



DRAFT AGENDA

Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Notice

Date: Thursday, December 12, 2019; 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Location: Transportation Authority Hearing Room
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco

- 1. Meeting #1 Follow-ups [Presentation] [Q&A]**
Meeting accessibility for committee members, meeting #1 notes, public engagement
- 2. Why Congestion Pricing + Existing Conditions Part 1 [Presentation] [Q&A]**
An overview of congestion pricing as a tool and information on San Francisco's existing transportation landscape
- 3. Learnings from Outreach to Date [Presentation] [Activity]**
Present learnings from the first round of outreach and changes, get feedback from committee members
- 4. Goals and Objectives [Presentation] [Activity] [Vote]**
Present draft goals and objectives, get feedback from committee members and discuss priorities
- 5. Engagement Plan: Co-Creation Workshop Materials [Presentation] [Activity]**
Present co-creation materials, committee members give feedback
- 6. Next Steps**
Action items, future Policy Advisory Committee meetings
- 7. Public Comment**
Members of the public have an opportunity to provide public comment

Enclosure

- 11/21/2019 Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Notes
- Draft Goals and Objectives
- Updated Policy Advisory Committee Roster
- Updated List of 1:1 Listening Sessions



**San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority**

Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, December 12, 2019 Page 2 of 2

Additional Information

The Hearing Room at the Transportation Authority is wheelchair accessible. To request sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Clerk of the Board at 415-522-4800. Requests made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting will help to ensure availability. Attendees at all public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products.

The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Grove/Hyde Streets). Accessible Muni Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center or Van Ness Stations). Muni bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 6, 7, 9, 19, 21, 47, and 49. For more information about Muni accessible services, call 415-701-4485.

Draft Meeting Notes

Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Date: November 21, 2019

Packet: See [here](#) for all materials shared in meeting, including presentations noted below.

Project Staff

- Tilly Chang, Executive Director, Transportation Authority
- Rachel Hiatt, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, Transportation Authority
- Eric Young, Director of Communications, Transportation Authority
- Paige Miller, Senior Communications Manager, Transportation Authority
- Drew Cooper, Senior Transportation Modeler, Technology, Data, and Analysis, Transportation Authority
- Michelle Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, Policy and Programming, Transportation Authority
- Brooke Staton, Co-Founder, Managing Partner, Reflex Design Collective
- Julia Kong, Managing Partner, Reflex Design Collective
- Tracy McMillan, Senior Associate, Nelson\Nygaard
- Emily Roach, Associate, Nelson\Nygaard
- Paisley Strellis, Director, Civic Edge Consulting

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Members in Attendance

A. Philip Randolph Institute (Jackie Flin), Central City SRO Collaborative (Evan Oravec), Commission on the Environment (Tiffany Chu), Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association (J.R. Eppler), San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (Laura Tolkoﬀ), San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (Brian Wiedenmeier), San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations (Maryo Mogannam), San Francisco Giants (Josh Karlin-Resnick), San Francisco Human Rights Commission (Brittini Chicuata), San Francisco Labor Council (Rudy Gonzalez), San Francisco Transit Riders (Peter Straus), San Francisco Travel (Jessica Lum), South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay Neighborhood Association (Bruce Agid), TransForm (Hayley Currier), Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee (John Larson), Uber (Shin-pei Tsay), UCSF Mission Bay (Amiee Alden), Union Square Business Improvement District (Karin Flood), Walk San Francisco (Jodie Medeiros), Yellow Cab of San Francisco (Chris Sweis)

Not in Attendance

APA Family Support Services (invited), Chinatown Community Development Center, ClimatePlan, District 11 Mobility Justice Committee, El Centro Bayview, The Greenlining Institute, Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association, La Raza Centro Legal, Mission Economic Development Agency, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Senior and Disability Action (invited), South of Market Community Action Network, Vietnamese Youth Development Center, West of Twin Peaks Central Council, Young Community Developers

Agenda Item: Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda

Agenda Item: Study Purpose and Background

Agenda Item: Role of the Policy Advisory Committee

Agenda Item: Q&A with Public Feedback

PAC Question: The 2010 study shows a border for the congestion pricing zone at 18th Street. There have been significant developments north of 18th Street, including the UCSF Medical Center and the Chase Center. Were other Mission Bay employers, such as the Golden State Warriors, invited to participate in this PAC?

- **Hiatt:** We've tried to limit the size of the PAC to make it a more effective working group (there are currently 35 invited members, but we could easily have had 60). The Warriors and many other stakeholders have been engaged in one-on-one conversations about the project.

PAC Question: Can you talk about data collection and when we can expect to see it?

- **Cooper:** There are a few sources of data that will be used to inform the study. A key data source is the travel diary data that is currently being collected from approximately 5,000 people across the nine-county Bay Area using a cell phone app that tracks their travel.
- **Hiatt:** We are also looking at attitudinal info and census info.
- **Cooper:** We are using established weighting methods to correct for age, income, smartphone ownership, and other inherent bias in the data.

PAC Question: Better Market Street will have impacts on travel. How are you working to incorporate that project in this plan?

- **Hiatt:** When we try to predict traffic patterns we will represent the changes to Market Street as assumptions in our predictions, and use Better Market Street data if available to inform those scenarios.

PAC Question: How are you projecting long-term for new technologies like autonomous vehicles or increased numbers of electric vehicles that create additional wear and tear on infrastructure by being heavy?

- **Hiatt:** We will be incorporating existing and emerging technologies into the scenarios that we develop.

PAC Question: Is there going to be more time spent on the “why” of congestion pricing? It seems premature to talk about how we are going to weigh stakeholder opinions when not everyone in the room has bought into the idea.

- **Hiatt:** That’s a great point – we will take that step back and discuss the “why” further in upcoming meetings.

PAC Question: Are we going to get lessons-learned from cities that have implemented congestion pricing?

- **Hiatt:** Yes, we are putting those together now and will bring you case studies at an upcoming meeting.

PAC Question: Is this going to be approached through a regional lens?

- **Hiatt:** Yes, we want regional contributions both in terms of data collection and stakeholder engagement. We are in the process of learning where the trips downtown are coming from and where they go, so we can learn what we are trying to address. Are there travelers who don’t have transit alternatives? If so, we don’t want to negatively impact them because they don’t have the ability to shift. We can respond to such unintended negative impacts through refinements to the policy.
- **PAC follow-up:** TransForm is a regional organization and as part of the PAC we will be looking for input from regional travelers.
- **Miller:** We agree about this being a regional project. We have some ideas for reaching regional travelers and will be asking for your ideas on how best to reach them.
- **Staton:** Additionally, we are going to use a co-creation process to specifically work with communities that have been negatively impacted by policies in the past.

Public Comment: You’ve defined a year-long exercise that culminates in recommendations to the board. Then what?

- **Hiatt:** Our final recommendations will include implementation options and a plan for deployment, should the Board decide to proceed to next steps. We know this will involve additional analysis as well as state approvals – these considerations will be included in the final recommendations.

Public Comment: There are several neighborhoods not represented on the PAC – how will they be heard?

- **Staton:** We have a number of engagement strategies including co-creation workshops, pop-ups, surveys, and more. We will review the engagement plan as part of our meeting tonight.

Public Comment: Will recommendations consider time of day that congestion pricing is implemented?

- **Hiatt:** Yes.

PAC Question: Will transportation improvements be implemented in conjunction with the onset of congestion pricing?

- **Hiatt:** Yes, that has been a successful strategy for other cities. Part of this study will be to consider what those day-one improvements will look like.
- **Chang:** I just testified to Congress about what this should look like. If we don't have the capacity to show improvements to Muni on day one - which we hope we can - we will need to look at alternative options. I want to note that we are already advocating for that kind of federal investment or other revenue streams to make day-one improvements possible.

PAC Question: What will the funds raised through congestion pricing be used for?

- **Hiatt:** We have not decided – that is part of the study.
- **Staton:** Congestion disproportionately negatively impacts low-income communities in a variety of ways. This is particularly unequitable as low-income communities use transit more heavily. In addition to reducing congestion, what is done with the funds raised through congestion pricing will be an important opportunity to improve equity.

PAC Question: Why was the 2010 study not implemented?

- **Hiatt:** The Transportation Authority board adopted the report in 2010 but the recession made it difficult to implement. We were asked to evaluate other options, like parking pricing, which was implemented. Over the last 10 years, congestion has returned as well as new issues like TNC traffic. However, the 2010 study informs where we start with our current study.

PAC Question: Have you asked why people drive downtown rather than take other modes and why they drive during peak hours? Can you increase frequency and reliability of Muni without congestion pricing?

- **Miller:** We launched a survey this week to ask questions like “How do you get downtown? Why do you make the choices you do?”
- **Hiatt:** As far as traffic management – can we increase frequency of transit and capacity? One of our goals is to be able to move more people with the limited street space we have. The downtown congestion pricing study is considering how to move more people within the same amount of street space by encouraging those who don't need to drive to shift and freeing up the space.
- **Chang:** We have looked at existing improvements, including added service and giving transit priority. However, we know from our current studies that without further reducing congestion, improvements to transit is just not enough to make the impact we need.

Chang: One note on this process – the Transportation Authority is taking on this project because we are the designated congestion management agency for San Francisco County. Our number-one indicator of congestion is bus speeds. We are dedicated to closing the gap between transit travel times and car travel times.

Agenda Item: PAC governance protocol

Agenda item: Activity: Meet Fellow PAC Members

Agenda Item: PAC governance protocol [Vote]

Activity Report-Out

- **PAC Member:** My biggest fear is that we will end up with congestion pricing and it won't solve congestion. You'll end up paying a little more and getting a little less. What do I hope for is that we will get to the "if" and the "why" of congestion pricing. Is this going to work, why will it work? People are being forced out of their cars, but they should be enticed onto transit. Transit should be clean and reliable.
- **PAC Member:** Transit alone is not going to solve this problem. The transit system and the bus system can't get better until we deal with congestion. Traffic is why our buses are getting slower not faster. This is one tool that we can use to manage congestion to allow transit to work better. It is my hope that we get ahead of the curve before the onset of autonomous vehicles. One of my fears was that this was not moving expeditiously enough – or at all. But someone else in my group worried it would move too quickly!

Inclusive Decision-Making Conversation

PAC Member: How many items will we be voting on at each meeting?

- **Hiatt:** Future meetings will be two hours long (as opposed to tonight's two-and-a-half-hour meeting), so we expect there will be one to two action items per meeting.

PAC Member: I want clarity that each vote is weighted equally – there are a lot of people who are missing. If vote night happens and only some members are present, how might you weigh or discount the outcome?

- **Kong:** There are PAC members missing today. One thing we could talk about is that if people are missing – any item that people are giving agreement on will be online 72-hours in advance. If someone can't be here, they can still submit their vote online or by phone. We do imagine each vote will be weighted equally – but it is something we can think about in future meetings.

PAC Member: Will the voting items be announced as part of the packet?

- **Kong:** Yes, and members could have the opportunity to vote by phone or via email in advance of meetings if they cannot attend. The team will consider the options and bring back a revised proposal to address this.

PAC Member: Sometimes processes can be weaponized, for example if someone attempts to use the process to disrupt forward progress. How will that be addressed?

- **Staton:** The idea of having two processes, consensus and flagging, is an opportunity to give people a chance to stand up for their communities.
- **Kong:** This is a risk in the equity flagging process, since it can be used inappropriately. But it also serves a critical role in accountability to equity. We are open to ideas on how to prevent the process from being weaponized.

PAC Member: At the time of a vote will there be some sort of decision-making support tool like an evaluation matrix that shows what the outcome implications of our decision will be?

- **Hiatt:** Yes, as the technical staff we need to bring you the tools to weigh tradeoffs against goals.

PAC Member: If a decision point passes with a score that is just slightly over the approval threshold, and those who have voted against it have issues that are correlated or clustered, will that be included in the record?

- **Hiatt:** We certainly want to hear minority views. We are asking that PAC members write down and share with us their concerns so we can address them in a future action or policy suggestion, if they are not addressed in an initial decision point. We want to document minority concerns, particularly if they are shared.

PAC Member: Is this how we will vote on final recommendations?

- **Kong:** Yes.

PAC Member: I am still concerned about regional input and quorum.

- **Hiatt:** As far as the roster – you can see that there are a lot of people who did RSVP and didn't make it. We will need to learn more about why they aren't here and potentially ask them to identify alternates. We also have a broad engagement plan aimed at regional engagement.
- **Chang:** There are neighboring agencies who are partnering with us on the technical advisory committee (TAC). We are looking for ideas through them as well as generating ideas internally. We are particularly interested in reaching more vulnerable groups who are in the farther-away communities and who are harder to reach.
- **PAC Member follow-up:** Would like you to come back with info about how you are going to engage a regional audience.

PAC Member: With regard to participants voting in advance of meetings, I don't like the idea of PAC members voting remotely and "armchair quarterbacking." Part of our process is hearing one another's perspectives and if you vote prior to the meeting you've already made up your mind without that input.

Hiatt: These are great questions and some of these we would like to give some thought to and respond to in the future after we've had time to consider.

Kong: It sounds like our primary concern is how to capture votes and/or input of people who are not in the room, whether it is PAC members or other stakeholders throughout the region.

DECISION POINT to Adopt the decision-making process: Average is 3.8

- **Kong:** Because this is above the 3-point approval threshold, it means that the PAC will move forward with this decision-making process and will loop back about concerns.

Agenda item: Community Engagement: Approach

Agenda item: Activity: Editing the Engagement Plan [Voting item]

Miller: One note on the engagement plan – it is an outline – it has the “how” but not the “who.” At our next meeting we’ll be sharing a list of groups to whom we’ll be conducting outreach.

PAC Member: What’s the overall budget for the study and what is the communications budget?

- **Hiatt:** The overall study budget is 1.8 million, being funded through local Prop K transportation sales tax, Metropolitan Transportation Commission regional funds, and local City development impact fees.
- **Miller:** Of that \$1.8 million, about \$700,000 is dedicated to outreach – 2/3 of that amount for direct costs and 1/3 for staff time.

Public Comment: How will the list of community groups to be engaged be developed?

- **Staton:** We know a number of stakeholders from our previous work in San Francisco and the Bay Area. We have also been in one-on-one conversations with community leaders to learn who else we should be talking to. We also hope to learn from PAC members and members of the public who attend these meetings.

PAC Member: How will you ensure a representative sample for your current survey? Will CBOs be paid to distribute the survey and engage with their communities? How will you ensure that all community members are heard?

- **Miller:** We are asking demographic questions to track who is responding to the survey. We know that digital is not the only way to distribute it, and we are working to distribute paper versions. We do not currently have a plan to fund CBOs but can certainly explore that suggestion.
- **Staton:** For our co-creation process, we are thinking about geographic diversity as well as the dynamics of lower transit service and quality for certain San Francisco neighborhoods.
- **Kong:** We are looking very closely at the Tenderloin, SoMa, Chinatown, and Mission for co-creation because they are along or are close to the potential borders of the congestion pricing area. We are also looking closely at how we can engage car-reliant neighborhoods such as Excelsior, Visitacion Valley, Bayview, as well as commuters and displaced folks coming from places such as Antioch.

PAC Member: What is the plan to ensure geographic diversity in the engagement process?

- **Chang:** Data from the travel survey will help inform this process. We are also working on earned media – including in-language media – to spread the word to communities across the region. We are going to be pitching stories and would welcome ideas for story angles from PAC members.

PAC Member: How will you be sharing the data findings with the general public?

- **Miller:** All of the items noted in the engagement plan are ways that we will be reaching out to share findings and collect feedback.

PAC Member: Will the feedback be presented to PAC members as well?

- **Staton:** Yes.

PAC Member: How will the 2010 congestion pricing study inform this work?

- **Hiatt:** From a technical standpoint, we'll be collecting new data to understand how things have changed since 2010, and also looking at the data that does stand up over time. We are starting out much farther along in the research process than we would be without the benefit of the 2010 study. We can explain what parts of our research are taken from the previous work in terms of the project design at upcoming meetings.

PAC Member: I'd like to suggest pop-up engagement at BART stations to reach a wide variety of people including commuters. I'm glad to know that the survey results will inform further outreach. It currently appears that the western 75 percent of the city is not really being considered. There may be some interest from people out there about what's happening downtown!

PAC Member: I hate the name congestion pricing. Please consider branding and suggest a title for the project that is not so technical and dry. Additionally, looking around the table we have a lot of businesses represented, but few of us are trusted community representatives. I'm concerned about those implications for the study and will be interested to see how you make this an inclusive process.

DECISION POINT to adopt the engagement plan: Average is 3.9

Agenda item: Next Steps

Agenda item: Q&A with public feedback

Summarized Comments from PAC voting:

These comments were received from PAC members in writing on voting cards.

- Reiterated concerns expressed on voting cards regarding the PAC voting process:
 - Makeup of the PAC: e.g., who will show up, who gets decision-making power
 - How voting will relate to quorum (how many folks are attending, and who is represented for a given vote)
- Reiterated concerns expressed on voting cards regarding community engagement plan:
 - Request for additional clarity around the community engagement plan
 - Concern that agenda was unclear, wanting to be sure that every item on it is articulated in the written agenda

Written Questions from the Public

Numerous questions from the public were submitted to staff during the meeting but time did not allow for staff to answer all of them. Transportation Authority staff answered the following written questions after the meeting.

Written question from the public: Will transportation alternatives (i.e. more bus, BART, Muni, bike lanes) be implemented/added in-situ with the implementation of the congestion pricing to provide an outlet for residents wanting to avoid the charge?

- In order to effectively reduce congestion and provide options for people who shift from driving on the first day of implementation, a congestion pricing program would require upfront investments to accommodate more people using sustainable travel modes like transit, walking, and biking. Other cities that have implemented congestion pricing have launched expanded transit service and other improvements along with congestion pricing. Through this study process, we will learn what service and other improvements are most important and which could be in place at the start of a congestion pricing program. We will also work with SFMTA, regional transit agencies, and funding partners to identify ways of introducing improvements ahead of or along with new toll revenue to fund them.

Written question from the public: What is the intent of using funds collected from the pricing scheme? More transit? Other departments? And to what extent will the funds be divided?

- Our 2010 study recommended a revenue investment package designed around improving travel options to and within downtown, for all modes of travel. A recommendation for the use of funds will be determined throughout the course of the study in partnership with local agencies and the public.

Written question from the public: You have defined a year long exercise which culminates with a recommendation to the Transportation Authority board. Is thought being given to what happens if the board accepts a plan in 2020? In other words, what next?

- Our 2010 study estimated that it would take about 5 years to get from study conclusion to start of a program. These steps include authorizing legislation, securing additional funding, detailed design, environmental review, construction and startup (including time needed for launching day 1 improvements), and communications.

Written question from the public: Do existing congestion pricing schemes consider time of day variation in pricing?

- Yes, in a few different ways
 - London has a flat fee between 7AM and 6PM. Free outside those hours.
 - Stockholm has set prices which vary throughout the day.
 - More expensive during morning and evening rush hour
 - Cheaper in the morning, evening, midday
 - Free at night
 - Singapore has charges which vary by the ½ hour. These rates are adjusted every 3 months. Rates go up if traffic is slower than desired during a ½ hour period. Rates are lowered if traffic is moving freely.



Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Goals and Objectives – DRAFT 12/09/2019

Introduction:

Traffic congestion is a significant problem in downtown San Francisco and SoMa. We are exploring how a fee to drive into downtown/SoMa during busy hours could keep traffic moving while making our transportation system safer and more equitable. This is a strategy called congestion pricing.

Timeline and Status of Study

Throughout fall 2019, the Transportation Authority is engaging in a “listening” period to confirm our study approach. We’re conducting one-on-one listening sessions and launching a community-led Policy Advisory Committee to better understand how congestion impacts San Francisco’s communities, especially the most vulnerable. Our goal is to shape a study that leads with equity and is built in partnership with the community.

We will begin our public outreach efforts in early 2020. We’ll use public input to shape and test various scenarios for what a downtown congestion pricing program could look like. We expect to bring a final recommendation to our board for approval at the end of 2020.

Why is the Transportation Authority conducting this study? What is the problem the Transportation Authority is trying to address?

San Francisco has a transportation equity and traffic problem, and it affects everyone. This doesn’t need to be the case and we can do something about it. We’re looking at congestion pricing to flip this dynamic by prioritizing public transit and addressing the unequal burdens of climate change on low income and minority communities. These priorities will help us build a more fair and healthier transportation system while alleviating traffic congestion downtown.

What is the congestion pricing study?

Congestion pricing is a tool we are considering to manage traffic, address inequities, and promote transit use. Through congestion pricing, we would charge a fee to drive into downtown and SoMa during the busiest times. Through the end of 2020, we will be working with community members and technical experts to understand what an effective and equitable congestion pricing solution could look like. We are still early in the process, and we will be working with the community to see if this idea works. If we decide to implement congestion pricing, we will need to obtain state legislative approval and conduct further planning.

Why is the Transportation Authority doing this study now?

We’ve considered this approach before. In 2010, a feasibility study found that congestion pricing would significantly improve air quality and the flow of traffic. Since then, traffic in San Francisco has worsened and is expected to continue to get worse as we continue to add residents and jobs. Now, we are leading the study with equity, focusing on downtown and SoMa and updating our analysis.



How does the 2010/MAPS study impact this study?

1. The MAPS data is useful for today's discussion, but it is not current
2. The proposals in MAPS are useful for discussion, but we are not beholden to those recommendations today
3. This study relies on collecting new information, including data and people's preferences, to focus on how to make congestion pricing work best for all of San Francisco

How would congestion pricing affect people?

We understand that people want to know how congestion pricing will benefit them, not make things worse for them. In this study, we will learn more about how congestion pricing would affect different types of travelers. We are working with communities to understand who is traveling into downtown and SoMa during busy times, how they are traveling, why they are making the trip, and how many of these peak travelers are part of vulnerable communities. This will help us design congestion pricing in a fair and equitable way.

What are the Goals of Congestion Pricing?

We have proposed the following seven goals for a congestion pricing program in San Francisco:

- 1) Move more people: enable the transportation ecosystem to bring more people and goods into the downtown area in an efficient, reliable way
- 2) Provide better choices for those with the fewest choices: expand non-drive-alone choices to outer neighborhoods and those who have limited efficient, reliable, and affordable options to get to the downtown area
- 3) Promote fairness: contribute to an equitable future for communities of concern, specifically in the realm of environmental health, public health and safety, and economic opportunity
- 4) Meet San Francisco's climate and ecological goals: contribute to the overall sustainability of the city by reducing greenhouse gas and other emissions, as well as reducing harmful runoff
- 5) Make downtown neighborhoods safer, more livable, and healthier: support projects that create safe and healthy communities through improvements to the public realm and active transportation network.
- 6) Promote commerce by improving the efficiency of the roadway network: make it easier for goods and services to travel in the area through reduced congestion
- 7) Promote a thriving and vibrant commercial and cultural district: support more walkable and vibrant downtown neighborhoods to increase trips to small businesses, and support help arts and culture thrive by bringing more space and people to art and culture destinations



Downtown Congestion Pricing Policy Advisory Committee Updated 12-09-2019

The Policy Advisory Committee will advise the project team throughout the study. The committee consists of representatives from neighborhood groups, historically underserved communities, advocacy organizations, labor and business organizations, and groups that focus on the environment, equity, and health.

The committee includes representation from the following organizations:

1. A. Philip Randolph Institute
2. APA Family Support Services
3. Central City SRO Collaborative
4. Chinatown Community Development Center
5. ClimatePlan
6. Commission on the Environment
7. District 11 Mobility Justice Committee
8. El Centro Bayview
9. The Greenlining Institute
10. Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association
11. La Raza Centro Legal
12. Mission Economic Development Agency
13. Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association
14. San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association
15. San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
16. San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
17. San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
18. San Francisco Giants
19. San Francisco Human Rights Commission
20. San Francisco Labor Council
21. San Francisco Transit Riders
22. San Francisco Travel
23. Senior and Disability Action
24. South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay Neighborhood Association
25. South of Market Community Action Network
26. TransForm
27. Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee
28. Uber
29. UCSF Mission Bay
30. Union Square Business Improvement District
31. Vietnamese Youth Development Center
32. Walk San Francisco
33. West of Twin Peaks Central Council
34. Yellow Cab of San Francisco
35. Young Community Developers



One-on-One Listening Sessions

The project team is holding one-on-one interviews with members of the community during fall and winter 2019.

Complete

Nicole Bohn

Director of the Mayor's Office on Disability

Dion-Jay (DJ) Brookter

Executive Director of Young Community Developers (YCD)

Eric Chan

Community Organizer for SF Transit Riders and Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN)

Kit Dai

Dean of City College San Francisco, Chinatown Campus

Tyra Fennell

Founding director of Imprint.City
Board member of SPUR

Karin Flood

Executive Director, Union Square BID

Alexandra Goldman

Senior Community Organizing and Planning Manager at Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

Matthew Goudeau

Director, San Francisco Grants for the Arts



Miriam (Mir) Green

Owner of Wicked Grounds Kink Cafe and Boutique
Community leader in the LGBTQ and Leather District within SoMa

Joshua Karlin-Resnick

Transportation Manager, San Francisco Giants

Warren Logan

Policy Director of Mobility and Inter Agency Relations, Office of Mayor
Libby Schaaf

Manoj Madhavan, Raymond Ridder

Director of Transportation Demand Management, VP of
Communications, Golden State Warriors

Christina Olague

Lead of El Centro Bayview - Mission Neighborhood Centers

Peter Papadopoulos

Land Use Policy Analyst at MEDA

Michael Pappas

Executive Director, San Francisco Interfaith Council

Jason Porth

Executive Director, San Francisco State University
Also: Caitlin Steele and Nick Kordes, SFSU Office of Sustainability

Azja Ragasa

Student at San Francisco State University
Organizer for the Pistahan Parade and Festival

Chhavi Sahni

Interim Executive Director, Golden Gate Restaurant Association



**San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority**

Jason Serafino-Agar

Founder of My Bike Skills

Amy Farah Weiss

Community Organizer

Co-Founder of the St. Francis Homelessness Challenge

Sherry Williams

Executive Director of One Treasure Island

Eddy Zheng

Former Executive Director at the Community Youth Center of San Francisco

Former board member of Chinatown Community Development Center

Staff of SOMCAN - South of Market Community Action Network

Community advocacy group in SoMa

Scheduled/to be scheduled

Joe D'Alessandro

President and CEO, SF Travel

Vincent Boudreau

President, City College of San Francisco

Kevin Carroll

Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco

Michon Coleman

Regional Vice President, San Francisco Hospital Association

Regina Dick-Endrizzi

Executive Director, Small Business Commission



**San Francisco
County Transportation
Authority**

David J. Fike

President, Golden Gate University

Rodney Fong

President and CEO, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Marc Intermaggio

Exec. Vice President, Building Owners & Managers Association

Nick Josefowitz

Director Policy, SPUR

Brian Kingston

CEO, Forest City/Brookfield Properties

Randall Scott

Executive Director, Fisherman's Wharf CBD

Alex Tourk

Consultant, SF.Citi

Francesca Vega

Vice Chancellor, UCSF

Jim Wunderman

President and CEO, Bay Area Council