

The SFMTA Board of Directors will consider passage of legislation to regulate private transportation vehicles (PTVs) on Tuesday, October 3. Right now there is only one private company offering mass transportation services in San Francisco, Chariot, which is owned by Ford. This legislation was originally considered on September 19, and you can see the documents here: <https://www.sfmta.com/calendar/meetings/board-directors-meeting-september-19-2017>. The legislation proposes to grandfather in Chariot's current routes, prohibit Chariot and other PTVs that may start service in San Francisco in the future from replicating Muni routes, and restrict the size of vehicles. The legislation does not call for an EIR, does not limit the number of PTV vehicles or companies that can operate in San Francisco, and does not propose to charge the full amount that the City could charge of use of government infrastructure -- City streets. In fact, the legislation suggests permit discounts if PTVs extend service into under served neighborhoods!

Please:

-- **oppose grandfathering in of routes.** This is corporate giveaway o Chariot/Ford and does not restrict the number of vehicles on already existing Chariot routes. Additionally, the SFMTA memo that accompanies the legislation outlines current conflicts with Muni because Chariot/Ford is now replicating public transportation routes. It's hard to imagine how these conflicts will not increase in number if grandfathering is permitted and the number of PVT vehicles is not restricted;

-- **demand an EIR.** The City needs to start assessing private transportation systems that it permits to operate on City streets. Recall that a judge ruled that the City needed to conduct and EIR for the Bicycle Plan. It should do an EIR for motorized systems of transport that seek to compete with our public system, which is moving toward renewable fuels and electric vehicles;

-- **demand that the City charge for the use of government property above and beyond genuinely regulatory aspects of the PTV program.** In 2010, California voters passed Proposition 26. This Proposition restricted many government fees to cost recovery. However, there are exceptions. Fees for use of government property is one. In 2012, San Francisco cab drivers sued the City and County of San Francisco to try to lower the price of medallions (\$250,000). The City won the case (Bill Mounsey vs. CCSF; see the attachment below) based on the exceptions included in Proposition 26. PTVs, according to the proposed legislation, will be regulated under the local taxi code, thus it would make sense for the SFMTA to charge similar per vehicle fees to PTVs that it charges for medallions; and,

-- **demand that every PTV vehicle is handicapped accessible.** Chariot vehicles are not handicapped accessible;

The City also has the power to prohibit PTVs from operating on City streets, and based on the competition that Chariot poses to Muni and on the fact that Chariot's profits are based on breaking the law, **you may opt to testify that the City should banish PTVs** - or at least Chariot. As some of you may know, Chariot/Ford's operations have involved using public bus stops in violation of [California Vehicle Code 22500.5](#), double parking in order to pick up and drop off passengers, parking in crosswalks, and [illegally posting sandwich boards on City sidewalks](#).

If you cannot attend the meeting on October 3, at 1 p.m in Room 400 of City Hall, please submit an email to the MTABoard@sftma.com.