

[REDACTED]

From: Jordan Moldow [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2025 11:39 PM
To: city.auditor; Valle, Maria; Obi, Ebelechukwu; Harvey, Brittney; Rois, Joseph; Ristow, John; Scott, Rick; Bittner, Jim; Hoshii, Heather; TEPublicComment; Agendadesk
Cc: District4; District9; District2; District3; District5; Salas, Carl; Tordillos, Anthony
Subject: Access to and Use of the City's Traffic Safety Programs by Traditionally Marginalized Communities Audit Report - Item (d)1. T&E 8/11

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

This is an incredibly important topic. Thank you to the City Auditor's team for this report, and thank you to Council for requesting this series of reports.

Finding 1: EPCs Received the Same or Higher LOS in Traffic Safety Programs

- DOT was more timely in closing out basic traffic safety requests for EPCs.

This is great news!

- EPCs received a greater number of quick builds.
- Requests for basic neighborhood traffic safety services were equally distributed.

This is good to hear, but doesn't necessarily represent the most ideal outcome. We know that:

- EPCs have received decades of lower investment compared to their neighbors.
- A disproportionate number of VZ Safety Corridors go through EPCs / are located in lower-wealth districts.
- Members of equity priority communities are disproportionately over-represented as victims of fatal and serious crashes.
- Equity doesn't imply giving equal resources to everyone, or giving slightly more resources to those in need. It implies allocating resources (potentially disproportionately) in order to correct historic imbalances and/or deliver equal outcomes.

With that in mind, I have the following questions that I hope can be answered:

- Were the types of Vision Zero safety projects equal or better, and dollar investments equal or greater, in EPCs compared to other communities? Or is it possible that EPCs received a greater share of quick-build projects, because other communities received a greater share of non-quick-build capital projects?
- How are we succeeding (or failing) at trending towards Vision Zero in EPCs, compared to other communities? Are EPC community members trending towards or away from more equal representation in KSI crashes?

- Are basic neighborhood requests from EPCs proportionally eligible to be completed as requested? Or is it possible, due to regulations or roadway classifications or other factors, that requests from EPCs have to be modified or rejected at a higher rate than requests from other communities?
- Pages 19 and 20 indicate, "39 percent [of quick build projects]" and "31 percent [of basic traffic safety service requests]" were in MTC EPCs, "while those communities accounted for 26 percent of census tracts." Given the disparities that EPCs often face, should those percentages be higher in order to deliver more equitable outcomes?

Also, although this audit report is technically focused on proactive traffic safety services, a very related and important topic is the delivery of services after a severe crash has occurred. I would have liked to explore:

- How do SJPD/SJFD/ambulance response times to KSI crashes compare between EPCs and other communities?
- How often are emergency responders and/or hospital personnel able to prevent a serious injury from becoming a fatality, in EPCs vs other communities?

Finally, I'd like to continue to highlight the need to revisit/strengthen the [2018 Complete Streets Design Standards and Guidelines](#), so that all repaved roads are treated with pedestrian-supportive elements and traffic calming by default. In the long run, this should reduce the need for after-the-fact traffic calming requests. DOT staff have agreed to revise the design standards, and I thank them for that.

Regarding the Administration Response to Recommendations #4 and #5: Given the recent closure of school campuses, and those many students now commuting longer distances to get to different campuses, please consider whether these two recommendations should attempt to be completed this calendar year.

Regarding Recommendation #6 DOT should update and translate its traffic safety resources, including the Traffic Calming Toolkit: Please look at [Pittsburgh, PA's Neighborhood Traffic Calming website <https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/neighborhood-traffic-calming>](#) as a potential North Star. Their website is extremely informative and transparent to the public. Most notable are their online request form, annual reports of each individual completed and in-progress project, and [a GIS map showing the status of all past/present/upcoming/requested traffic calming projects](#) and the streets that are eligible for the neighborhood traffic calming program.

Thank you,
 Jordan Moldow (speaking only on his own behalf)
 District 3, Japantown, 95112

P.S. It is my desire that the City conduct an analysis of the costs associated with traffic collisions [1] so that we know how much money we can save / how many resources we can redeploy by achieving Vision Zero. San Francisco recently conducted such an analysis "of the economic costs and fiscal impact of traffic collisions in San Francisco over the past five years, including total costs such as medical care, property damage, and loss" [<https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA.Traffic_Crash_Costs.042325.pdf>](#),

and found that the economic cost (to society at large) was probably around \$2.5 billion over five years, and the cost born directly by the city and state governments was probably around \$80 million over those five years.

[1] Examples of costs: deployments of SJP, SJFD, and detectives to crash sites; follow-up police work; detective work and public outreach when a hit-and-run driver needs to be identified; fatality review board work to analyze crashes; communications with the County coroner; any costs to the city associated with clearing the street of wrecked vehicles, blood, and other debris.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.