



**San Francisco  
County Transportation  
Authority**

1455 Market Street, 22ND Floor, San Francisco, California 94103 415-522-4800 info@sfcta.org www.sfcta.org

**Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Policy Advisory Committee  
Meeting Notice**

Thursday, March 11, 2021

6:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m.

Virtual meeting conducted via Zoom

1. Introductions
2. Modeling updates
3. Breakout Rooms: PAC Members will move into breakout rooms. Members of the public will stay in the main room where they may participate in a discussion facilitated by agency staff.
4. Group discussion
5. Next steps
6. Public comment

**Enclosure**

7. Agenda
8. Meeting notes from PAC #6

## DRAFT MEETING NOTES

### **Downtown Congestion Pricing Study Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #6**

**Date:** Thursday, November 12, 2020

**Packet:** [Follow this link](#) for materials shared in the meeting.

#### **Project staff:**

- Tilly Chang, Executive Director, Transportation Authority
- Rachel Hiatt, Assistant Deputy Director for Planning, Transportation Authority
- Colin Dentel-Post, Senior Transportation Planner, Planning
- Eric Young, Director of Communications, Transportation Authority
- Paige Miller, Senior Communications Manager, Transportation Authority
- Abe Bingham, Senior Graphic Designer, Transportation Authority
- Brittany Chan, Communications Coordinator, Transportation Authority
- Drew Cooper, Senior Transportation Modeler, Transportation Authority
- Michelle Beaulieu, Senior Transportation Planner, Transportation Authority
- Brooke Staton, Co-Founder, Managing Partner, Reflex Design Collective
- Ezra Kong, Co-Founder, Managing Partner, Reflex Design Collective
- Paisley Strellis, Director, Civic Edge Consulting

#### **Policy Advisory Committee Members in Attendance**

Central City SRO Collaborative (Evan Oravec), Commission of the Environment (Tiffany Chu), Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (Robin Levitt), Mission Economic Development Agency (Rajni Banthia), Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association (JR Eppler), SPUR (Jonathon Kass), San Francisco Bicycle Coalition (Janice Li), San Francisco Labor Council (Rudy Gonzalez), San Francisco Transit Riders (Peter Strauss), Senior and Disability Action (Pi Ra), San Francisco Bicycle Advisory Committee (Bert Hill), San Francisco Mayor's Office (Alex Sweet), South Beach | Rincon | Mission Bay Neighborhood Association (Bruce Agid, TransForm (Hayley Currier), UCSF Mission Bay (Amit Kothari), Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee (Nancy Buffum), Treasure Island Advocate (Barklee Sanders), Uber (Chris Pangilinan), Walk San Francisco (Jodie Medeiros), West of Twin Peaks Central Council (Steve Martin-Pinto), Yellow Cab of San Francisco (Chris Sweis)

#### **Not in Attendance**

A. Philip Randolph Institute, APA Family Support Services, Chinatown Community Development Center, ClimatePlan, El Centro Bayview, La Raza Centro Legal, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Council of District Merchants, SF Giants, San Francisco Human Rights Commission, Union Square Business Improvement District, San Francisco Travel, SOMCAN, The Greenlining Institute, Vietnamese Youth Development Center, Young Community Developers

## **Agenda Items 1-4 [[Presentation](#)]**

- *Introductions*
- *Where We've Been + What's Next*
- *Agenda Item 3: Activity Overview*
- *Agenda Item 4: Breakout Rooms*

**Breakout Room #1** - Facilitator: Colin Dentel-Post, Senior Transportation Planner

### **What are your overall reactions to the presentation?**

- PAC Member: concerned about TNCs - analysis showed that it would reduce TNCs by 6% and I don't think that's adequate, we need to reduce TNCs by at least 15%. On the expenditure side, need to be clear that 20-25% in Muni service (peak only?), lines that only run into downtown. What level of funding is available for capital support? Ex. buying garages, paying for increases in service. Essential that 15 million of 600 million goes to support base Muni service - need to stabilize service.
- PAC Member: Does CP area include Chinatown? If we want this to succeed, we need to talk to the merchants and we need to get their buy in. I work in Chinatown and a lot of people who live there don't seem to be aware of this.
- PAC Member: Income level that gets you exempted is really low and should be a bit higher. Are there numbers for car ownership within the proposed zone? Who are we worried about paying this? Thinking about resident and income exemption crosstab. Don't quite know what to think about TNC pricing yet, could encourage people to get a car of their own.
- PAC Member: Thinking about implementation of discounts and the barriers. Will the TNC charge be passed onto the rider? Think about the intended impact of the fee, we want to discourage people from taking TNCs.
  - TA Staff Response: We haven't gotten into details of TNC fee yet, but our assumption is that the TNC fee would get passed onto the rider. We looked at a cordon fee and \$9.50 per mile charge within the zone. We have not proposed to move forward with this because there are some folks who rely on TNCs.
- PAC Member: Did you look at how large the fee would look if it was a single fee, rather than a combined fee? Did you look at how the TNCs would impact group rides? Don't think a proposal that include 6% of TNC trips is worth including

### **What's worth looking into next? Any favorites so far?**

#### **Consistent Fee Elements**

- PAC Member: Why is it not a feasible path to charge TNCs the cordon fee and a per mile charge? Do low-income riders get a discount?
  - TA Staff Response: User base of TNCs is diverse and the logic here is fairness for users and is it a reasonable and affordable fee to pay. We could work with companies to get the discounts for low-income riders. Very-low income would pay no fee on TNCs.
- PAC Member: TNC trip riding is elastic. It takes high fees to discourage use, but there would be discounts for means and income-based levels which seems fair.

- PAC Member: What if you only charged the per mile fee to a middle and high income? Ultimate goal is to charge people with more money so we can have them take the bus or have their money go towards increasing buses.

### **Income-based Discounts**

- PAC Member: Great to have a 100% discount for low-income. If we have an income discount, why do we need a resident discount?
- PAC Member: have you thought about the idea of getting 2 trips a week for free? Is there a way to split the difference? Encourage people to try a different way to get to work but still charging them
- PAC Member: How many people are commuting downtown by car to the Richmond District? What are the numbers of people who have cars and are driving?
- PAC Member: Someone who lives inside the zone doesn't get charged anything for any internal trips?
- PAC Member: Who is the group that is going to be impacted without the resident discount? How many people are actually going to be benefiting from the discount that are commuting out of the district during a peak hour?

### **Other Discounts**

- PAC Member: should not be making the assumption that additional revenues be invested in transit subsidies, we should be able to decide what the investment goes.
- PAC Member: you pay bridge toll + pay congestion pricing fee, is there a drop in the amount of cars who drive across the bridge?
  - TA Staff Response: We will be able to answer this in the upcoming round of analysis,.

### **Investments**

- PAC Member: How can you assume that the ancillary capital costs are included in that because they're substantial
- PAC Member: is cross town and feeder too detailed for this level of analysis? Make sure you do look at some of those cross towns.
  - TA Staff Response: too detailed for the level of analysis we've done so far
- PAC Member: Give communities what they want - match need with investments
- PAC Member: Access to bike share/expansion of bike share as an investment
- PAC Member: Stabilize MTAs operating budget, off-peak service is free to some extent
- PAC Member: how are investments focused? focus on Vision Zero priorities first

### **Boundary**

- PAC Member: was there a lot of concern from businesses or was it pretty widespread?
  - TA Staff Response: here was concern from both sides
- PAC Member: have you spoken to the Tenderloin merchants in the outreach?
  - TA Staff Response: will check with our outreach team

**Breakout Room #2** - Facilitator: Rachel Hiat, Asst. Deputy Director, Planning

### **What are your overall reactions to the presentation?**

- PAC Member: UCSF has been able to provide input through PAC and through the meeting our leadership had with you. Concerns about those who work at hospitals and the boundaries. Understand we may have congestion soon, but if it doesn't come back should re-examine in a few years. Start with a smaller, most congested area, then expand later. Concerned about income thresholds too--50-70% for middle income is still a large amount of their income.
- PAC Member: regarding boundary, glad it has moved west to Laguna. Some neighborhoods are concerned about boundaries splitting them up--and this splits us in half. Hayes Valley goes maybe to Fillmore.
- PAC Member: Subsidies for income groups- feel uncomfortable subsidizing that as the purpose is to reduce driving. Should just give lower-income households an allowance to either pay for the fee, or for a taxi, or for transit or a bridge toll instead of this complicated system. They may choose to use the allowance for transit instead.
- PAC Member: generally seems like a good direction. Interested to know what you're thinking about people who aren't being honest with the system.
- PAC Member: People with disabilities and essential workers will still need to drive no matter how high the cost because public transit doesn't meet their needs. Some people with disabilities do drive, part of their independence and public transit doesn't always meet their needs. Would like to see equity when it comes to pricing.

### **What's worth looking into next? Any favorites so far?**

#### **Consistent Fee Elements**

- PAC Member: Low income discount makes sense to me. Thinking of this as successfully signalling that if folks in these income groups have an option to NOT drive they should do it, but not make it impossible to drive. 100% discount for very low income folks, it's challenging to pay for their vehicle, gas, parking--is a sufficient signal that if they didn't have to drive they wouldn't be.
- PAC Member: how is a disability defined?
  - TA Staff Response: It is an implementation detail that would need more work. For shorthand, what qualifies for MTA parking placard. Variations could be a further discussion.
- PAC Member: on placard, you're talking about private paratransit, not public. You're driving your mother around, or your disabled son. That's going to be a little harder to monitor. Placards are notoriously "stretched" into what isn't disabled. Agree that the small population of disabled folks who do drive shouldn't be punished for their disability.
- PAC Member: how does this work? For individuals with placards? He or she is in their own vehicle, but being driven by a family member? Is it the family member's vehicle with the placard?
- PAC Member: have a problem with subsidizing driving. Low income folks don't get a discount to buy gas or buy tires. The government is going to subsidize your driving--doesn't make sense to me. If they need a subsidy they can apply for a subsidy or an allowance any way they see fit. Maybe pay for gasoline or for tolls. If they want to avoid the fee, they can drive at a different time.

- PAC Member: love the idea of the allowance. My concern with this kind of situation with many regional trips, seems like that would be more complicated.
- PAC Member: It's basically like a tax. Essential works use it because they have to. Where is that line, where people use it because they have to.
- PAC Member: one of the key goals is to promote equity.
- PAC Member: TNC fee would depend on income of the rider?
  - TA Staff Response: Spirit of the policy is that your discount would apply to you even if you're in a TNC. We still need to determine how to implement that.
- PAC Member: principle of applying per trip makes some sense to me. 2 exceptions: inbound vs charging both ways, TNC gets one charge for one trip, don't know how that would work in each scenario. More significantly, maybe this isn't the place for this, but would want the TNCs to have a signal about driving around without drivers in them.
- PAC Member: appreciate where that came from daily caps for issues like school trips. Worry about folks who aren't stuck making multiple trips, but are choosing to.
- PAC Member: any feedback from TNCs? Assuming at the end of the day, all TNCs will be paid by rider and not TNCs.
  - TA Staff Response: that is the policy principle we've heard. And consistent with how the existing TNC fee is.
- PAC Member: No limit to how many fees TNCs pay? And they pay for every trip?
  - TA Staff Response: that is correct.

### **Income-based discounts**

- PAC Member: How would the transit subsidy work? If the toll is committed to a device, assigned to an individual, how does that work for transit subsidy?
  - TA Staff Response: this would be a separate program, there is an existing lifeline program that MTA has, and we would fund them to expand that.
- PAC Member: and this could subsidize transit trips that are occurring now. Not just encouraging people to quit driving.
  - TA Staff Response: Yes
- PAC Member: I have a car that has a transponder and I'm low-income. And my buddy who makes \$100k/year asks me to use my car, so he gets the discount. You could subsidize people who don't need the subsidy. And essential workers, shouldn't we be pushing for them to be paid decently so if they have to drive, they can afford to? Subsidizing car trips, lowest income folks live in the Tenderloin and SoMa, and they are enduring all the harm. If we're going to talk about equity, we need to start there.
- PAC Member: most essential workers will be coming into SF from outside the city. Transportation is just one part of the equity problem. Interesting that someone with a high income would drive a poor person's car. Can't solve all equity problems with one program. A lot of those folks have to drive, and at ungodly hours. People who live in the city, less need for them to use their vehicles. Essential workers inside the city are affected by traffic and don't use vehicles, it the essential workers outside the city, and it's about equity overall. Placard problem is like the rich guy driving the poor guy's car. Not gonna get everyone who will cheat, costs too much, so need a good balance to catch low hanging fruit cheaters.

- PAC Member: If it is essential that revenue be used for certain things politically, maybe needs to happen. Without that would be a fan of defining principles for how to invest funding and use that to drive investments.

### Investments

- PAC Member: At the highest level, if you're taking money from those who drive, should go to improvements to impact those trips--provide alternatives to improve them as choices. Not to improve programs that are already happening--repaving alone would take millions.
  - TA Staff Response: investments should be related to the program and not backfill.
- PAC Member: very broad principles, climate change, affordability, supporting active transportation goals. Wouldn't quite know how to apply. A tricky part here is the regional vs local. One would anticipate a lot of the income is from regional drivers, but falls under SF control. Need investments in regional trips at the proportion that they are paying.
- PAC Member: There are externalities from cars like air pollution, safety issues. I live in Hayes Valley, we have some of the worst air quality because of the traffic. I have asthma now, I attribute that to the traffic. Constantly cleaning window sills from tire dust. Costs folks have to pay, health, cleanliness, safety, the people who drive these cars should pay for those things.
- PAC Member: proposing to invest in healthcare due to asthma and other pollution related issues.
- PAC Member: say this goes through, and reduces congestion. People will still be suffering for 10-15 years because the pollution stays. Would that be a proposal to invest a % into healthcare and phase down over the years, hopeful that this would have an impact on our health.

### Boundary

- PAC Member: Western boundary proposed to be Laguna. Neighborhoods are concerned about being split. And Laguna splits us right in half. HVNA extends from Van Ness to Fillmore. Happy it includes at least part of the neighborhood, this is better than Van Ness. Should include maybe to Divis, should include Oak and Fell. Fulton is fine on the north side.
- PAC Member: does technology help so that its not such a sharp definition, to allow short trips near the boundary, so folks don't pile up at the boundary. But sure this will be a huge challenge.
- PAC Member: less likely to think a resident would take a short trip across a boundary. Those would be by bus or walk or bike, rather than drive 4-5 blocks. I'm also trying to think what impacts the boundary would have in a neighborhood. Businesses? Maybe it can be a "soft" boundary whatever that means. A little bit more flexible.
  - TA Staff Response: that is a challenge to think about, but we will.
- PAC Member: soft in the lenient way, and in a way to capture folks who are driving right to the edge of the boundary every day from a long distance.
- PAC Member: can we make boundary 2-3 blocks wide? Expand the edge differently.

## **Final Questions + Reflections**

- PAC Member: for subsidies, all the discounts. How do Stockholm and London and Singapore handle that?
  - TA Staff Response: they do not offer discounts for people with disabilities that I'm aware of. They are pretty different as far as structures. London's focuses discounts on residents, and Stockholm's focuses on small businesses. I'll send you those summaries. London's also focuses on clean vehicles.
- PAC Member: COVID 19 is on everyone's minds. Common anxiety is, when is this going to happen. Even if everything went smoothly, not until 2024 or 25, an indication of that to the public would help.
  - TA Staff Response: yes, multi-years effort, board decision and they need state authorization.
- PAC Member: You've done a lot to get out into the community. We're always happy to host events for our audiences.

## **Breakout Room #3 - Facilitator: Paige Miller, Senior Communications Manager**

### **What are your overall reactions to the presentation?**

- PAC Member: sounds like you had good feedback from city/social groups out there and have incorporated feedback pretty well, especially low-income discounts. Few questions about pricing, but think you're going in the right direction.
- PAC Member: appreciate "robust" outreach to reach groups, appreciate low income discounts.
- PAC Member: outreach has been good, SFCTA has taken a great, broad approach, got the right people in the conversation. After Walk SF's presentation, glad to hear TA's response.

### **Consistent Fee Elements**

- PAC Member: what about TNCs?
  - TA Staff Response: no cap for TNCs
- PAC Member: It seems like the three options result in the same revenue or fees being charged. Why did you try a two way?
  - TA Staff Response: 1-way less expensive to administer. 2-way generates more net revenue, can be deployed more flexibly.
- PAC Member: how would tolls be collected? Booths?
  - TA Staff Response: Fastrak-like, w/ cameras
- PAC Member: Venmo is a good idea
- PAC Member: People w/ disabilities? Does that cover caretakers?
  - TA Staff Response: We've heard this idea about a caretaker discount, this is the kind of feedback we're interested in. Thanks for the idea.
- PAC Member: Disability discount on par w/ transit discount?



- TA Staff Response: free for low income w/ qualifying disability. Also, discounts don't add, you get the best one.

### **Income-based discounts**

- PAC Member: why were resident/bridge discounts only in scenario 2?
  - TA Staff Response: Stacking more discounts further increases base fare. Could consider stacking them. These scenarios were designed to illustrate trade-offs between means-based and high-usage discounts. Very low income zone residents are already paying nothing, and low income getting 50%-67%, regardless of resident discount.
- PAC Member: how many zone residents would incur a charge? If it's pretty low, then we should save the discounts for people who need it more.
- PAC Member: what's the price point where people shift modes?
  - TA Staff Response: depends, in general though people are more likely to shift modes than to shift travel time entirely outside of peak period
- PAC Member: In the two way option, is it peak-direction? Would I get a free ride if I live in the zone?
- PAC Member: what about monthly passes? Or something like that?
  - TA Staff Response: haven't built that in, do you think we should consider it?
- PAC Member: if we get pricing right, then monthly discount isn't necessary. We don't get that w/ FasTrak. The one group I'm wondering about is, for example, electricians. Is two-way worse for them? Maybe w/ daily cap it doesn't matter.
- PAC Member: how would an electrician's vehicle get charged? Low income if the person is low income, or high income b/c it's a business?
- PAC Member: what about Amazon, other delivery services?
  - TA Staff Response: we are developing fleet policies, little fuzzy when we get to people doing deliveries but driving their own vehicles.
- PAC Member: not convinced that 2-way is the best way to go. What about bridges, that's Bay Bridge only, right?
  - TA Staff Response we represented it as all bridges, but that may not be our final rec. Golden Gate Bridge drivers are only 3% of people driving to NE SF.

### **Other Discounts**

- PAC Member: What is the Muni lifeline discount now?
  - TA Staff Response: Currently 50% for people who qualify as very low income. Today "low income" (but not very low) would pay full Muni cost
- PAC Member: Transit subsidies for low income groups is important
- PAC Member: Monthly discount for commuters? Or would that would reduce revenue?

### **Investments**

- PAC Member: Transit is a must have.
- PAC Member: How did you get to 25% increase in Muni service? Seems too low.
  - TA Staff Response: this is the amount needed to offset crowding
- PAC Member: should get more specific on who's getting service

- PAC Member: Need more transit, some buses already too crowded to get on.
- PAC Member: What is net revenue?
  - TA Staff Response: \$80M-\$100M based on scenarios we presented last time
- PAC Member: what are ambassadors?
  - TA Staff Response: unarmed civilians to help people navigate transit and to be present. Not for fare enforcement.
- PAC Member: transit service and bike/ped are important. So is paratransit for seniors/people w/ disabilities. First two are "need to have". .
- PAC Member: transit and bike/ped are must have. Paratransit, ambassadors, and school buses- explore more.

### **Boundary**

- PAC Member: Could you tell more about Chinatown concerns?
  - TA Staff Response: Merchants have concern about visitors being deterred. Residents concerned about someone coming to pick up grandma for doctor's visit in the zone. Looking into additional outreach to residents/merchants to try to develop solutions. Whereas Tenderloin was interested in reduced traffic, better environment.
- PAC Member: Is the hospital in the zone?
  - TA Staff Response: yes.
- PAC Member: what about patients?
  - TA Staff Response: emergency vehicles exempt, can look into solutions for other patients.
- PAC Member: What about Covid? When would CP happen?
  - TA Staff Response: when there's significant economic recovery and congestion is a problem. Also developing "stress test" scenarios for longer recovery.

### **Final Questions + Reflections**

- PAC Member: this solution makes sense, many taxi drivers would already avoid SoMa, this might make serving that market more viable. Think the benefits for low income are important.
- PAC Member: A bit concerned about equity/cost for low income, appreciate the thought and proposals, they have mitigated my concerns
- PAC Member: Couldn't agree more, this is one of the transformative policies for SF. Want more info on transit investments. My biggest fear is that this revenue will bring Muni back to pre-covid and that's it.
- PAC Member: happy to start a support group for other mothers biking to Mission Bay.

**Breakout Room #4** - Facilitator: Ezra Kong, Managing Partner, Reflex Design Collective

### **What are your overall reactions to the presentation?**

- PAC Member: Want to lift up a few things: Appreciate disability discount. Like means-based discounts. Discussion about boundaries makes sense, especially re: school and the southern boundary. Want to see more about resident discount.

- PAC Member: Want to talk about boundaries. Incorporated a lot of commercial core or neighborhoods that I don't think are downtown. Polk, 8th -- will force people to pay. Lots of the businesses have people that drive in from the west side of the city -- folks will choose other businesses rather than paying \$12/day. Big concern for merchants -- will decrease business and impact economy.
- PAC Member: Want to talk about boundaries of the zone. Want them to be contiguous and not divide neighborhoods. Have some concerns about the southern boundary. Campus on one side of line and student housing on one side. Mariposa boundary and 280 off-ramp could be an issue -- forcing people into Dogpatch and Potrero Hill. Use Division St as boundary to traffic circle -- then take King or Townsend and use 7th St as your boundary to 16th St.

### **Consistent Fee Elements**

- PAC Member: If you really want to reduce traffic, you need to reduce the subsidies. Especially for the higher income folks, you have to disincentivize their trips. People will game the system to pay less. Have to minimize discounts or loopholes. If I was low income, I'd still keep driving. If I was high income, I'd still keep driving. This pricing system won't change behavior. What's the intent? To generate revenue or to reduce congestion?
- PAC Member: Is there a way to make this more progressive so that you're really charging the higher income folks more to do a better job of changing behavior?

### **Income-based discounts**

- PAC Member: Favor bridge toll payer discount because a lot of minimum wage commuters have moved out of the city -- these folks run on a tight budget and can't necessarily afford to keep their SF jobs if they have to pay two charges.
- PAC Member: Need to understand how pricing impacts minimum wage commuters coming from East Bay -- would like to understand modeling impacts for people making \$19ish an hour -- have to consider how not to penalize these folks.
- PAC Member: Many office employees will never go back to the office, but the low-wage workers are still going and will have to continue -- this could really pinch these folks (just like the rich people who will pay the price and not really be impacted)
- PAC Member: We have a lot of front-line public health workers who are moderate or middle income folks who live 2 hours away because they can't afford to live in the city.
- PAC Member: Low-wage service workers are so critical for the AMI thresholds -- 2 people earning minimum wage together are just at the border of the income thresholds
- PAC Member: How would people establish their eligibility for a certain AMI level?
- PAC Member: Like the idea of 2-way since it gives you more opportunities to smooth your travel flow over the day -- understand it's a balancing act with cost but presents options rather than just smoothing the morning
- PAC Member: More favorable to just means-based rather than means-based and toll payer discounts -- better disincentive to driving over the bridge in an SOV, whether moving people into buses or carpools.
- PAC Member: Hybrid between scenarios #2 and #3 is preferred.

## **Other Discounts**

- PAC Member: Have to have zone resident discount -- but need to better define it, but it's critical, especially for service workers who do live in the zone -- how will you qualify? What about people who are undocumented or unhoused? Or those who are couch surfing? Want to know if this is just a loophole we're creating or if it's helpful to people.
- PAC Member: Yes, need to have it but need to understand the criteria. Is zone resident based on vehicle registration or the resident's home location? Need to define how you establish residency.
- PAC Member: Feel strongly about the transit subsidy as a need to have to help change behavior
- PAC Member: What's the definition of a zone resident? Does it include small businesses or any of their staff?
- PAC Member: For the tiny businesses I represent, the business owners can afford the fee and work it into their fees. The employees might not be able to pay though. But more important is the customer -- will they come into a small business in the zone? Could push more local folks to stay at their local restaurants, but most restaurants really do have to draw from the outside. Could be a big impact to businesses that rely on customers driving in. Can we get this data?
- PAC Member: Prefer not to have a bridge toll subsidy, as it won't discourage people from driving.

## **Investments**

- PAC Member: Connected and protected network of bicycle lanes to travel easily and safely is most important -- ensure the network we have is protected as much as adding a bunch of new infrastructure.
- PAC Member: For a border community, need an investment in parking enforcement on corridors and residential zones to ensure we don't become a parking lot for people parking and hopping on the bus to go the last mile into the zone.
- PAC Member: Would also like to see traffic calming in areas around the cordon as an investment.
- PAC Member: How is your analysis taking COVID into account? What are we doing to think about the new volumes? Are we sure the numbers are realistic? Do we really know we could generate this amount of revenue? And what do we know about long-term behavior change and how long it will take for the economy and traffic to rebound?
- PAC Member: Would buses be citywide or just in the zone?
- PAC Member: There is a question about how new school assignment process will impact the need for buses, so be aware of that and study the cutting edge on this.
- PAC Member: If they're genuine school buses, yes. Want lots of kids on one vehicle. But school district is using zoom for busing kids -- that's more vehicles, not less. Be careful about just enabling another private fleet.

## **Boundary**

- PAC Member: Are border streets included? Would like to see data showing what's happened after Market St going car-free -- nearby streets feel more chaotic and would

like to see the patterns and consider how that might inform the boundaries. Want the least amount of congestion possible, so there's part of me that would like to see Van Ness included (have to pay if you're driving on it). Also appreciate it not being included so I can visit all the businesses on that street. As an individual, I'd be incentivized to hop on the bus on Van Ness if I was charged for it.

- PAC Member: Map looks like Republican gerrymandering in Democratic territory. Would be really hard to understand how to navigate the zone. Want something a lot simpler to digest -- clear boundary that's really easy for people to understand. Tenderloin wants to reap revenue benefits to help the community. Some commercial corridors that don't want to be in could be incentivized with transit corridor improvement or bike lanes (or a parking lot) could get them to adopt the zone. Hayes Valley wanted a street included and that's great -- have to be careful about creating chaos in other areas, too
- PAC Member: Isolating Mission Bay with this geography. 14th is awkward -- splitting off a block of the Mission in some ways no matter what. Freeway is an issue -- good chunk of the neighborhood identifies with other areas rather than Mission Bay. Cutting off at SoMa would be better. Don't include 16th street in the boundary -- would be a massive problem for the neighborhood. Part of Owens within the cordon would be a big deal if the border went to 16th -- that's a bunch of local traffic that would be. Need to be able to drive from Mariposa off-ramp and up Owens, making a left on 16th St before hitting the cordon. The current boundary would take drivers from offramp of highway and shunt traffic to the surrounding residential area. Want to understand the fuzzy line around the bend at Mariposa. Solution: 13th to Townsend or King, 7th St to 16th St

### **Final Questions + Reflections**

- PAC Member: Still optimistic that we can come up with a plan that works and can be successful -- the devil is in the details, but I understand that congestion pricing could be a good thing.
- PAC Member: Not as optimistic as before COVID because of the fact that it started and stopped once before.
- PAC Member: Have a bit of a hybrid opinion. Devil is in the details. Congestion pricing can work if done correctly. Worst thing is congestion on top of congestion pricing. As for my outlook on congestion pricing, I am cautiously still undecided.

**Breakout Room #5** - Facilitator: Paisley Strellis, Director, Civic Edge Consulting

### **What are your overall reactions to the presentation?**

- PAC Member: What are hours? Peak hours on weekdays (6:30 - 9:30, 3:30 - 6:30)
- PAC Member: want to get in to trade-offs, equity
- PAC Member: looks like a good synopsis of what we talked about. Is there a cost difference for implementation? All achieve the same congestion reduction goal.
- PAC Member: equity focus - map is supposed to be based on community feedback. Concerned about outreach that has occurred that has led to these proposals. Participated in Chinatown and Tenderloin co-creation workshops. Thought there was

very little time allotted to input, most time allotted to presentation. There is the aspect of do the numbers work out but also the aspect of whether people will be ok with this.

- PAC Member: How does better Muni service factor into Better Market Street and this project?
- PAC Member: went to both co-creation and community presentation outreach. They tend to be really presentation heavy, white, older people. Should start with what people want, then look at what will technically work.
  - TA Staff Response: We are tasked with onboarding people to his complicated activity and then get feedback. Feedback on how to do this better is welcome.

### **What's worth looking into next? Any favorites so far?**

#### **Consistent Fee Elements**

- PAC Member: Thinks we should consider TNC fee applying to taxis.
- PAC Member: Not sure if 50% disability discount is right. Want to make sure we aren't decreasing disability access downtown. Would be interested to know how many zone residents and people with disabilities are covered by the income discounts. Could there be a discount/exemption for TNC fees for people with disabilities/low-income?
  - TA Staff Response: Would have to figure out how to technologically do that but worth exploring.
- PAC Member: Uber WAV. In NYC, had a cap but allowed WAVs to grow. How to allow service for people with disabilities.
- PAC Member: if you live in the zone and don't leave, do you not have to pay?
  - TA Staff Response: Yes.

#### **Income-based Discounts**

- PAC Member: Glad to see low income discounts. Not sure about moderate income discounts. What are the cross tabs for people with disabilities, zone residents for TNC trips touch the zone or are in the zone?

#### **Other Discounts**

- PAC Member: zone resident discount - two scenarios have no resident discount. Few schools in the zone and but some kids too young to put on transit. To have no discount, it would indicate that families just shouldn't live in the zone.
- PAC Member: what are the cross tabs for bridge toll payers? How many bridge crossers are middle and high income? Excluding commercial drivers.
- PAC Member: Does math work for the bridge toll payer discount?

#### **Investments**

- PAC Member: Top two priorities seem right on. Ask MTA what they need. There might be un-sexy things like traffic calming. Easy to say this as a goal, but what are the specifics. Concerned about implementation. Better Market Street can only fit certain amount of vehicles per hour. Van Ness and Geary BRT - can they handle this? Can we actually spend this much money - do we need capital improvements?
- PAC Member: Need transit in place on day 1.

- PAC Member: How to make it easier for people to take transit - like passenger info, ambassadors, fare integration.
- PAC Member: School buses. School district looking at school assignment system to hopefully get kids closer, within a couple years. Explore improving accessibility of taxi and many on-demand fleet.
- PAC Member: hard to find money to pay for paratransit so this could be a good source of revenue.
- PAC Member: great nexus between congestion pricing and accessibility for people with disabilities. Agree with need to have. Isn't street repaving already paid for?

### **Boundary**

- PAC Member: Reason we left off Franklin and Gough? May snare some families who would have to pay
- PAC Member: Inclusion of 19th Ave? Weekend recreational traffic?
- PAC Member: there was a debate about whether developer impact fees should be tied to where the development is - they decided no. Same question here - should investments also be made in places where people are coming from to facilitate their transit trip downtown, for example. Are investments planned to be only downtown? So that people have a good bike route to get to downtown.

**Breakout Room #6 (Public room) - Facilitator: Eric Young, Communications Director, SFCTA**

### **What are your overall reactions to the presentation?**

- Member of the Public: How are the income levels determined? What are the sources for these?
  - TA Staff Response: Based on existing income levels primarily devised around housing affordability and AMI; we could consider adjusting these
- Member of the Public: Concern that this program asks for personal information about the vehicle occupant. How are you going to gather this information for anyone who would enter the SF congestion zone? And how will this information be matched to a vehicle?
  - TA Staff Response: We haven't determined what technology would be used, but we'd likely look at technology similar to what's used on the bridges. Transponder would be matched to vehicles.
- Member of the Public: Really excited and pleased to see CP moving forward - feels optimistic that we can create a fair and effective program.
- Member of the Public: Treasure Island is a nuanced situation and I'm curious how this applies to a community that lives on an island and doesn't have a choice to avoid these tolls.
  - TA Staff Response: We're working on a transportation plan for TI and we're planning on doing Treasure-Island specific outreach.
- Member of the Public: Upset that she did not hear about previous outreach meetings and concern that a small number of people have contributed - outreach is not just data gathering. Concern about how affordability will work. Concerned about congestion being caused by rideshare and a low cap. We don't have a transit system that works - this

would work if we had better transit. Wants to know what problem this is supposed to solve (congestion? Rideshare vehicles? Cannot lump these together). CP will create an unexpected expense for people who occasionally want to travel downtown.

- TA Staff Response: Explained that this is not the end of outreach. We agree transit now is not where it needs to be to support congestion pricing.

## **What's worth looking into next? Any favorites so far?**

### **Consistent Fee Elements**

- Member of the Public: Wants clarification about who the income level applies to in an Uber/Lyft (the driver? the passenger?)
- Member of the Public: How do we know which vehicles are Uber/Lyfts? Do you see problems with this because Uber/Lyft are sanctioned by the state?
- Member of the Public: When an Uber/Lyft is not picking someone up, they could be a private individual - how will we distinguish?
- Member of the Public: What will be charged to TNCs per trip?
- Member of the Public: Are you going to invoice the company or the drivers?
- Member of the Public: Regardless of who is in the Uber/Lyft the fee will be charged, which will be passed onto the rider.
- Member of the Public: What is the percentage of commercial vehicles that would cross the boundary? And how would these vehicles be charged?
- Member of the Public: Commercial vehicles are a huge problem and recommends higher fees for these vehicles; potentially lower the fee during non-peaks hours
- Member of the Public: Charging extra for commercial vehicles is a very bad idea; a lot of businesses especially in Chinatown will be driven out of business - they rely on daytime deliveries and they may not be able to get off-peak hour deliveries (extra burden put on businesses to stay open extra hours). Also, a lot of people who work and live in Chinatown are not aware of congestion pricing and we need their buy-in.
- Member of the Public: What time of day will CP operate?
  - TA Staff Response: We're thinking M-F during AM/PM rush hour (6:30-9am, 3:30-6:30pm)

### **Income-based discounts**

- Member of the Public: The discount levels refer to families of 4 but this is not necessarily indicative of drivers in the City. She is a shift worker and has to drive into the zone because transit is not available when she needs it and then drives out of the zone during peak hours - she would be unfairly charged. For individuals making \$75k or less, \$14 per day is a lot to pay. We're punishing people because they live in the city and/or because they are shift workers. Overall, if this program is to be implemented (she would prefer it isn't), the low-income threshold needs to be higher.
- Member of the Public: This is going to be very hard on businesses that already aren't doing well during the pandemic.
- Member of the Public: Need an incentive for electric vehicles.



- Member of the Public: A lot of the danger posed by cars in cities is not due to burning gasoline; PM 2.5 comes from brakes and tires, not just gas.
- Member of the Public: Making it easier for some to drive downtown is counter to the purpose of the program, e.g., shifting trips to off-peak hours is not reducing VMT, of emissions, or effecting mode shift.

### **Other Discounts**

- Member of the Public: Residents shouldn't have to pay at all.

### **Investments**

- Member of the Public: Good idea to increase investment in transit; the problem is that the level of investment that is needed is huge
- Member of the Public: All of these things need to happen but not convinced CP is the way to do it
- Member of the Public: In favor in ear-marking revenue for transit and bike/ped investments
- Member of the Public: what does "minimum investment" mean? Is this on top of what we have now or what is actually needed to maintain the current load?
- Member of the Public: Need to consider who is able to ride transit and/or take a bike; these options are available to everyone
- Member of the Public: Concern that this program will make it easier for people who have more money to travel into the zone.
- Member of the Public: Give Muni buses signal priority to make them move more smoothly. We're not giving mobility limited people other options - we need a more comprehensive transit system. T 3rd extension isn't enough. Also, the average person does not feel safe on BART.
- Member of the Public: Need a comprehensive transportation improvement plan before moving forward with this plan
- Member of the Public: Feels like we have a cart before the horse in the planning of this. We've mixed up congestion with a lot of other goals. If you want to reduce congestion, you'd charge more to people who come into the zone more frequently. We've mixed this up with other goals.
- Member of the Public: Want the revenue from congestion pricing to be put towards the loss in businesses due to the program and therefore the loss in tax revenue - there's no guarantee that this CP revenue will be used for transit
- Member of the Public: Excited that there's potential for so much revenue to be put towards transit and bike/ped investments.
- Member of the Public: Don't want to see a program that disperses money into the General Fund; the rules for how the expenditures will be used needs to be tightly controlled in the legislation
- Member of the Public: Talking about transit needs to come way before congestion pricing planning.
- Member of the Public: This program needs to pay for itself; but the first goal is to reduce congestion in the zone that is dangerous for people who live, work, and visit there - need

to keep this as the top priority. We've come a long way with this and we really need to do it.

### **Boundary**

- Member of the Public: this will be a tough sell to Chinatown; merchants depend on tourism, commercial vehicles supplying their shops (they didn't like when 480 freeway was torn down); need aggressive outreach and buy-in from this community.
- Member of the Public: Concern with boundaries; Mariposa cuts UCSF in half; also strange how the boundary cuts through Potrero Hill - take it north or way south.
- Member of the Public: Boundary is too broad and shouldn't split neighborhoods e.g., she lives in Potrero and would have to cross the boundary to go to the grocery store just a few blocks away and it's difficult to walk especially with groceries.
- Member of the Public: There are very important facilities right on the boundaries (e.g., UCSF on Mariposa); people who drive to these locations will park within several blocks.

### ***Agenda Item 5: Report-outs and Group Discussion***

- Discounts serve as a behavior signal to higher income groups.
- Discount should stay, but we should be careful about discount implementation
- We should be investing in transit to meet increase demand.
- It should be emphasized that one group spent a lot of time talking about TNCs and how that fee can be equitably dealt with among different income groups.
- One group was generally happy with the fixed pricing structures and concerned about affordability for lower-income residents and drivers.
- Some members preferred income/outbound and the rest preferred just inbound. The general preference to not have discounts for residents, and it was unanimous to invest in transit and to keep low-income people prioritized.
- Want less crowded buses and increased services - better than pre-covid service.
- Generally, people seem to be onboard with congestion pricing, but the TA should focus on details.
- Strong support for improved paratransit.

### ***Agenda Item 6: Next Steps***

- Agency staff shared the study schedule and planned next steps. Timeline has been extended to ensure thorough engagement. Next phase is analysis that will include outreach from late February to April. A recommendation will be presented to TA Board in the summer, then the final report and final recommendations will be made in October.

### ***Agenda Item 7: Public Comment***

- Public comment: People are going to have to pay to go to Safeway, Smart & Final, etc. The boundaries are going to make it expensive to go to regular shopping. You haven't done a price sensitivity analysis to identify if people are going to pay this if they're coming from elsewhere.
- Public Comment: This is just like another tax. This will hurt businesses and people who work odd hours. Income levels need to be adjusted to include people who live alone and earn 75,000.

- Public Comment: A simple way to judge equity is a regression analysis. I am against this program.
- Public Comment: I want to express how excited I am about congestion pricing.
- Public Comment: I think it's an interesting idea, but San Franciscans rely on their cars. Without adequate transit alternative we'd be in big trouble.
- Public Comment: To me this is a solution in search of a problem. If we want to solve congestion we need to invest in transit infrastructure.
- Public Comment: I don't know how you know people's income when they're in a car. Most of congestion in San Francisco is from people outside the city who come to work downtown. I don't think any residents in San Francisco should be charged.
- Public Comment: This program does not consider people who live in outer areas where Muni is not efficient.
- Public Comment: If the tolls will be implemented, Treasure Island needs to be more connected by transit, bike, etc. Majority of us are low-income, so keep that in mind.