



## San Bruno / South San Francisco Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Update Community Engagement Summary

### I. Needs Assessment Overview

Between November 2024 and June 2025, consultant staff from MIG and Redwood Resources partnered with the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (CCAG) to gather community input for San Bruno / South San Francisco Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP or Plan). The Plan will provide recommendations, including potential projects and programs, for how communities and transit agencies can help to improve access to transportation services and amenities, especially for residents more likely to use or need transit access, or those more likely to walk or bike. The Plan is focused on several key community areas within these two cities, identified by MTC as “Equity Priority Communities,” those with high numbers of potential transit-dependent residents, or key jurisdictions where expanded transportation access and programs would benefit residents with limited means.

The purpose of this engagement was to understand the transportation needs and priorities of residents in Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). These areas have a significant concentration of underserved populations, like households with low incomes, people of color, and a combination of additional factors. Feedback was collected through a combination of in-person and virtual methods, including stakeholder interviews, community focus groups, pop-up events, briefing sessions, and a paper survey. These activities enabled the project team to hear directly from community members about their transportation challenges and suggestions for improvements to transportation services in their community. Participants were also asked to identify any unsafe locations and key destinations they travel to in their neighborhoods and community. Themes from the input are described in the summary below.

Much of this input was also geographically located onto a map of San Bruno / South San Francisco County and Equity Priority Communities. This can be accessed at:

<https://bit.ly/46AYMCT>.

#### A. Key Stakeholder Interviews

As a foundational step, the team identified and talked to representatives from five community organizations that have direct relationships with residents living in Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). These organizations were selected for their trusted roles within the community and their deep understanding of local needs.

Through a series of one-on-one and small group interviews, representatives from these organizations shared insights that helped the team better understand the broader context of community life as well as the specific transportation challenges faced by EPC residents. These conversations shaped our understanding of both everyday barriers and opportunities for improvement.

The organizations interviewed included:

**Low-Income, Homeless or Housing-Challenged, Environmental Justice**

- Nicolas Rackard-Hilt, Founder, San Bruno Healthy Homes
- Julio Garcia, Rise South City
- Elida Valencia Sobalvarro, YMCA Resource Center

**Small Businesses, Transit Station Neighbors**

- Hermes Monzon, Brittany Burgo, and Dana Abarca, Friends of Old Town

**Bike Activists, Micro-Mobility Enthusiasts**

- Matt Jones, Silicon Valley Bike Coalition

These interviews and conversations provided a comprehensive view of the transportation challenges faced by San Bruno / South San Francisco's Equity Priority Communities.

**Transit Affordability and Access**

- Cost is a major barrier, especially for low-income residents and warehouse workers.
- Loss of previous bus pass assistance programs has worsened access.
- Infrequent or unreliable transit service makes commuting inefficient and especially difficult for residents with multiple jobs or family responsibilities.

**Connectivity and Coverage Gaps**

- Limited transit routes and first/last-mile connectivity force people to rely on cars.
- Key locations like the YMCA Resource Center and food distribution sites are hard to access without a car.
- Underutilized free shuttle services due to poor promotion and lack of awareness.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Issues**

- Poor walkability due to narrow or damaged sidewalks and unsafe crossings.
- Lack of bike lanes and connectivity, particularly along major corridors and at key intersections (e.g., El Camino Real, San Bruno BART, San Mateo Avenue in San Bruno).
- Unsafe infrastructure deters walking and biking, especially for youth and seniors.

**Transit Infrastructure Needs**

- More bus shelters with seating, lighting, and weather protection are needed—especially at key high-traffic stops.
- Improved wayfinding and signage can enhance user experience and safety.

### **Proposed Transportation Solutions**

- Expand shuttle routes and improve frequency for buses and Caltrain.
- Add dedicated bus lanes or BRT on corridors like El Camino Real.
- Enhance bike and pedestrian infrastructure, including safer crossings, extended bike lanes, and sidewalk improvements.
- Improve connections between major transit hubs and underserved neighborhoods.

### **Geographic and Policy Considerations**

- Community organization representatives urged the inclusion of East San Bruno and San Bruno Avenue in the study area due to upcoming redevelopment (e.g., Tanforan Mall).
- They also encouraged alignment with the San Bruno Transit Corridors Plan and soliciting input from advisory committees such as the South San Francisco Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and San Bruno Complete Streets Committee.

## *B. Engaging Directly with Community Members*

### **Pop ups, Trusted Messengers, Bilingualism**

To effectively engage residents in San Bruno and South San Francisco—particularly those from historically underserved and transit-dependent communities—community representatives interviewed by the project team emphasized the importance of culturally responsive and accessible outreach strategies. In-language engagement is essential, especially for residents who primarily speak Spanish, or other non-English languages. Outreach efforts should be tailored to reflect the diversity of the community, ensuring that language is not a barrier to participation.

Pop-up events at trusted, high-traffic locations such as schools, churches, laundromats, and food distribution sites offer practical opportunities to reach residents where they already gather. These informal settings create a more comfortable environment for engagement and increase the likelihood of participation.

To further encourage involvement, small incentives such as gift cards were recommended. Engagement activities should be brief and easy to participate in, recognizing that many residents have limited time and availability.

Stakeholders also highlighted the value of partnering with local community-based organizations (CBOs), such as Rise South City, Friends of Old Town, and the YMCA. These groups have established relationships and trust within the community and are well-positioned to lead grassroots outreach. Leveraging their networks can significantly improve participation and ensure the process is community-driven.

Additionally, offering virtual engagement options like Zoom focus groups and scheduling sessions outside of regular business hours can help reach working families and individuals with constrained schedules. These strategies together provide a foundation for equitable, inclusive, and effective community engagement.

To initiate the engagement process, we developed large-format posters featuring detailed maps of each Equity Priority Community (EPC), accompanied by key questions such as: *“What is most frustrating about transportation in your area?”* and *“What ideas do you have for improving mobility?”* We also created a survey designed to gather more in-depth information about residents’ transit and mobility habits.

With these materials prepared, we reached out to a range of community settings to ensure broad participation. This included outreach to community-based organizations, pop ups events outside churches and stores, and focus groups collaborating with key partners.

### **Pop up Events**

- Rico Pan Latin Pastries, 532 San Mateo Ave, San Bruno, CA - April 17, 2025
- La Hacienda Market, 249 Hillside Blvd, South San Francisco, CA - April 26, 2025
- All Souls Catholic Church, 315 Walnut Avenue, South San Francisco, CA - April 27, 2025
- La Mexicana Produce Market, 512 San Mateo Ave, San Bruno, CA - May 18, 2025

### **Focus Groups**

- Resilient San Bruno – April 30, 2025
- Friends of Old Town – May 15, 2025
- San Bruno Healthy Homes – May 12, 2025
- YMCA Community Resource Center – May 29, 2025

## II. Key Findings

Participants provided comments at events through the survey across a multitude of transportation needs and issues. The team organized these across Infrastructure categories.

### *A. Infrastructure and Service Improvements*

Community feedback collected between November 2024 and June 2025 revealed a range of infrastructure and service needs across San Bruno and South San Francisco Equity Priority Communities. Residents and stakeholders offered targeted recommendations to address longstanding barriers to mobility, emphasizing both physical improvements and service enhancements that would better support everyday travel.

#### *Pedestrian Infrastructure*

Across 37 individual comments, community members emphasized the urgent need for safer, more accessible, and better-connected pedestrian infrastructure across San Bruno and South San Francisco. Many comments reflect concerns over unsafe walking conditions, particularly in areas with high traffic volumes, near schools, or in neighborhoods where sidewalks and lighting are inadequate or deteriorating.

#### *Poor Sidewalk Conditions*

A recurring issue was the poor condition of sidewalks, with residents noting that many walkways are narrow, uneven, or poorly maintained—posing risks to people using wheelchairs, pushing strollers, or navigating on foot, especially seniors and children. Specific concerns included cracked pavement, missing sections of sidewalk, and obstacles like utility poles or overgrown vegetation.

#### *Lighting and Visibility*

Lighting and visibility were frequently mentioned as key safety concerns. Multiple commenters described feeling unsafe walking at night due to dim or inadequate street lighting, particularly in areas like Kains Avenue and along corridors like Sneath Lane in San Bruno, and South Linden Avenue south of Canal Street in South San Francisco\*, and on the Centennial Way Trail between Orange Park and Maple Avenue. Women, in particular, expressed safety fears when walking in these poorly lit areas.

\*Note: The City of South San Francisco recently completed a project (September 2025) to upgrade lighting in Old Town and Downtown, which included enhancing light fixtures with LED bulbs along Linden Avenue from Railroad Avenue to Airport Blvd.

### *Intersection Safety*

Community members also called for improved crosswalks and intersection safety, especially near parks, schools, and along major roads such as El Camino Real, San Mateo Avenue, and Spruce Avenue. Suggestions included the installation of enhanced crosswalks, bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands, raised crosswalks, and stop signs with flashing lights. There were also specific mentions of intersections where pedestrians are forced to navigate confusing or dangerous crossings, including the area near San Bruno BART Station and under Highway 380.

### *Pedestrian Gaps*

Participants advocated for a more comprehensive and connected network of pedestrian pathways, highlighting that gaps in walkability prevent residents from reaching transit stops, parks, schools, and neighborhood services. This lack of connectivity especially affects children walking to school and people trying to access public transit without a car.

### *People Scale Streets*

Beyond functionality, respondents also recommended Complete Streets design elements, such as adding benches, shade trees, and signage along walking corridors. These enhancements would make walking more inviting and comfortable, while simultaneously addressing environmental concerns.

Finally, several comments stressed that pedestrian improvements must be prioritized not just in busy commercial districts but also in underserved residential neighborhoods where residents rely heavily on walking and transit. There is a clear demand for equitable investment in infrastructure that supports safe and active transportation for all community members.

### *Suggested Locations for Pedestrian Safety and Infrastructure Improvements*

- Walkability improvements such as safer pedestrian crossings or raised crosswalks in key corridors and areas including: El Camino Real; under 280 and 380; in South San Francisco on Spruce Avenue; near Centennial Way Trail and surrounding area (including connectivity to San Bruno BART and Caltrain stations; and in downtown San Bruno, particularly on Pacific Avenue and Huntington Avenue (especially from bus depot/BART station); along San Mateo Avenue in San Bruno; near schools such as Lomita Park Elementary School in San Bruno, and high-traffic intersections such as Linden Avenue and Armour Avenue.
- Add benches, better lighting and emergency phones on Centennial Way Trail
- Replacement of sidewalks in San Bruno, especially West and East San Bruno Avenue
- Address flooding issues at Belle Air Elementary School

## Bicycle Infrastructure

Community feedback revealed a strong and consistent demand for safer, more connected, and more accessible bicycle infrastructure in South San Francisco and San Bruno. Across 53 individual comments, residents emphasized the need to shift from fragmented, high-risk biking environments to a more bike-friendly network with first/last-mile connections to transit.

### *Disconnected and Inadequate Routes*

Many participants described the existing bicycle network as incomplete or unsafe, especially along major corridors and near schools, parks, and commercial centers. Bicyclists reported feeling forced to share the road with fast-moving vehicles due to a lack of dedicated bike lanes or shoulders. Comments highlighted that even where bike lanes exist, they are often unprotected, too narrow, or interrupted by unsafe intersections, creating stress and discouraging ridership.

The lack of east-west connections from key locations like Skyline College, especially across Highway 101 and the Caltrain corridor, was cited as a key gap. Riders noted that many arterial streets feel intimidating or hazardous, especially for younger riders and families.

### *Call for Protected and Separated Facilities*

Numerous comments explicitly requested protected bike lanes separated from traffic by curbs, barriers, or parked cars as a way to improve safety and encourage broader use. Community members noted that protected lanes would particularly benefit:

- Students biking to school
- Low-income workers using bikes for commuting
- Seniors and new riders who currently avoid biking due to fear of traffic

### *Supportive Infrastructure and Amenities*

In addition to lanes and routes, several comments focused on the need for basic bike amenities that make cycling more practical. These included:

- Secure bike racks at transit hubs, shopping areas, and public buildings
- Wayfinding signage to help riders navigate safe routes
- Improved lighting along popular biking corridors – especially on Centennial Trail and corridors leading to BART like Linden Avenue – for safety after dark

There was also interest in bike repair stations, particularly near transit nodes, to support maintenance and promote bike-transit integration.

### *Equity and Access Considerations*

Feedback underscored that better bike infrastructure is not just about recreation—it’s a matter of transportation equity. For residents who cannot afford a car or who rely on bicycles as a primary mode of travel, current conditions are often unsafe or insufficient. In neighborhoods with higher proportions of essential workers, immigrants, and youth, improved bike facilities could offer a low-cost, sustainable alternative for reaching jobs, schools, and services.

### *Suggested Locations for Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements*

- Extend bike lane connectivity, especially to Caltrain and BART where possible and throughout both cities’ downtowns: in key corridors such as El Camino Real, Spruce Avenue, Centennial Way Trail and surrounding area; in South San Francisco near Orange Memorial Park, on First Lane, Mayfair Village, and Myrtle Avenue; and in San Bruno on San Mateo Avenue and Huntington Avenue (as part of the Huntington Avenue Cycle Track and Southline Projects), on First Avenue, San Bruno Avenue, from downtown San Bruno to the Airport, around San Bruno BART Station, under the 380 Freeway, and from the Crestmoor / Highlands area to downtown.
- Add more bike racks / bike parking on San Mateo Avenue and at First Avenue and Angus Avenue.
- Improve lighting on Centennial Trail (between Orange Park and Maple Avenue specifically mentioned).

### *Roadway Infrastructure*

A total of 54 comments pointed to roadway-related concerns, including poor pavement conditions, unsafe intersections, and traffic flow issues. Some suggested redesigning specific intersections to reduce collisions, while others asked for traffic calming and speed enforcement in neighborhoods. These improvements were often framed as necessary for safety but also for improving transit performance and multimodal integration.

### *Suggested Locations for Roadway Improvements*

- Improve safety measures including lighting, more safety signs and stoplights, near schools and high-traffic intersections including: in South San Francisco, at Linden and Armour Avenues, South Maple Street, Cypress and Pine Avenues, and outside the Municipal Services Building (street not specified); and in San Bruno on North San Anselmo Avenue, Kains Avenue, Green Avenue, and First Avenue
- Improve street lighting in San Bruno on Angus Avenue, Sneath Lane, 2nd Avenue, Third Avenue, 7th Avenue, Walnut Street (east of San Bruno Avenue) and San Bruno Avenue; in South San Francisco on Linden Avenue.

- More safety or stop signs in San Bruno outside Lions Park area, on San Antonio, San Diego, and South San Anselmo, along with nearby area
- Improve safety measures at places where drivers don't look for pedestrians or bikes including turning left at Starlite Street and South Spruce Avenue; on Spruce Avenue between Canal and Victory; and on Grand Avenue between Maple and Linden
- Add speed humps on Cypress and Pine, Spruce Avenue, and First Lane
- Limit speed on Park Way in South San Francisco
- Add measures to limit street racing and speeding on Linden Avenue in South San Francisco between Railroad Avenue and San Mateo Avenue; and on Cypress Avenue in Old Town South San Francisco
- Repair torn-up paving or holes in road on El Camino; in South San Francisco on the Westborough Freeway Exit Ramp; and in San Bruno on 2nd Avenue, Easton Avenue, Green Avenue, Kains Avenue, and Hensley Avenue
- Paint stripes or provide pavement delineation on the street at 7th Avenue and Angus Avenue
- Add safety/traffic cameras at Grand Ave and Mission Road, San Felipe
- Fix situation at the Caltrain crossing at South Linden where the railroad crossing lights get turned sideways by the wind

## *B. Transit System Improvements*

Community members across South San Francisco and San Bruno expressed strong and consistent interest in improving the area's public transit system. The comments gathered through interviews, surveys, and outreach activities reveal the importance of frequent, reliable, and well-connected transit options, especially for residents who rely on transit as their primary means of mobility.

### *Expanding and Improving Bus Service*

The most frequently cited need was for an enhanced local bus service network, with 69 individual comments identifying challenges and suggesting improvements. Residents called for more frequent buses, particularly in the evenings and on weekends, to better serve shift workers, students, and seniors. Many noted that long waiting times and irregular service schedules undermine confidence in transit and make it difficult to plan trips.

There was also a clear call for expanded coverage, particularly to areas that are currently underserved or disconnected from key destinations like medical facilities, schools, and job centers. Bus reliability, real-time information, and better customer experience were also emphasized, pointing to a need for consistent performance and communication.

### *First/Last-Mile and Community Shuttle Services*

A significant portion of feedback—31 comments—highlighted the need for community shuttles and last-mile connections especially in San Bruno. These services were seen as essential to link neighborhoods, housing developments, and community centers with major transit hubs such as BART and Caltrain stations. Many participants recommended flexible, circulator, or on-demand shuttles, especially to serve:

- Seniors and people with mobility challenges
- Residents in hillside and lower-density areas
- Commuters trying to bridge the gap between home and rail transit
- Students trying to get to Skyline College

Residents requested shuttle services between BART and Caltrain stations and residential neighborhoods or new housing developments; a shuttle service that would hit the “hot spots” such as retail along San Mateo Avenue, Skyline College, BART and Caltrain stations and Skyline Trail; service between the airport and downtown San Bruno; along El Camino Real; and in South San Francisco between Old Town/Linden Avenue and other neighborhoods (note this is already potentially served by the city’s Free South City Shuttle).

Shuttles were viewed not only as a mobility solution, but also as a strategy to increase equity and reduce isolation that can promote economic development.

One community comment specifically suggested developing a system that allows people to get discounted Uber rides. This reflects an interest in subsidized or voucher-based ride-hailing options, particularly to fill service gaps or support residents without access to fixed-route transit.

### *Better Regional Connections*

Twenty-five comments focused on the importance of improving regional transit connections, particularly with Caltrain and BART. Participants emphasized the need for better coordination between local buses and regional rail, including:

- Synchronized schedules to minimize wait times during transfers
- Unified fare systems or discounts for multi-agency trips
- Improved access to rail stations, especially for pedestrians and cyclists

Many saw regional integration as a key to expanding economic opportunity and making long-distance travel more viable for work and family obligations.

### *Other Transit System Enhancements*

A few additional comments proposed technology-driven solutions and user experience upgrades, such as:

- Real-time bus arrival information
- Mobile trip-planning tools
- Expanded paratransit options for individuals with disabilities

These suggestions reflect a desire for a modern, responsive transit system that serves a wide range of needs. Together, these insights underscore a clear community vision: a more frequent, connected, and flexible transit system that supports residents of all backgrounds in accessing opportunity.

### *Suggested Locations for Transit Service Improvements*

- Improve transit connections from Skyline College / Skyline Boulevard to downtown areas, key corridors such as El Camino, and transit hubs, possibly by extending the free South City shuttle service or a shuttle being provided by College of San Mateo; add a shuttle stop at Berkshire in Monte Verde area at Skyline Boulevard.
- Improve transit connections (shuttles or buses) between underserved areas and major transit hubs including: between Old Town South San Francisco/Linden Avenue and other key service areas; between the Avenues (1st to 7th Ave) and downtown San Bruno; between BART / Caltrain and residential neighborhoods and new developments; from SFO to downtown and other major destinations (idea: BART to Caltrain to Airport); around Antoinette Lane, Myrtle Avenue, and San Mateo Avenue, Angus Avenue, and Mastick Avenue area (especially for seniors – also provide free bus for community members in December in this area).
- Improve transit access to key locations for low-income residents including the YMCA Resource Center at Huntington and Spruce (bus stop out front but poor connections from Old Town and Linden Avenue); food distribution sites such as former library location near West Orange.
- Extend free South City shuttle routes on Huntington Avenue, in underserved areas like Old Town and West Orange
- Improve timing of South City shuttle so it follows the schedule / app on South Spruce Avenue. Community members say it is not arriving at the scheduled time.
- Provide a San Bruno city shuttle hitting all of the “hot spots” - San Mateo Avenue, Skyline College, BART, Caltrain, and Skyline Trail.

- Make improvements to the San Bruno BART / bus transfer station for a better commuter experience.
- More buses / service / new routes or better connections: Easton Avenue; Bus Rapid Transit or Shuttle services along ECR; Paradise Valley south on Linden Avenue to San Bruno BART; a direct bus from San Bruno to Daly City; from South San Francisco Caltrain through downtown along Grand Avenue to Orange Park; bus line from South San Francisco BART Station to access other transit without a long walk
- Provide bus stops on Baden Avenue, Eucalyptus Avenue, Commercial Avenue Area; route 292 at or near Cypress and Pine in South San Francisco; Orange Avenue and Railroad Avenue (RR Ave x2); San Anselmo North; San Mateo Avenue; Pine Street and First Avenue; Santa Lucia Avenue; San Mateo and Walnut (for 41 line).
- Provide more shelters or seating at bus stops: 200 Airport Boulevard; California and Airport; Armour Ave and Airport Boulevard; Grand Avenue and Airport Boulevard; Baden Avenue; El Camino Real; South Linden Avenue; at Spruce and Tanforan Mall.
- Extend bus route hours on San Bruno West and Green.
- Provide more frequent buses at Linden Avenue.
- Mitigate the vibration from passing Caltrain at First Avenue

### **C. Community Safety Concerns**

Safety was a recurring and deeply felt theme throughout community engagement for the South San Francisco and San Bruno CBTP. Across comments, residents expressed a desire for streets and transit environments that feel safe, secure, and welcoming for all users, whether walking, biking, or waiting for the bus. These concerns spanned both traffic-related safety and personal security, with particular emphasis on vulnerable users such as seniors, youth, and people with disabilities.

#### ***Pedestrian Safety***

One of the most prominent concerns was pedestrian safety, especially in areas with high traffic volumes, limited crossings, or poorly maintained sidewalks. Residents identified numerous locations where crossing the street felt dangerous due to:

- Missing or faded crosswalks
- Wide intersections with fast-moving vehicles
- Lack of pedestrian signals or stop signs

These conditions were particularly of issue for community members near schools, transit stops, and senior housing, where residents often rely on walking as a primary mode of transportation.

Several comments called for traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps, bulb-outs, and raised crosswalks, to make walking routes more visible and protective.

### *Avoiding Bicycling Due to Safety*

While concerns about biking often centered around infrastructure, many also included safety risks. Riders described conflicts with cars, unsafe intersections, and a general lack of protection from traffic. In some cases, individuals reported avoiding biking altogether or not allowing their children to bike due to fear of being hit or harassed, especially along arterial roads. There was a strong demand for protected bike lanes, intersection upgrades, and clear right-of-way rules to enhance safety for both cyclists and drivers.

### *Personal Safety Fears While Using Transit*

Several participants raised concerns about personal safety, particularly when waiting for transit in poorly lit or isolated areas. Some described feeling vulnerable to theft, harassment, or violence, especially in the early morning or evening hours. These concerns were heightened for women, older adults, and people with disabilities.

Community suggestions to improve the sense of personal safety included:

- Better lighting at bus stops and along walking paths
- More visible and maintained shelters
- Security features, such as emergency call buttons or cameras
- A stronger presence of ambassadors or community safety patrols at transit hubs

### *Safety Concerns as a Barrier to Youth Mobility*

Parents and caregivers emphasized the importance of creating safe routes for children to walk or bike to school and transit. In neighborhoods with high youth populations, unsafe crossings and unmonitored bus stops were seen as barriers to independence and mobility. Many residents called for design features that prioritize children's safety, including flashing beacons, curb extensions, and crossing guards.

### *Investment in Safety Requested*

Across South San Francisco and San Bruno, residents are asking for a transportation environment that doesn't just move people—it protects them. Community feedback clearly points to the need for investment in infrastructure, lighting, and design strategies that reduce risk and foster a sense of safety. These improvements are essential for building trust in the transportation system and encouraging broader participation in walking, biking, and transit use.

### *Non-Transportation Related Issues*

There were a number of comments made regarding issues in general and at specific locations that are outside the purview of the CBTP, as well as some that are located outside the EPC areas. These included issues regarding parking availability and cost, improvements to street cleanliness, better policing due to perceived safety threats due to dangerous behavior on the street, needed improvements to park facilities, and housing. These will be passed on to the appropriate City departments or agencies.

### *D. Affordability and Cost Barriers*

For many residents in South San Francisco and San Bruno, the cost of transportation is a significant and ongoing barrier to mobility. Community feedback revealed that even when transit services are available, the price of riding – along with hidden costs related to time, reliability, and access – can deter regular use, particularly among lower-income households, youth, seniors, and residents in affordable housing.

#### *Household Strain of Transit Costs*

A recurring theme was the strain of paying for daily transit fares, especially for families or individuals who rely on multiple trips per day. Participants shared that even modest fare costs add up quickly, and current discount programs are either insufficient or not well known. Concerns about affordability were especially common among:

- Seniors on fixed incomes
- Low-wage workers commuting to multiple jobs
- Youth and students without access to free or reduced-fare options

Several comments suggested the need for free or subsidized transit programs for priority populations and proposed expanding existing youth and senior fare programs to reduce economic burden. They stressed that these efforts would undoubtedly raise ridership.

#### *Unequal Access to Fare Discounts*

In addition to fare costs, residents pointed out the inaccessibility of discount programs due to complex eligibility requirements or lack of awareness. Some people said they were unsure how to apply, while others shared that language barriers or limited internet access prevented them from enrolling in reduced-fare programs.

The community called for:

- Simplified enrollment processes

- More outreach and promotion in multiple languages
- Automatic fare capping or account-based discounts to reduce barriers to use

### *Indirect and Hidden Costs*

Affordability concerns extended beyond fares. Residents also described indirect costs that impact their ability to use transportation effectively:

- Long wait times or infrequent service force people to miss work or appointments
- Lack of safe walking or biking access to transit leads some to rely on costly ride-hail services
- Missed connections between services result in paying multiple fares unnecessarily

These indirect burdens disproportionately impact those with the fewest resources, reinforcing inequities and isolating residents from opportunity.

### *The Cost of Not Driving*

Several residents without access to a personal vehicle expressed frustration with how much more expensive and time-consuming it can be to depend on public transportation, especially in a system that isn't always reliable. While driving is often perceived as faster and more convenient, many low-income residents simply cannot afford to own and maintain a car—making the affordability of transit a fundamental equity issue.

These insights illustrate that affordability is not just about fare cost, it's about equitable access to a transportation system that works for everyone. The CBTP process highlighted a need for more inclusive pricing structures, expanded discount programs, and thoughtful service design that considers the full cost of mobility from the rider's perspective.

## *E. Informational, Promotional, and Awareness-Building Needs*

Community feedback from residents of South San Francisco and San Bruno revealed a significant need for better communication, outreach, and visibility around local and regional transportation services. While many people expressed interest in using transit, shuttles, and other mobility options, they often lacked the information or guidance to do so confidently. This disconnect was especially prominent among immigrant families, seniors, and low-income households—populations that are most likely to benefit from accessible transportation but are often least likely to receive or understand critical information.

### *Limited Awareness of Local Services*

Residents in both cities frequently stated they were unaware of key services, such as:

- The South San Francisco Senior Shuttle
- The San Bruno Caltrain Station's connections to local buses
- SamTrans route changes or service frequencies near El Camino Real and Sneath Lane
- Free or reduced-fare programs for youth, seniors, and low-income riders

This lack of awareness wasn't due to a lack of interest, it stemmed from a lack of effective outreach, with many people learning about services only through word-of-mouth or not at all.

### *Multilingual and Community-Based Outreach is Essential*

In both cities, community members highlighted the linguistic diversity of their neighborhoods and called for translated and culturally relevant materials, especially in Spanish, Tagalog, Cantonese, and Mandarin. Many residents – especially seniors and immigrant families – rely on printed materials and in-person outreach and are less likely to access transit info online.

Residents recommended:

- Posting translated schedules and flyers in places they already visit, such as churches, Filipino and Latino grocery stores, laundromats, and schools.
- Partnering with trusted community organizations, like the YMCA, local senior centers, or school districts, to host info sessions and distribute materials.
- Providing visual, step-by-step instructions on how to ride transit, transfer between services, and qualify for discount programs.

### *Program Promotion and Sign-Up Support*

Many people in South San Francisco and San Bruno said they had never heard of discount programs or didn't know how to apply. This was especially true for Clipper START, the Youth Clipper Card, and paratransit services. Even among those aware of the programs, some were deterred by confusing eligibility requirements or language barriers.

Residents suggested:

- Holding community enrollment events at schools or senior centers
- Offering assistance with applications during food distribution or health fairs
- Providing simple comparison charts of fare options and benefits in multiple languages

### *Need for Real-Time, Easy-to-Use Information*

While some tech-savvy riders in South San Francisco mentioned using apps to check real-time arrivals, others—particularly in San Bruno—expressed frustration with outdated signage or difficulty finding updated schedules. There was a clear divide between those comfortable using digital tools and those who need low-tech solutions like printed brochures or staffed call lines.

Both groups agreed that information should be:

- Centralized and consistent across platforms
- Clearly indicate real-time delays, route changes, and shuttle availability
- Posted at high-traffic areas like Tanforan Mall, BART/Caltrain stations, and senior housing complexes

### *Promoting a Culture of Transit Use*

Finally, residents in both cities expressed that more positive messaging could help encourage transit use and reduce stigma—especially for people new to the system. Community members called for:

- “Try or Free Transit” days in South San Francisco neighborhoods like Westborough or Downtown
- Transit ambassadors or ride-alongs for seniors and youth in San Bruno
- Social media or local radio campaigns showcasing real users and the benefits of riding transit

In both South San Francisco and San Bruno, improving access to information isn’t just about communication – it’s about equity, trust, and empowering people to move freely and confidently through their communities. By investing in multilingual outreach, community partnerships, and simple, human-centered tools, local agencies can ensure that more residents are aware of, and able to benefit from, the transportation resources available to them.



## San Bruno / South San Francisco Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Update Appendix A: Summary of Key Stakeholder Interviews

### I. Introduction and Methodology

#### A. Introduction

MIG, Inc. conducted five interviews with key stakeholders to inform the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)'s Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) 2025 Update. The CBTP focuses on identifying strategies to improve mobility and transportation access for historically underserved communities in San Bruno and South San Francisco with a high percentage of low-income residents, people of color, residents with limited English proficiency, seniors and persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable populations, many of whom are transit-dependent. In order to create a plan to equitably engage those most historically underserved and most impacted by transportation and mobility barriers, MIG interviewed the following representatives from organizations which serve communities in these areas, or who advocate for improved transportation options (listed by their constituent audience):

- Low-Income, Homeless or Housing-Challenged, Environmental Justice
  - Nicolas Rackard-Hilt, Founder, San Bruno Healthy Homes
  - Julio Garcia, Rise South City
  - Elida Valencia Sobalvarro, YMCA Resource Center
- Small Businesses, Transit Station Neighbors
  - Hermese Monzon, Brittany Burgo, and Dana Abarca, Friends of Old Town
- Bike Activists, Micro-Mobility Enthusiasts
  - Matt Jones, Silicon Valley Bike Coalition

#### B. Interview Methodology

Interviews were conducted via Zoom and were one-half hour in length. Interview subjects were provided with a brief presentation of the purpose and process for the CBTP update and asked to respond to the following questions:

##### **Tell Us About Yourself and Your Organization**

1. Please tell us about yourself and your organization. What is its mission, and who are the communities or individuals you serve?

##### **Key Transportation Needs, Issues and Opportunities**

2. What are the key transportation needs of the community members you serve? Where do they need to go?
3. What are the main challenges or barriers that prevent people from reaching where they need to be?

4. What solutions would you propose to have the most impact on improving the mobility of these community members, particularly within Napa County?
5. Are there any specific safety-related concerns related to transportation you can identify? (e.g., bike/pedestrian safety, collision prevention, etc.)
6. What can we do to encourage more active modes of transportation?

### Community Outreach

7. MIG has a range of community engagement strategies and methods for engaging the community members you serve. Are there specific events or locations that would work well to attract people and to engage them in a discussion about their transportation needs and priorities? Do you have any suggestions for how we might reach the “hard-to-reach” community groups?
8. Do you have any questions for us?

## II. Summary of Community Feedback Organized by Major Themes

Input provided during the interviews is summarized below by theme.

### A. Transportation Needs, Issues, and Challenges

#### A1: Public Transit Issues

- A1.1. Cost is a major barrier**, especially for low-income residents trying to access needed services and workers in warehouse districts. Loss of previous bus ticket assistance program has made access more difficult.
- A1.2. Lack of reliable transit connectivity in general**, with limited routes and stops, irregular and/or too infrequent schedules leading to long and inefficient commutes, and limited options for first- and last-mile connectivity, such as shuttles or bike lanes, which encourage heavy reliance on cars over transit.
  - A1.2.a.** Inefficient commutes make it particularly difficult for those with multiple jobs and family responsibilities to rely on transit.
- A1.3. Transit connectivity issues** and poor access for specific transit services or at specific locations:
  - A1.3.a. The free South City Shuttle** doesn’t serve enough key locations; residents want more stops.
  - A1.3.b. Shuttles or other last-mile solutions** between major transit hubs and stations (such as San Bruno BART) and residential areas and new developments in underserved neighborhoods.
  - A1.3.c.** Poor access to key locations for low-income residents. These include:
    - A1.3.c1. The YMCA Resource Center at Huntington and Spruce** in South San Francisco. There is a bus stop right in front, but connections from parts of the City such as Old Town and Linden Avenue are challenging.
    - A1.3.c2. Food distribution sites** such as the former library location next West Orange are hard to access without a car, requiring multiple transfers on transit. The West Orange location is made additionally challenging by being a walk-up food distribution – there is no drive-through option.
- A1.4. Lack of transit amenities**
  - A1.4a. Many bus stops lack essential amenities** like shelters, seating, and lighting, making them uncomfortable and unsafe, especially in high-traffic areas and busy locations. Harsh weather conditions make unsheltered transit stops uncomfortable.



## *B. Proposed Solutions*

### B1: Improvements to Transit

#### B1.1. General transit access and reliability

- B1.1.a.** Better transit access for low-income residents (more shuttles, expanded bus service)
- B1.1.b.** Improved transit reliability & frequency, especially for Caltrain and SamTrans buses.
- B1.1.c.** Focus on residential areas for transportation improvements rather than biotech zones.
- B1.1.d.** Potential Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or dedicated bus lanes to improve transit flow.
- B1.1.e.** Coordination with the San Bruno Transit Corridors Plan (TCP) for integrated planning.
- B1.1.f.** Better marketing and information distribution is needed for the free shuttle service – many don't know about it.

#### B1.2. Improvements to Transit Connectivity

- B1.2.a. Consider shuttles or other transit solutions** to connect underserved areas, provide last- and first-mile connectivity to major transit hubs, and improve travel efficiency. This includes shuttles between BART / Caltrain stations and residential neighborhoods or new developments.
- B1.2.c. Enhanced bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure**, including dedicated bike paths, to link transit hubs to residential areas, improve safety, and encourage multimodal commuting.

#### B1.3. Specific locations identified:

- B1.3.a.** Better connectivity between BART and the Centennial Trail.
- B1.3.b.** Bike Lanes along San Mateo Avenue to Huntington Avenue, connecting to Caltrain and BART.
- B1.3.c.** Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or shuttle services along El Camino Real
- B1.3.d.** Shuttle Services between the avenues (1st to 7th Ave) and downtown San Bruno.
- B1.3.e.** Improve east-west transit connections from Skyline College to downtown areas and transit hubs.
- B1.3.f.** Expand the shuttle route to include underserved areas like Old Town and West Orange.

#### B1.4. Transit Amenities

- B1.4.a.** Install bus stop shelters with seating, lighting, and weather protection at key stops. Improved shelters with lighting and seating are critical for comfort and safety.
- B1.4.b.** Improvements to the San Bruno BART bus transfer station for a better commuter experience.

### B2: Bicycle and Pedestrian Solutions

#### B2.1. Usability and Safety Improvements

- B2.1.a.** While bike lanes are underutilized, targeted investments like multi-use paths and safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists can encourage alternative transit. Improve pedestrian safety through sidewalk repairs, traffic management initiatives, and features such as larger pedestrian refuges, bulb-outs, raised crosswalks.
- B2.1.b.** Redesign sidewalks to ensure wheelchair accessibility and sufficient space.
- B2.1.c.** Create safer pedestrian and bike crossings and stop signs with lights, especially near schools, on major roads, and near high-traffic intersections. Reconfigure

confusing intersections, potentially with roundabouts or pedestrian overpasses, to enhance safety and clarity.

**B2.1.d.** Create more bicycle-friendly enhancements without dedicated cycle tracks.

**B2.1.e.** Long-Term Considerations: Ensure future developments, like those near 500 Linden, incorporate wider sidewalks and better infrastructure for pedestrians and transit users. Strategically plan bike and pedestrian improvements to maximize utility and address community concerns about underuse.

**B2.2.** Bicycle/Pedestrian Amenities

**B2.2.a.** Additional trees and shade along the cycle track to improve usability.

Environmental Enhancements along proposed bike paths and walking routes to integrate green spaces and reduce the environmental impacts of heavy car usage in the area. Need for additional amenities like tree cover, safety improvements, and bike lane expansions.

**B2.3.** Specific locations

**B2.3.a.** Extend bike lane connectivity and walkability improvements such as safer pedestrian crossings or raised crosswalks in key corridors and areas including: El Camino Real; Spruce Avenue; Huntington Avenue; San Mateo Avenue; Centennial Trail and surrounding area.

**B2.3.b.** Better bike lanes and pedestrian safety measures to connect BART and surrounding areas around San Bruno BART Station and under the 380 Freeway.

**B2.3.d.** Extend bike connectivity that is part of the Huntington Avenue Cycle Track and Southline Projects to San Mateo Avenue to enhance cyclist mobility.

**B2.3.d.** More bicycle-friendly enhancements without dedicated cycle tracks at San Mateo Avenue and Downtown San Bruno.

**B2.3.e.** Improve lighting and safety measures along corridors like Sneath Lane and Linden Avenue.

**B2.3.f.** Add enhanced crosswalks and stop signs with lights near schools and high-traffic intersections like Linden and Armour.

**B2.3.g.** Better bus or shuttle connectivity between Old Town South San Francisco / Linden Avenue and other key service areas.

**B3: Land Use and Redevelopment Opportunities:** In San Bruno's District 4, new developments and rezoning for mixed-use housing offer opportunities to address affordability and mobility challenges.

### *C. Community Outreach Recommendations*

#### **C1: Enhancing Equitable Outreach**

**C1.1.** Focus on engaging underserved communities, particularly low-income and non-English-speaking populations. Engage diverse community groups, such as the Chinese and Filipino communities, for broader representation in projects.

**C1.2.** Conduct focus groups with diverse community members to gather detailed input on transportation needs.

**C1.3.** Conduct workshops, outreach at schools, and planned pop-ups at markets or in market areas, churches, transit hubs, laundromats (e.g., La Cienega), dog parks, and local events to increase community participation. For pop-ups, use posters, stickers, and quick questions to gather input. Engage people as they pass by instead of a formal sit-down meeting.

- C1.4.** Bus Shelter & Transit Rider Engagement. Talk to transit riders at key bus stops and BART stations. Focus on gathering input on: Bus shelter improvements (wind protection, seating). Transit frequency issues (long waits, delays).
  - C1.5.** Use existing public spaces like Orange Park or the Boys and Girls Club area for community events.
  - C1.6.** Focus on direct communication, such as one-on-one outreach, to build trust.
  - C1.7.** Offer small incentives like gift cards for participation in surveys and events, while addressing concerns about perceived bias.
  - C1.8.** Collaborate with organizations like Rise South City and Friends of Old Town to conduct outreach.
  - C1.9.** Flexible Community Engagement: Formats: Zoom focus groups and after-hours sessions to accommodate working residents. Rationale: To include diverse voices, including those with time constraints.
  - C1.10.** Collaborate with existing housing surveys or separate surveys for transportation and housing to gather input on specific needs and priorities efficiently.
  - C1.11.** Emphasize minimal and focused sessions to respect participants' limited availability.
  - C1.12.** Community organizations have difficulty engaging the community in environmental efforts due to lack of trust and tangible results from past initiatives, and limited staffing to meet the growing needs of the community.
- C2: Proposed Locations for Pop-Up Events**
- C2.1.** Mexican Produce Market on San Mateo Avenue and Rico's Panadería nearby. Rationale: High visibility and accessibility for local residents.
  - C2.2.** All Souls Church (Sunday Mass attendees)
  - C2.3.** La Hacienda Market (Hillsdale area)
  - C2.4.** San Bruno BART Station (high transit foot traffic)
  - C2.5.** Pop-up events at YMCA food distributions (350+ households attend). Held at YMCA Resource Center and other locations (e.g., West Orange former library site). Advantage: Large turnout (350+ households), opportunity to engage residents while they wait in line. Consideration: Need to ensure engagement doesn't disrupt food distribution.
- C3: Collaboration with Local Groups**
- C3.1.** Partner with organizations like the San Mateo County Bike Coalition and the San Bruno Climate Resilience Team to leverage existing networks.
  - C3.2.** Collaborate with organizations like Families Taking Action and local civic groups to expand community outreach.
  - C3.3.** Providing materials and allowing YMCA staff to collect feedback from residents. Paid partner to conduct outreach, lead focus groups & pop-up events, w/stipends for participants. Offering stipends to community members to incentivize survey participation.
  - C3.4.** Potential partnership with MIG and city planners for outreach and engagement.
  - C3.5.** Collaborate with community-based organizations and local businesses for outreach and engagement.
  - C3.6. Silicon Valley Bike Coalition proposed a partnership** with the CBTP team to enhance community outreach and engagement. Proposed elements include:
    - C3.6.a Joint Outreach & Community Engagement:** Partnering on public outreach efforts, particularly in underserved communities. Utilizing existing networks and relationships (e.g., Rise South City, Friends of Old Town) to gather feedback. Integrating Bike Coalition outreach efforts into the broader transportation plan.

- C3.6.a** Inquired about **potential funding support** from the planning team to assist with outreach. Suggested that the Bike Coalition could help conduct surveys, host events, and engage cyclists and transit users if provided with resources.
- C3.6.a Collaboration on Cycle Track & Infrastructure Promotion:** The Bike Coalition is applying for funding to promote the new cycle track once completed. Proposed coordinating promotional events, such as group rides for “Bike to Work” or “Bike to Wherever” days. Advocating for additional bike-friendly infrastructure along Huntington Avenue, San Mateo Avenue, and El Camino Real.
- C3.6.a Advocacy for Transportation Equity:** Emphasized the importance of including low-income workers in transit planning, especially warehouse workers in South San Francisco. Encouraged the team to consider the equity impact of transportation decisions, even in non-residential employment zones.
- C3.6.a Participation in Policy & Planning Discussions:** Encouraged representation in BPAC (Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees). Advocated for ensuring the transportation plan aligns with San Bruno’s Transit Corridors Plan (TCP).
- C4:** Proposed Additions for San Bruno Ave & East Side of San Bruno: Expand study area to include everything east of El Camino Real due to expected development. Ensure public engagement in the redevelopment process to include transportation improvements.



**San Bruno / South San Francisco  
Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Update  
Appendix B: Community Survey – Summary of Results**

As part of their community engagement to solicit input on the 2025 Update to the San Bruno / South San Francisco Community-Based Transportation Plan, C/CAG circulated a survey, available both on-line and in hard copy format. Following is an analysis of results and key findings from the survey.

**A. Public Transit Usage**

Nearly half (41%) of the 122 survey respondents who answered the question of which SamTrans or other transit routes they currently use indicated that they use BART. A further 32.8% stated that they do not currently use any transit service. Respondents were provided with a list of possible reasons why they do not use transit and asked to identify all that apply. They gave a variety of reasons, of which the most common were “service is too slow,” (40%) “service is too infrequent,” (32.7%) and “transit doesn’t travel where I need to go” (30.9%). Those who selected “other” commented that the schedule was limited or unreliable, or that they prefer to drive themselves, among other reasons. Results are detailed in Tables 1 and 2 below.

<b>SamTrans Route or Transit Service</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
BART	41.0%	50
None	32.8%	40
ECR	26.2%	32
Caltrain	23.0%	28
Route 130 / B	18.0%	22
Free South City Shuttles	16.4%	20
Other	10.7%	13
Route 141	10.7%	13
Route 142	9.0%	11
Route 122	7.4%	9
Route 41	5.7%	7
Route 49	4.9%	6
Route 37	4.9%	6
Route 397	3.3%	4
EPX	1.6%	2
FCX	1.6%	2
Commute.org Shuttles	1.6%	2
Route 35	0.8%	1

N=122

*Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.*

<b>TABLE 2</b> <b>If you answered “none” to the previous question, why?</b> <b>(Mark all that apply)</b>		
<b>Reason Why Not to Take Vine Transit</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
Service is too slow	40.0%	22
Service is too infrequent	32.7%	18
Transit doesn't travel where I need to go	30.9%	17
Other	25.5%	14
It doesn't fit my schedule	21.8%	12
Fares are too expensive	16.4%	9
Transit stop is too far	12.7%	7
Transit is too confusing / complicated	10.9%	6

N=55

*Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.*

**Please note:** There was a difference between the survey as filled out online vs. the hard copy surveys. Online, respondents only received this question if they had answered “none” to the previous question. On the hard copy surveys, no such distinction was made. The majority of surveys were filled out in hard copy; therefore many of the respondents who responded to this question also marked transit routes that they currently use. It was decided that it was important to get the comments on issues with transit; therefore all responses are included.

**Comments from respondents who selected “Other”:**

- Doesn't go to Menlo Park
- I live in SB District 2, no bus goes there
- No Crestmoor / Highlands connection – need ability to connect with e-bike
- Limited schedule
- The shuttle doesn't run on schedule. NOT reliable EVER! LOL
- It takes too much time
- Parking is expensive
- Drive myself
- I have a car
- I have my own vehicle
- Much easier just to drive
- Just makes more sense for me to drive my own car.
- I currently drive but have used transit in the past or when cars are non working or between cars
- I don't use public transit
- I just don't
- No need
- Work from home, basically don't go anywhere
- Dog and tools

**B. Transportation Modes Used**

Survey respondents were asked to identify which modes of transportation they use to commute to work or school, as well as those they use for non-commuting trips.

The most popular modes for commuting are transit (used by 44.3%) and driving alone (41.8%). Walking is somewhat less common (21.3%). Only a small percentage (9% or less) use the other modes listed.

For non-commuting-related trips, the most popular modes were the same: 50.4% take transit, 47.1% drive alone, and 18.2% walk. Once again, other modes are used by 9% or fewer respondents.

Results are detailed in Tables 3 and 4 below.

<b>TABLE 3</b>		
<b>How do you commonly commute to work or school? (Select all that apply)</b>		
<b>Commuting Mode</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
Transit	44.3%	54
Drive alone	41.8%	51
Walk	21.3%	26
Carpool / Vanpool	9.0%	11
Bicycle	9.0%	11
Ride Share (Uber, Lyft, etc.)	5.7%	7
I don't work / go to school	4.9%	6
Other	3.3%	4

N=122

Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.

Note: None of the respondents who selected "Other" identified a method.

<b>TABLE 4</b>		
<b>How do you commonly commute for NON work/school related trips? (Select all that apply)</b>		
<b>Commuting Mode</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
Transit	50.4%	61
Drive alone	47.1%	57
Walk	18.2%	22
Bicycle	9.1%	11
Carpool / Vanpool	8.3%	10
Ride Share (Uber, Lyft, etc.)	8.3%	10
Other	4.1%	5

N=121

Note that because respondents were allowed to make multiple selections, the percentages do not add up to 100%.

Respondents who selected "Other" identified the following modes of transportation:

- Electric Scooter
- Bart/Caltrain
- Lyft to BART or train, because no public transit near my home in the hills
- Drive with my wife
- Public transportation 13
- Lime Scooter

### C. Mobility Programs and Other Transportation Issues

Two final questions were posed to respondents about transportation. The first asked them to identify whether they are currently enrolled in any Mobility Programs. The second asked whether they experience difficulties accessing medical facilities, grocery stores, and/or schools, and to further elaborate on those difficulties.

The majority of respondents to this question (87.5%) are not enrolled in any mobility programs. Of those who are, only two elaborated on the programs they're enrolled in, mentioning Clipper Start.

Results are detailed in Tables 5 and 6 below.

<b>Mobility Program</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
No	87.5%	105
Yes	9.2%	11
Please elaborate	3.3%	4
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>120</b>

Respondents elaborated on what mobility programs they are enrolled in as follows:

- Clipper Start x 2
- Not sure what this means but I have a disabled placard and a discounted Clipper Start card.
- GoPass Forward
- Ramps
- I don't even have a card
- Paratransit, but does not use it – too confusing and she has Alzheimer's

<b>Response Options</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
No	72.6%	85
Yes	21.4%	25
Please elaborate	6.0%	7
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>117</b>

The following comments were made by respondents who responded to "please elaborate":

- Currently I can still drive. The 141 is about one mile away, a long walk, unless you cross busy Skyline Blvd. Maybe have the 141 make a stop on Skyline Blvd and Berkshire.
- No – When I lived near Skyline College, it was way more difficult to access
- Can't drive
- Slow or too slow (x 4)
- No transport

- Yes - Arthritis in old age
- Yes - There are a lot of requirements

Respondents were also asked to provide any additional comments for improving their transportation experience within the Equity Priority Communities identified in San Bruno and South San Francisco. Their comments have been included separately in the matrix listing and categorizing comments, and/or on the location-specific map and associated data table.

#### **D. Survey Respondent Demographics**

Respondents were asked a number of demographic questions, including neighborhood of residence within San Bruno or South San Francisco (or elsewhere), age, and race/ethnicity, to clarify who had responded to the survey. Those results are shown below.

<b>Neighborhood / Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>San Bruno</b>	<b>39.1%</b>	<b>43</b>
San Bruno	4.5%	5
Downtown or Heart of San Bruno	4.5%	5
Crestmoor	4.5%	5
Belle Air	3.6%	4
7th Avenue San Bruno	2.7%	3
Rollingwood	2.7%	3
Huntington Park	1.8%	2
Mills Park	1.8%	2
Monte Verde	1.8%	2
Portola Highlands	1.8%	2
Easton, Near Forest Lane Park, Lomita Park, Parkview, Lower San Bruno Avenues, San Felipe, [exact address redacted] on Camino San Bruno, Easton Ave, Diamond Street, Santa Clara Ave	0.9% each	1 each
<b>South San Francisco</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	<b>56</b>
South San Francisco	10.0%	11
Baden Avenue	2.7%	3
Aspen Avenue	1.8%	2
Miller Ave	1.8%	2
Sign Hill / Hillside area	1.8%	2
San Bruno Ave.	1.8%	2
West Orange Ave	1.8%	2

<b>Neighborhood / Area</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
La Magnolia, Old Town/Barrío Viejo, Buri Buri, Alta Vista, Avalon Area, South San Francisco, 2nd Lane, SSF, Arroyo Drive, Bantry Lane, Drake, Grand Chestnut, Paradise Valley, Maple Avenue, Northwood Dr, Poplar Ave, Rail Road, South San Francisco Hickey, Spruce, West Winston Manor, Westborough, [exact address redacted] on Alta Mesa Drive SSF, Aspen Ave SSF, Baden Ave SSF, California Ave SSF, Circlura (?) Street SSF, Commercial Avenue, Del Monte SSF, Garden Ave South San Francisco, Gardiner Ave South San Francisco, Larch Avenue South San Francisco, Lewis Avenue SSF, Linden Ave South San Francisco, Maple Ave	0.9%	1 each
<b>Other Areas</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>6</b>
Brentwood, CuriOdyssey, Daly City, Guatemala, San Anselmo, San Mateo	0.9%	1 each
<b>Unclear Location</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>6</b>
El Camino	2.7%	3
Near downtown, Military, Mission Street, 5th Edition	0.9%	1 each
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>110</b>

<b>Age Categories</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
55-64	27.1%	32
34-44	23.7%	28
45-54	18.7%	22
>65	11.9%	14
25-34	11.0%	13
18-24	5.9%	7
<18	1.7%	2
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>118</b>

<b>Race / Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
Hispanic, Latino, Mexican, Latin American, South American	62.5%	55
White / Caucasian	19.3%	17
Asian (unspecified, Japanese, Palestinian, Indian, Iranian)	8.0%	7
Mixed race	5.7%	5
Black or African American	3.4%	3
Polynesian / Pacific Islander	1.1%	1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>88</b>

<b>Language</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number</b>
Spanish	49.6%	58
English	41.9%	49
Other (please specify)	8.5%	10
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>117</b>

Languages specified by respondents who selected “Other” included:

- English and Spanish (x2)
- Bilingual
- Hindi

<b>Total Household Income Ranges</b>	<b>Number of People in Household</b>	<b>Percentage of Overall Total</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>Under \$25,000</b>	<b>All</b>	15.3%	<b>18</b>
	6	1.7%	2
	4	1.7%	2
	3	5.1%	6
	2	0.8%	1
	[no response]	5.9%	7
<b>Between \$26,000 and \$45,000</b>	<b>All</b>	22.9%	<b>27</b>
	5	2.5%	3
	4	3.4%	4
	3	5.9%	7
	2	0.8%	1
	1	0.8%	1
[no response]	9.3%	11	
<b>Between \$46,000 and \$65,000</b>	<b>All</b>	19.5%	<b>23</b>
	6	2.5%	3
	5	2.5%	3
	4	3.4%	4
	3	2.5%	3
	[no response]	8.5%	10
<b>Between \$66,000 and \$85,000</b>	<b>All</b>	8.5%	<b>10</b>
	8	0.8%	1
	5	0.8%	1
	3	2.5%	3
	2	0.8%	1

**TABLE 11**  
**How many people live in your household (total number of the people in your home)? / What is your household income (total income of all people in your home?)**

Total Household Income Ranges	Number of People in Household	Percentage of Overall Total	Number
	[no response]	3.4%	4
<b>Between \$86,000 and \$110,000</b>	<b>All</b>	9.3%	<b>11</b>
	6	0.8%	1
	5	1.7%	2
	4	1.7%	2
	3	1.7%	2
	2	2.5%	3
	[no response]	0.8%	1
<b>Between \$111,000 and \$150,000</b>	<b>All</b>	10.2%	<b>12</b>
	3	5.1%	6
	2	5.1%	6
<b>Over \$150,000</b>	<b>All</b>	5.1%	<b>6</b>
	7	0.8%	1
	6	0.8%	1
	4	1.7%	2
	3	0.8%	1
	[no response]	0.8%	1
I would prefer not to answer	N/A	7.6%	9
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>100.00%</b>	<b>118</b>