 PM

---

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

**From:** [Wally Rosales](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:35 PM

---

My name is **Wally Rosales**

My email address is **walterrosales837@comcast.net**

To whom it may concern, I am a veteran public servant, in which I've been commuting from my home in the Richmond District for the last almost 30 years. It's a long commute that I take and without a doubt, my favorite part of my commute is driving northbound and southbound along the great highway. In the mornings, it gets me off to a great start to my day and prepare to go out there and keep the public safe, on my way home when I see the ocean I know I'm home.

Covid took that away from me and thousands of others that use the great highway every month. I understand this was a phenomenon that happened to our world and we had to deal with it. But now radical coalitions trying to take away this small joy from us that depend and love driving along the great highway permanently is just absolutely unfair! Most of these folks that are involved in this don't even live in San Francisco, taking this simple joy and RIGHT away from a long time resident of this beautiful city is an absolute crime to not only me, but to every person that needs and enjoys driving along the great highway.

I understand about sharing this beautiful area of San Francisco and I for one am okay with sharing it and having it closed on the weekends, but to completely take it away from us permanently is an absolute disservice, insult and crime to the residents of San Francisco, especially the Richmond District. Please, please, do not close permanently this great joy that brings thousands of us that have to commute and use the great highway.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed

critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy

and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Wally Rosales



**From:** [wing.lee](mailto:wing.lee@sf.gov)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:35 PM

---

My name is **wing lee**

My email address is **wingli007@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,  
wing lee

**From:** [Ken Bentubo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:34 PM

---

My name is **Ken Bentubo**

My email address is **ken@bentubo.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,  
Ken Bentubo

**From:** [Georgette Petropoulos](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:32 PM

---

My name is **Georgette Petropoulos**

My email address is **georgettekp@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Georgette Petropoulos

**From:** [Roger Oyama](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:31 PM

---

My name is **Roger Oyama**

My email address is **rojioyama@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Roger Oyama



**From:** [Cranson Tong](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:31 PM

---

My name is **Cranson Tong**

My email address is **loenbho@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Cranson Tong

**From:** [Karl Baderschneider](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 3:32:31 PM

---

My name is **Karl Baderschneider**

My email address is **karl.surfacetech@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Sincerely,  
Karl Baderschneider

**From:** [Linda Mathews](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:57:26 PM

---

My name is **Linda Mathews**

My email address is **[linda.mathews@yahoo.com](mailto:linda.mathews@yahoo.com)**

Please do the right thing and conduct the environmental review. Just because the permit was obtained without warrant, doesn't mean it cannot be repealed. What they did was very sneaky and doesn't sound legal actually.

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Mathews

**From:** [Suzanne Schimaneck](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:57:26 PM

---

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



**From:** [mattnieder@aol.com](mailto:mattnieder@aol.com)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [rcllyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rcllyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Comment for Board of Appeals Meeting regarding Extension of the Coastal Zone Permit for Upper Great Highway Project  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 2:02:40 PM

---

## 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

To SF Board of Appeals Commissioners:

My name is Matthew Nieder and I live in the Mission.

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 indeed *great* because it borders a unique piece of the California coast called Ocean Beach. This is a natural resource that is not only special from an ecological viewpoint but one of the most accessible National nature reserves in the USA. It can be and is appreciated and used by people for various reasons in the most part sharing it in a generous respectful way. Making the Great Highway free from motorized vehicles during the daytime complements general access and use of Ocean Beach. Fewer people will get run over and more people will be able to walk, run, skate, and ride their bicycles to their favorite or maybe even a new spot to access the beach. Considering the Great Highway just another way to get from point A to point B as quickly as possible is short sighted. We already have many such roads and don't really need the Great Highway for that purpose in light of its critical location.

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](#).

Again, please uphold the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway and reject the appeals. Thank you.

mattnieder@aol.com

**From:** [Janet Kung](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:57:20 PM

---

My name is **Janet Kung**

My email address is **jrmkung@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,  
Janet Kung

**From:** [JACKLYN HANRATTY](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:57:18 PM

---

My name is **JACKLYN HANRATTY**  
My email address is **STROSE66@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,  
JACKLYN HANRATTY

**From:** [Jenna Newgard](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Keep Great Highway closed on the weekends!  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:45:35 PM

---

Hello Commissioners,

My name is Jenna and I am a resident of Lone Mountain/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.

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.

Jenna Newgard

**From:** [Lawrence Rhodes](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [rclyde@sfbike.org](mailto:rclyde@sfbike.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Board of Appeals Meeting Wednesday, February 7, 2024 5pm  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 7, 2024 1:28:14 PM

---

I think, as an avid cyclist and car driver, that closing the Great Highway for anything other than major 3 day weekends is madness. Cars are forced into neighborhoods not suited for high traffic loads. I don't ride for pleasure though it is a pleasure to ride. I ride to shop, get to work, etc. The free flow of all forms of transportation is vital to a smooth running society. I would be for the closure if no other alternative was available. However we have Golden Gate Park. A Mecca for bicyclists. I used to enjoy driving through the park on my way to work in Marin. I can no longer do so, but I think it is a wise move. JFK is a perfect place to learn to ride and have family outings. I do ride there to get to work in the Golden Gate Park Band. So I still get in a car free space at least once a week in the Summer. Thanks for the attention and please be reasonable on this issue. There is plenty of space on either side of the Great Highway that is always available for walking and riding. I see no need for closure to motor vehicles except, again, for holidays. That is when they would be used mostly. In my opinion. Sincerely,  
Lawrence Rhodes, Bernal Heights.

**From:** [Nancy Zerner](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [openthegreathighway@gmail.com](mailto:openthegreathighway@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Friday, March 8, 2024 9:34:13 AM

---

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

**From:** [Olivia Puerta](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 29, 2024 11:09:25 PM

---

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,

**From:** [Kim Russo](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [openthegreathighway@gmail.com](mailto:openthegreathighway@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 26, 2024 10:19:28 AM

---

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

**From:** [Judith Tornese](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [openthegreathighway@gmail.com](mailto:openthegreathighway@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Sunday, February 25, 2024 8:35:29 PM

---

My name is **Judith Tornese**

My email address is **jmtornese@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.

People use the Great Highway to commute to work & for general traffic needs, rather than driving through neighborhoods. Why are we allowing bicycles to take over our major routes for vehicle traffic in San Francisco?

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Tornese

**From:** [Michelle Lee](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardioffice@sfgov.org](mailto:engardioffice@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [openthegreathighway@gmail.com](mailto:openthegreathighway@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Saturday, February 24, 2024 11:21:24 PM

---

My name is **Michelle Lee**

My email address is **m13901738800@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,  
Michelle Lee



**From:** [Daniel Fleck](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiosstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiosstaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 5:11:18 PM

---

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,

Daniel Fleck

**From:** [Patricia Kimball](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [openthegreathighway@gmail.com](mailto:openthegreathighway@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 2:50:16 PM

---

My name is **Patricia Kimball**

My email address is **patricia.kimball@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

**WHILE YOU'RE AT IT: DUMP ALL PARK CLOSURES** [& the hideous obstructions that pose as "art"] & "SAFE" [sic] STREETS" & parking spaces taken up by bicycle rental spaces. The City has allowed the Bicycle Coalition and those in the City committed to eliminating vehicular traffic is a huge slap in the face to elderly residents & others who do not ride bicycles. These actions have made transportation and mobility across the park extremely difficult and have created terrible bottlenecks. Also, "safe" streets are actually dangerous, as they push drivers into oncoming traffic. It's hard enough driving with bicycles in one's blind spot all the time. This was all foisted upon the citizenry with only a false representation of "discussion". Many of us are outraged at this breach of the public trust.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Kimball

**From:** [Pamela Kimball](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [openthegreathighway@gmail.com](mailto:openthegreathighway@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 1:21:57 PM

---

My name is **Pamela Kimball**

My email address is **kimball.pd@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial for safeguarding the environment, ensuring public safety, and enhancing the quality of life in San Francisco, all while respecting legal and procedural standards.

Closure also makes it more difficult, expensive and time-consuming for we who live in the area to go about our necessary activities to function in our lives.

Sincerely,  
Pamela Kimball

**From:** [Michael Strain](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Thursday, February 15, 2024 9:22:48 AM

---

My name is **Michael Strain**

My email address is **michaelpstrain+fast@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is crucial 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 Strain

**From:** [RODNEY SEGAL](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 2:42:07 PM

---

My name is **RODNEY SEGAL**

My email address is **rod78351@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,  
RODNEY SEGAL

**From:** [Maria Spustek Rodgers](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](#); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](#); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](#); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](#); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](#); [info@openthegreathighway.com](#)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 2:17:15 PM

---

My name is **Maria Spustek Rodgers**

My email address is **Maria.Rodgers.001@gmail.com**

I urge you to overturn the Planning Commission's decision to issue the Coastal Zone Permit for the Upper Great Highway pilot project and to support the appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065.

This request stems not only from concerns over the impacts of the pilot program on urban mobility and public safety but also from significant procedural oversights in its implementation. SF Rec & Parks has bypassed critical steps required for such a considerable change, notably, the failure to conduct an environmental review before obtaining the necessary "Coastal Zone" permit.

This lapse in following established regulatory processes raises serious questions about the permit's validity and, by extension, the legality of the pilot program itself. The omission of an environmental review overlooks potential impacts on native species, such as the Snowy Plover, and disregards the broader ecological and community implications of closing the Upper Great Highway to vehicular traffic.

The consequences of the pilot program and the procedural oversight are manifold:

**Environmental Impact on Native Species:** The increased pedestrian and cyclist traffic threatens the habitat of the Snowy Plover, a sensitive and endangered species, due to the lack of an initial environmental assessment.

**Emergency Response Delays:** The closure significantly delays emergency responders, compromising public safety by hindering access to critical areas along the coast.

**Increased Traffic and Accidents:** The redirection of thousands of cars to surrounding neighborhoods creates congestion and has led to a noticeable rise in traffic accidents, affecting the safety and well-being of residents and

commuters alike.

**Elevated Air Pollution Levels:** With vehicles rerouted closer to residential areas, air pollution levels have spiked, posing health risks to the community, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, older adults, and pre-existing conditions.

**Longer Commutes:** For those who rely on the Great Highway for efficient travel, the partial weekly closures have resulted in significantly more prolonged and congested commutes, disrupting daily life and productivity.

Given the oversight of not conducting an environmental review and the resulting impacts, I strongly urge you to support the appeals. Ensuring compliance with regulatory processes is essential for any project's legitimacy and effectiveness. A more inclusive approach considering recreational and transportation needs can help the Great Highway meet our community's diverse requirements. This balance is 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... SUPPORT THOSE OF US WHO VOTE, WHO CARE FOR YOUNG CHILDREN AND THE ELDERLY, AND WHO NEED OUR CARS TO TRAVERSE THE CITY. THANK YOU.**

Sincerely,  
Maria Spustek Rodgers

**From:** [Lee Anne Weldon](#)  
**To:** [brian.stokle@sfgov.org](mailto:brian.stokle@sfgov.org); [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [info@greathighwaypark.com](mailto:info@greathighwaypark.com); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal); [chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:chanstaff@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Keep the Great Highway Park weekend compromise. Reject appeals 23-062, 23-064, 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 13, 2024 1:22:32 PM

---

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 family's access to and enjoyment of the shoreline. City agencies need to prioritize safe spaces for kids, seniors, and the entire community to gather and specifically to use the Ocean Beach shoreline for recreation. Great Highway Park and other projects like it are the best things to come out of the Covid pandemic, and the disheartening efforts to slowly dismantle this progress does not go unnoticed.

As a longtime resident of District 1, I expect my elected officials to work WITH the residents of this city in our quest to make San Francisco great for multi-generation families.

Thank you,  
Lee Anne Weldon  
834 27th Avenue  
SF CA

**From:** [Mark Cervantes](#)  
**To:** [boardofappeals@sfgov.org](mailto:boardofappeals@sfgov.org); [engardiostaff@sfgov.org](mailto:engardiostaff@sfgov.org); [MelgarStaff@sfgov.org](mailto:MelgarStaff@sfgov.org); [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal.chanstaff@sfgov.org); [info@openthegreathighway.com](mailto:info@openthegreathighway.com)  
**Subject:** I Support Appeals: 23-062, 23-064 and 23-065  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 13, 2024 6:30:39 AM

---

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