



Downtown Congestion Pricing Study

Outreach Findings

Spring – Fall 2020

Introduction

A primary objective of the Downtown Congestion Pricing Study is to ensure low-income communities of color would be helped and not harmed by a congestion pricing policy. Recognizing that low-income communities of color have historically been excluded from and often harmed by the planning process, the project team is working to lead the study with equity by inviting these communities to be collaborators in the outreach and engagement process.

The team kicked off the study in winter 2019 by hosting listening sessions with community leaders to get initial input on the study topic, process, and convening a Policy Advisory Committee with strong representation from equity-focused organizations to advise the project team throughout the study. With guidance from these stakeholders, the team developed an outreach strategy focused on working in collaboration with community organizations to design co-creation workshops that are accessible and relevant to their communities.

The team conducted the first large phase of community outreach from February to October 2020. This outreach round was paused when the global pandemic hit. The Policy Advisory Committee advised the project team to continue outreach with the study, recognizing that without intervention, a future economic recovery is likely to bring a return of traffic congestion and its negative impacts. The team then updated the study's outreach tools from in-person to remote with the goal of maintaining an equitable outreach strategy in a socially distant world.

During this first large phase of community outreach for the study, the project team introduced the concept of congestion pricing to the community and gathered feedback on the general concept of congestion pricing along with a long list of policy questions, such as:

If congestion pricing was implemented, how much should the fee be?

Who should receive a discount or exemption?

Where should the revenue go?

This memo outlines outreach activities and a synthesis of feedback from the first large phase of community outreach. Feedback from this phase of outreach will be used to inform a “short list” of three congestion pricing proposals that the project team will take back to the community for feedback during a second large phase of outreach in winter 2021.

Feedback Tools

The project team utilized the following channels to notify community stakeholders and gather feedback:

- **20+ Co-Creation workshops with 159+ participants** from Communities of Concern, including:
 - 5 workshops in Spanish
 - 7 Cantonese-only workshops
 - 1 mixed Cantonese-English workshop
- Reached out to **250+ community organizations**, resulting in **60+ meetings with community groups and the public**, including groups in all 11 San Francisco districts and regional stakeholders
- **1,000+ digital survey responses** (Unclog Fog City game) and almost **300 text survey responses** representing all 11 San Francisco districts and regional stakeholders
- **Custom in-language surveys** distributed through Russian American Community Center to the Russian community and through Self-Help for the Elderly to Chinatown business owners
- **Digital outreach**
 - 50K+ impressions and 350+ comments on social media
 - 3,052 unique visits to project webpage
 - 1,651 unique visits to blog
 - 587 views of congestion pricing videos
 - Email correspondence with stakeholders - over 70 emails received from the public
- [WalkSF report](#) of input they gathered from **280+ outreach session participants** in the Tenderloin, SoMa, and Bayview

Publicity Tactics

- **400+ multilingual posters in key corridors** in SoMa, Excelsior, Outer Mission, Ingleside, Oceanview, and Bayview
- **20 multilingual posters** in downtown parking garages
- **Spanish and Chinese newspaper advertisements** placed in Sing Tao and El Tecolote
- **Earned media** in several outlets (cumulative circulation/viewership estimated to be at least 349,000 people)
 - San Francisco Examiner
 - San Francisco Chronicle
 - Sing Tao
 - Mission Local
 - KTVU morning show
- **Digital outreach**
 - Website, NextDoor, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, WeChat, LinkedIn

Summary Key Findings

Overall themes

- **Input varied widely** on whether congestion pricing is a good idea, from very opposed to strong enthusiasm. For example, members of the Human Rights Commission Community Roundtable expressed strong opposition to the idea, due mostly to equity concerns. Meanwhile, members of Urban Environmentalists expressed strong support for the concept, noting its environmental and livability benefits. In general, the co-creation workshops and digital survey input channels, both of which allowed participants to design a recommended program while learning about the options and weighing tradeoffs themselves, resulted in higher levels of support for congestion pricing than other outreach methods that did not feature a strong co-design approach.
- The **most common concerns** included affordability for people with low and moderate incomes, existing challenges with public transit due to COVID-19, what the recovery from the pandemic and recession will look like, and effects on businesses.
- The **most popular benefits** included transit improvements and health and quality of life improvements for congested areas.
- **Income-based discounts and exemptions** for the congestion pricing fee and for public transit were a top priority.
- **Investment in transit was most popular** across all outreach formats, closely followed by pedestrian and bicycle safety upgrades.

Key findings from the neighborhood level

- **Hayes Valley** residents wanted Octavia Blvd to be inside the boundary.
- **Mission Bay** stakeholders had varied opinions, some supportive and some not supportive of the congestion pricing and whether the neighborhood should be included in the zone.
- **Chinatown** stakeholders had widespread concerns about effects on equity and merchants as well as concerns about being inside the boundary.
- **Tenderloin** residents were interested in potential safety and transit benefits
- Neighborhoods near the border, such as **Potrero**, **Mission** and **Japantown** did not want the boundary to split their neighborhoods.
- **Bayview** residents had concerns about how to get downtown given the difficulty of public transit in southeast San Francisco.

Limitations of Outreach

- **Regional outreach:** The Policy Advisory Committee strongly encouraged the project team to conduct thorough outreach to regional stakeholders, particularly those who have been displaced from San Francisco and have limited public transit options to access the city. About 35% of the text and online survey respondents live in the greater Bay Area region. However, the project team continues to work to establish relationships with equity-based regional partners for co-creation. Many regional stakeholders said that congestion pricing outreach is not a priority for them given that only a fraction of their

communities regularly travel to San Francisco, and that staff are currently addressing other challenges facing their communities. For this reason, the project team has planned remote outreach workshops for late October. Rather than partnering with community organizations to co-host these workshops, the project team will host them and recruit participants through community organization networks and flyer-ing.

- **Demographic breakdown of online survey respondents:** About half of respondents provided “optional” demographic information on the online survey. Of those who did complete the demographic information, the respondent breakdown differed from San Francisco’s population, skewing more white and higher income. The project team focused much of its outreach strategy on co-creation workshops which focused on gathering in-depth feedback from low-income communities of color to ensure the study process included thorough feedback from historically underinvested communities.

Key Findings from Co-Creation Workshops

Co-Creation Overview

Central to the engagement strategy is a series of collaborative “co-creation” workshops held in partnership with organizations in historically underinvested communities. These workshops seek to build creative solutions through deep and accessible community engagement. The project team workshoped policy ideas with community members during the first series of workshops and will return to the community a second time to continue to iterate on policy ideas. Co-hosts and participants receive compensation for their time.

During the first phase of workshops for the study, participants engaged in a card game where they balanced tradeoffs to design a potential congestion pricing program. In small groups, participants chose from a set of discounts/exemptions and then a set of investments, each costing a number of “tokens.” Participants then chose a peak period congestion fee which provides a number of tokens to pay for the other elements of their congestion pricing policy or could choose a “no fee” option and no discount or investment cards. Participants could iterate as needed to develop a balanced overall program. Although most sessions came to agreement on all the program elements, some were inconclusive with participants selecting discount and investment cards but not reaching agreement on the fee element to create a balanced program.

CARD GAME INSTRUCTIONS

Blue SUBSIDY cards: Each card includes a discount or exemption to help protect certain groups. Choose as many blue subsidy cards as you want.

Red INVESTMENT cards: Each card includes transportation improvements to make it easier to get downtown without a car. Choose as many red investment cards as you want.

Green FEE cards: Choose a fee to enter or exit the congestion pricing zone.

ANALYZE: Do you have enough tokens from your FEE card to pay for your congestion pricing program? If not, choose a higher FEE card or remove some SUBSIDY or INVESTMENT cards.

FEE
\$ ✓

\$12 for moderate, middle, and high income drivers

\$6 for low income drivers

\$0 for very-low income drivers

COLLECT
7
TOKENS

SUBSIDY
%

Discounted transit for more low-income riders

Expand the Lifeline program to provide discounted local and regional transit fares to downtown for more low-income riders.

Example low-income definition based on household size:

- 1 person < 65k annually
- 2 people < 75K
- 3 people < 85k
- 4 people < 95k

SPEND
3
TOKENS

INVESTMENT
📦

Transit improvements

Provide more frequent buses on 10 congested or underserved Muni and regional routes serving downtown.

SPEND
2
TOKENS

After the pandemic hit, the project team worked with co-hosts to develop a remote co-creation model where participants received physical workshop kits in the mail and joined a call or webinar with project staff to go through the workshop. Collaboration with household members was encouraged.

The project team made adjustments based on the needs of each community, including hosting workshops in-language and adjusting the timing to accommodate constraints in communities hard-hit by the pandemic. In some cases, organizational capacity constraints due to COVID meant the team needed to find a different co-host to work with a community.

Due to schedule changes in response to the pandemic, the components of the card game changed between spring 2020 when the project team initially launched outreach, and summer/fall 2020, when the project team had updated modeling information. For example, the summer/fall version of the game featured a one-way inbound fee instead of the two-way fee featured in the spring 2020 version of the game. These limitations are reflected in the analysis below.

The information represented here is synthesized from co-creation workshops from February to early October 2020. The planned upcoming regional workshops being hosted for those outside of San Francisco have not been incorporated into the findings yet.

Participant Information

Workshop Location	Community Partner	Total Attendees	Languages Used
Bayview	Young Community Developers & APRISF	30	English
Chinatown	Chinese Newcomers	17	English and Cantonese
Excelsior	Excelsior Works!	27	Cantonese
Mission	MEDA	13	English and Spanish
Mission Bay	CCDC	20	English
Mixed	El Centro & Senior and Disability Action	15	English and Spanish
SoMa	BiSHoP	3	English
Tenderloin	Central City SRO Collaborative	23	English and Spanish
Visitacion Valley	APA Family Support Services	4	English
West Side (Richmond + Sunset)	Self-help for the Elderly	7	Cantonese
Total		159	

Overall Themes

Theme 1: San Francisco has an affordability crisis and study recommendations should prioritize advancing equity and affordability.

People and small businesses in San Francisco struggle with affordability

- Many participants are concerned about housing and overall unaffordability.
- Increased travel costs would further strain budgets for families, workers, and small businesses.
- Affordability was a common primary concern for congestion pricing; this may have been why 10 sessions (about 24% of all sessions) wanted no fee at all or very low fees for drivers (\$1-3)

Participants overwhelmingly prioritized income-based discounts and exemptions over other types of discounts and exemptions.

- Very-low- and low-income communities should be a top priority and protected from fee costs. Some participants said that everyone in both very-low and low-income categories should get a full exemption.
- The income levels should be expanded to help moderate-income individuals. Of note, there is a heavy impact on individuals who are right on the cusp of being able to receive income-based social services but still have to grapple with the high expenses of San Francisco.
- There are many implementation questions/concerns:
 - How would someone get the subsidy (in terms of process) and how would that eligibility be verified?
 - How can people easily get this subsidy without going through lots of hoops and hurdles?
 - How would the government prevent abuse of the system (i.e. someone using another person's low-income status pass)?
 - Just because a subsidy exists, it doesn't mean that everyone who qualifies would get it. Very-low to low-income individuals may not know about subsidy, be afraid to get it because it'll get counted as public charge, have language barriers, etc.

A majority of participants prioritized transit discounts

- Many participants talked about how public transit is currently too expensive, and that it is actually cheaper to call an Uber/Lyft.
- Some participants brought up a need for seniors to be subsidized for transit, including those that may not be covered under means-based subsidy.

Some support for a discount for people with disabilities

- Some participants prioritized this discount because it is difficult for people with disabilities to get around and they should not have to pay more.

Some support for a bridge toll discount

- Though participants often supported this, usually they would prioritize income-based discounts and exemptions and public transit improvements over this discount.
- A small group of participants did choose this discount, and usually it was in consideration of workers who need to commute from the East Bay to get to San Francisco. They thought it would be too much for someone to pay both the bridge toll and congestion fee.

Some support for a resident discount

- There is some support for a downtown resident-based subsidy because they felt the idea of paying the congestion fee to go in and out of the area they live in is "ridiculous."
- However, some people noted that if someone is a high-income resident, they should not get this discount.
- Some people went further to say that residents should be fully exempted from the fee.

Some support for a daily cap

- Some parent participants spoke strongly about the impact of congestion pricing on their childrens' needs (school drop offs and pickups multiple times a day, it's more convenient to drive, it's safer to drive with young kids, etc.). They think congestion pricing would be unfair given this.

Theme 1 take-aways for program design:

- **Prioritize income-based discounts and exemptions while including other discount options in scenarios.**

Theme 2: Participants overwhelmingly prioritized public transit investments and emphasized the need for improvements to happen prior to a congestion fee.

Participants want major improvements to transit

- Improvement needs cited included:
 - More frequent and reliable service
 - Adding routes and stops
 - Safer and cleaner transit (less crime, fewer collisions, overcrowding)
 - More parking around transit hubs
 - Less crowding
 - Add different types of transit options (shuttles, pedicabs, bike shares)
- Some participants had questions around the future of transit given service cuts and usage due to COVID-19.
- Some participants emphasized the importance of improving transit before a congestion pricing is put in place, especially for neighborhoods like the Bayview. Some were skeptical about the government's ability to improve transit on a promised timeline based on past experiences with delayed transit improvement projects.

Pedestrian and bicycle safety upgrades were the second highest priority investment

- The majority of participants prioritized safety improvements, citing needs such as longer crosswalk times, dedicated signage, more bike lanes etc.
- Some participants don't feel safe on the streets because of poor behavior by some bicyclists, skateboarders, scooters, etc. and created their own investment card for pedestrian and bicycle safety education and law enforcers.

Street repaving was popular

- Nearly half of participants supported having roads repaved, citing currently poor conditions.
- Some participants noted that the construction associated with street repaving can itself cause congestion.

Transit ambassadors were popular

- Many participants supported transit ambassadors, correlating this support with feelings of unsafety in San Francisco, specifically on transit systems.
- Some participants thought this idea was currently too vague and would like to see more detail about how this would actually help increase safety on transit use.

There was interest in school buses and general education investments

- Some participants wanted increased school buses so that their children could have more options to get to school.
- Beyond school buses, there was also a pattern of participants creating broader school/education investments, such as funding for after school youth programs, funding for school supplies, or special bus tickets for students to go to downtown museums for learning.

There was interest in improved paratransit and improved disability accommodations overall

- A number of participants spoke about the importance of having improved paratransit options for people with disabilities so that it is easier for them to get around.
- In addition to paratransit shuttles, some advocated for better disability accommodations overall, especially on buses and in Uber/Lyfts.

Theme 2 take-aways for program design:

- **Prioritize investment funds for transit and safety improvements and consider other investment ideas depending on funding available.**

Theme 3: Most co-creation participants chose a fee level of at least \$10, provided it would fund a package of discounts and investments.

- Of the 42 sessions¹ conducted, 32 sessions (about 76%) decided on a fee of at least \$10, while the remaining 10 sessions (about 24%) wanted no fee at all or very low fees for drivers (\$1-3). Of these, 6 sessions decided on “no fee” (meaning no congestion pricing), 3 sessions decided on very low fees of \$1-3, and 1 session decided on no fee to drivers while passing on the fee to companies.
- The average group selected two discounts and three investments as part of its proposed policy. For example, a group who selected a \$12/6/0 fee structure would do so in tandem with 3 investments such as transit improvements, bike and pedestrian safety upgrades, and school buses, and 2 discounts and exemptions such as free transit for very-low income riders, and discounted transit for more low-income riders.

Theme 3 take-aways for program design:

- **The fee levels selected by most participants were close to the range under consideration for the study.**

¹ A “session” is defined as a breakout session within a co-creation workshop. Participants in each breakout session tried to reach agreement on a proposed program package.

- **The final policy recommendation should consider how many investments and other benefits the fee can fund, and if there are enough benefits funded given the community's expectations for revenue usage.**

Theme 4: Uber and Lyft should pay their fair share.

- Strong participant sentiments that ride-hail services (Lyft and Uber) are a major cause of congestion.
- Some participants went beyond ride-hail companies and named other tech companies and major corporations as responsible for helping address the congestion problem that they have disproportionately contributed to.
- Participants' attitudes toward Lyft and Uber drivers were mixed. There was some concern about Lyft and Uber passing any potential increase in their expenses to drivers or riders. Some participants cited drivers as also low-income community members, so it would be unfair for expenses to get passed to them. Some participants didn't like the congestion that ride-hail caused while others benefit from these services to get around the city.

Theme 4 take-aways for program design:

- **Include fees for ride-hail users to ensure their congestion impacts are addressed, while also maintaining affordability for those who have limited resources and rely on these services for their transportation needs.**
- **Pair a congestion pricing program with employer-based transportation demand strategies.**

Theme 5: The current state of our streets is unacceptable.

It's not safe

- Participants are concerned about being able to move about safely on streets, ranging from fear of traffic collisions to seeing drugs and alcohol usage in public.
- Public transit doesn't necessarily feel safe either, with participants citing regular fights and pickpocketing that happens in those settings.
- Participants also want their city to be cleaner in terms of the environment and the air.
- Some participants talked about police violence they've experienced in San Francisco.
- Some small business owners talked about their stores being robbed.

There is a lot of congestion

- Participants generally agree that there is a lot of congestion both getting in/out of the city and within the city. They would like to see less congestion in San Francisco.
- Small business owners talked about the difficulty congestion causes for their businesses, which are already hurting. They spoke particularly in terms of difficulty for deliveries and congestion being a deterrent for potential customers to come into the city.

The government isn't helping as much

- Many participants talked about distrust in government and past harms that government has caused.
- Many participants talked about their lack of faith in government's follow-through in creating positive change, including street pavement in poor condition and long delays in Central Subway construction.
- Participants named the needs for transparency and fairness as values to build trust with the government.

Theme 5 take-aways for program design:

- **Include improvements in investment proposals that would improve safety and perceptions of safety, such as bicycle and pedestrian safety measures and transit ambassadors.**
- **Continue to include robust community engagement as the program planning and design process continues.**

Theme 6: A number of participants proposed revising and contracting the zone boundaries.

- Some participants thought that only the most congested traffic streets should be in the zone, but not the entirety of the map itself.
- Participants from the Mission didn't want the zone boundary to split the neighborhood and wanted the boundary to be moved north closer to the Central Freeway.
- Some participants were concerned that the zone would push traffic to the borders and negatively impact adjacent underinvested communities.
- Chinatown had significant concerns about being in the zone, with the sentiment that it would negatively affect equity and merchants.
- Some participants from underinvested neighborhoods on the outskirts of San Francisco, like the Bayview, felt that they would be disproportionately affected by a large zone because currently they are forced to go into the downtown area to get basic services, groceries, etc. Residents had concerns about how to get downtown given the difficulty of public transit in southeast San Francisco.

Theme 6 take-aways for program design:

- **The zone boundaries should be adjusted to still include the most congested areas and ensure overall program viability, but with more sensitivity to individual neighborhood boundaries.**

Theme 7: The co-creation process sparked new ideas and highlighted unique concerns from community members.

Idea: Add a positive reinforcement/reward component suggestions included:

- Point system for riding public transit that gives free congestion pricing passes.

- Community service in exchange for free transit/congestion pricing options (especially for low-income people who can't afford congestion pricing).
- Exemptions for other transport options, i.e. motorcycles, electric cars.
- Monthly passes vs. per ride purchases that can reduce overall fee.

Idea: Worker-based/distance-based discounts and exemptions

- Some participants thought someone commuting for work to downtown should have discounts and exemptions or the cost could be directed to employers, particularly for San Francisco residents (i.e. Bayview) and East Bay commuters.

Idea: Invest in traffic control officers

- A small number of participants wanted more traffic directors who can enforce traffic rules and help move traffic along during congested times.

Concern: Some participants said there should be special consideration for seniors and college/graduate students who may not be protected enough by the means-based discounts.

Concern: A small number of participants had mixed feelings about congestion pricing and tourism. Some worried that congestion pricing would have a negative impact on tourism while some thought tourists should be charged a higher congestion fee.

Theme 7 take-aways for program design:

- **Consider pairing other incentives and transportation demand management strategies with a congestion pricing program, including for tourists**
- **Consider additional parking and traffic control officers as a potential investment with program revenue**
- **Continue to consider other ideas participants suggest as program design evolves**

Co-Creation Quantitative Data²

Overall Fees Chosen

	Regular Fee	Low Income	Very Low Income
Average	\$10.12	\$4.83	\$1.83
Median	\$12.00	\$6.00	\$0.00
Most Common Selection	\$12.00	\$6.00	\$0.00

Average Fee By Neighborhood (n=number of breakout sessions per neighborhood)

	Regular Fee	Low Income	Very Low Income
Bayview (n=7)	\$12.33	\$2.00	\$0.00
Chinatown (n=4)	\$3.00	\$1.50	\$0.00
Excelsior (n=6)	\$7.33	Information not available	
Mission (n=6)	\$12.29	\$6.14	\$2.86
Mission Bay (n=4)	\$15.00	\$8.00	\$4.40
Mixed - El Centro (n=2)	\$12.00	\$6.00	\$0.00
Mixed - SDA (n=2)	\$6.00	\$3.00	\$0.00
SoMa (n=2)	\$20.00	Information not available	
Tenderloin (n=6)	\$9.67	Information not available	
Visitation Valley (n=1)	\$12.00	Information not available	
West Side (n=2)	\$1.50	\$0.00	\$0.00

2

Co-creation data analysis limitations:

1. The findings and themes in this document do not include the last remaining co-creation workshops which took place after 10/2/2020, which includes workshops for those in Oakland, Richmond, etc.
2. Data set is inconsistent between the spring 2020 and summer/fall 2020 game versions and across workshops, which means some information is not available. For example the income discount card options changed between the spring 2020 and summer/fall 2020 game versions - the earlier version did not group income-based discounts with overall fee levels or distinguish between the low- and very-low income categories.
3. Variations across the number of co-creations facilitated at each neighborhood means that neighborhoods with more workshops will have their results represented more heavily.
4. Notes and workshop reporting were taken in varying formats, which may affect data representation and interpretation for results.

Discounts, Investments, and Fee Overall Popularity

Type	Neighborhood	# of Times Card Selected	% of Groups Who Selected Card
Discount Cards	Free transit for very low-income riders	24	59%
	Discounted transit for more low-income riders	21	51%
	Bridge toll-payer discount	14	34%
	Drivers with disabilities discounts	14	34%
	Create Your Own	14	34%
	Maximum daily charge	8	20%
Investment Cards	Transit improvements	27	66%
	Pedestrian and bicycle safety upgrades	21	51%
	Street repaving	19	46%
	Transit ambassadors	18	44%
	Add school buses	15	37%
	Create Your Own	11	27%
	Improved Paratransit	8	20%
Old Fee cards	\$4 peek period fee	6	15%
	\$6 peek period fee	5	12%
	\$5 peek period fee	2	5%
	Apply the fee to drive within the congestion pricing zone	2	5%
New Fee Cards	\$12/\$6/\$0	7	17%
	No Fee	5	12%
	\$10/\$5/\$5	3	7%
	\$14/\$7/\$0	2	5%
Both	Create Your Own	15	37%

Key Findings from Other Feedback Tools

Discounts + Exemptions

Income-based Discounts:

- Income-based discounts and exemptions were the top discount priority across all outreach channels.
- 37% of digital survey respondents prioritized free transit for very low-income (Lifeline) travelers – this was the top selection; 27% of survey respondents wanted discounted transit for more low-income riders. The digital survey included income-based congestion fee discounts in packages with the fee option levels.
- Income-based discounts were nearly universally prioritized in community presentations.
- Comments received via the text based survey, community presentations, social media, and email correspondence showed significant concern for low- and moderate-income people having to pay a fee.

Disability Discount:

- Discounts for drivers with disabilities was the next most popular discount in the digital survey (29%) after income-based discounts.
- Some text survey respondents and social media comments also said that discounts for disabled drivers were important.

Bridge Toll-payer Discount:

- About one in seven digital survey respondents selected a bridge toll-payer discount. Non-San Francisco participants were more likely to choose the bridge toll discount (20%) compared to 11% of San Francisco respondents.
- Some text survey respondents were in favor of a bridge toll discount, which often correlated with concern about low-income commuters.
- Participants in community presentations expressed frustration that congestion related to eastbound on-ramps to the Bay Bridge had returned – some noted that the bridge toll alone wasn't enough of a deterrent to driving to eliminate ramp-related congestion.

Resident Discount:

- Overall, approximately one in four digital survey respondents favored discounts for zone residents. One in three Eastside residents favored a discount for those in the zone.
- Digital and text survey participants expressed concern for low income residents of the zone in their comments.
- A number of social media commenters noted that they would only support a plan that offered a discount to zone residents.

Daily Toll Cap:

- A maximum daily charge was the least popular discount/exemption among digital survey participants, with only approximately one in ten selecting it, even among Eastside residents.
- The unique needs of parents were cited in open-ended comments across outreach channels, with a number of participants citing that parents may/do make multiple car

trips a day in/out of zone. However, participants did not necessarily link this travel pattern to a maximum daily charge.

Discount and exemption take-aways for program design:

- **Prioritize income-based discounts and exemptions while including other discount options in scenarios.**

Investments

Transit Improvements

- Transit improvements were the most popular investment choice across outreach channels. Two out of three digital survey respondents (67%) chose transit improvements as an investment. Two out of three text respondents cited transit improvements as a top investment choice.
- Participants in community presentations frequently referenced making Muni free/cheaper, more accessible to seniors/parents, and less crowded. Community presentation attendees also cited better regional transit as a priority.
- A number of open-ended comments in the text survey as well as on social media expressed concern that without transit improvements, congestion pricing would create additional challenges for those traveling downtown.
- Commenters on social media expressed concern about trying to shift more people to transit, given recent service reductions due to COVID-19.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements were a close second to transit improvements for the most popular investment choice across outreach channels. 61% of digital survey respondents prioritized bicycle and pedestrian safety upgrades.
- Safety was a recurring theme in open-ended comments on the text surveys and in social media.

Improved Paratransit

- Approximately one in four digital survey respondents prioritized investment in improved paratransit.

Transit Ambassadors

- Approximately one in four digital survey participants selected transit ambassadors as an investment.
- Participants in community presentations, the text survey, and on social media noted a desire for Muni to be made more safe, often in the context of making it more accessible to parents, seniors, and people with disabilities.

Street Repaving

- Approximately one in four digital survey participants (24%) selected street repaving as an investment but wasn't frequently mentioned through other outreach channels.

Additional School Buses

- Survey comments and participants in community presentations voiced concerns about school transportation, but school buses were not prioritized as much as other investments by those who took the digital survey.

Investment take-aways for program design:

- **Prioritize investment funds for transit and safety improvements and consider other investment ideas depending on funding available.**

Pricing by Vehicle Type

- Many participants in community presentations and social media commenters cited the impact that Lyft and Uber have had on congestion in San Francisco and voiced concerns that Lyft and Uber should pay their fair share.

Pricing by vehicle type take-aways for program design:

- **Include fees for ride-hail users to ensure their congestion impacts are addressed, while also maintaining affordability for those who have limited resources and rely on these services for their transportation needs.**

Overall Fee Levels

- For those who engaged in the congestion pricing game via the digital survey, 44% preferred a \$14 fee, 27% selected a \$12 fee, 19% selected a \$10 fee, and 8% chose “no fee.”
- However, nearly three out of four text respondents expressed opposition to the idea of a fee.
- Participants who provided social media comments frequently voiced their concern over any additional fees, particularly for low-income drivers.

Fee level take-aways for program design:

- **Overall, most survey participants selected one of the fee level options under consideration for the study, particularly when providing feedback in the context of selecting an overall balanced package of discounts/exemptions, investments, and fees.**
- **The final policy recommendation should consider how many investments and other benefits the fee can fund, and if there are enough benefits funded given the community’s expectations for revenue usage.**

Boundary

- Open-ended comments received across outreach channels frequently described the congestion pricing zone being too large.
- Those who participated in public meetings had a variety of responses to the geography

- Neighborhoods in the zone:
 - Hayes Valley residents wanted Octavia Blvd to be inside the boundary
 - Mission Bay stakeholders had varied opinions, some supportive and some not supportive of the congestion pricing and whether the neighborhood should be included in the zone
 - Chinatown stakeholders had concerns about effects on equity and merchants
 - Tenderloin residents were interested in potential safety and transit benefits
- Neighborhoods near the border:
 - Potrero, Mission and Japantown stakeholders did not want the boundary to split their neighborhoods

Boundary take-aways for program design:

- **The zone boundaries should be adjusted to still include the most congested areas and ensure overall program viability, but with more sensitivity to individual neighborhood boundaries.**