



MOBILITY BOARD

Meeting Notice and Agenda

Wednesday, May 6, 2026
Hybrid Meeting, 4:00-5:30PM
Location: Civic Center Plaza
1200 3rd Ave, 4th Floor Conference Room
San Diego, CA 92101

Zoom Link: <https://sandiego.zoomgov.com/j/1619281857>

Chair: Daniel Reeves (Chair, Mayoral)

Board Members: Michael Donovan (Mayoral), Haylee Rea (Mayoral), Harry Bubbins (D1), Stephan Vance (D2), Dr. Lima Saft (D5), Jeff Dosick (D6), Steve Gelb (D7), Anar Salayev (Vice Chair, D9)

Staff Liaisons: Sarah Pierce, Senior Planner and Philip Trom, Program Manager

The Link to Join the Webinar By Computer, Tablet, Or Smartphone Is:

<https://sandiego.zoomgov.com/j/1619281857>

Meeting ID: 161 928 1857

To Join by Using One-Tap Mobile:

US (English): + 16692545252,, 1619281857#

US (Spanish): + 16692161590,, 1619281857#

To Join by Telephone:

Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

(US West Coast): +1 669 254 5252 or +1 669 216 1590 or (US East Coast): +1 551 285 1373 or +1 646 828 7666 or (US Spanish): +1 415 449 4000 or +1 646 964 1167 or (US Toll Free) 833 568 8864

Meeting ID: 161 928 1857

Find your local number: <https://sandiego.zoomgov.com/u/aKT2VxCzG>

Public Comment

Public Comment on an Agenda Item: If you wish to address the Board on an item for today's agenda, please complete and submit a speaker form before the Board hears the agenda item. You will be called at the time the item is heard.

Written Comment through Webform: In lieu of in-person attendance, members of the public may submit their comments using a [web form](#). If using the web form, indicate the agenda item number you wish to submit a comment for. Instructions for word limitations and deadlines are noted on the web form. On the web form, members of the public should select Mobility Board.

Virtual Public Comment: When the Chair introduces the item, you would like to comment on (or indicates it is time for Non-Agenda Public Comment), raise your hand by either tapping the “Raise Your Hand” button on your computer, tablet, or Smartphone, or by dialing *9 on your phone. You will be taken in the order in which you raised your hand. You may only speak once on a particular item. When the Chair indicates it is your turn to speak, click the unmute prompt that will appear on your computer, tablet, or Smartphone, or dial *6 on your phone.

Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda: You may address the Board on any matter not listed on today's agenda. Please complete and submit a speaker form. However, California's open meeting laws do not permit the Board to discuss or take any action on the matter at today's meeting. At its discretion, the Board may add the item to a future meeting agenda or refer the matter to staff or a committee. Individuals' comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. At the discretion of the Chair, if a large number of people wish to speak on the same item, comments may be limited to a set period of time per item.

Requests for Accessibility Modifications or Accommodations

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), by contacting Sarah Pierce at 619-236-7385 or spierce@sandiego.gov. Requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for alternatives to observing meetings and offering public comment as noted above, may be made by Sarah Pierce at 619-236-7385 or spierce@sandiego.gov. Requests for disability-related modifications or accommodations required to facilitate meeting participation, including requests for auxiliary aids, services or interpreters, require different lead times, ranging from five business days to two weeks. Please keep this in mind and provide as much advance notice as possible in order to ensure availability. The City is committed to resolving accessibility requests swiftly in order to maximize accessibility.

Requests for translation services to offer public comment may be made by contacting or Sarah Pierce at 619-236-7385 or spierce@sandiego.gov. The City is committed to addressing language translation requests swiftly to maximize public participation.

Item 1: Call to Order. Roll Call

Item 2: Approval of Meeting Minutes (Action)

Approval of the April 1, 2026 meeting minutes (Attachment 1).

Item 3: Non-Agenda Public Comment

Item 4: City of San Diego Crash Data (Information)

Staff from the City of San Diego Police Department will present an annual update on serious injuries and fatal collisions within the City.

Item 6: Subcommittee Updates (Discussion/ Possible Action)

6.a. ATI Workplan Subcommittee Activities

The ATI Subcommittee will present their feedback on the Bicycle Master Plan Update (Attachment 2).

6.b. Budget Subcommittee Activities

The Budget Subcommittee will present their feedback on the Proposed Budget for FY 2027 and will share priorities for council consideration (Attachment 3).

Note: Subcommittee minutes and agenda requests shall be submitted no later than 10 days prior to the next Mobility Board meeting.

Item 7: Staff Updates

Item 8: Updates from Members

Item 9: Schedule and Topics for Future Meetings

- June 3, 2026
- July 1, 2026
- August 5, 2026
- September 2, 2026

Mobility Board meeting agenda topic requests shall be submitted no later than 10 days prior to the next Mobility Board meeting.

Item 10: Adjournment

The next scheduled meeting of the Mobility Board is June 3, 2026.

The City of
SAN DIEGO
MOBILITY BOARD

Wednesday, April 1, 2026
 In Person Meeting: 4:00 – 5:30 PM
 Civic Center Plaza, 1200 3rd Ave., 4th Floor Conf. Room
 San Diego, CA 92101

Members: Michael Donovan (Mayoral), Haylee Rea (Mayoral), Daniel Reeves (Chair, Mayoral), Harry Bubbins (D1), Stephan Vance (D2), Dr. Lima Saft (D5), Jeff Dosick (D6), Steve Gelb (D7), Anar Salayev (Vice Chair, D9)

Agenda:

Item 1: Call to Order. Roll call.

Vice Chair Salayev called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

Mobility Board Member	Seat	Attendance
Vacant	Mayoral	No
Daniel Reeves**	Mayoral	Yes
Michael Donovan	Mayoral	Yes
Haylee Ann Rea	Mayoral	Yes
Harry Bubbins	D1	Yes
Stephan Vance	D2	Yes
Vacant	D3	No
Vacant	D4	No
Lima Saft	D5	No
Jeff Dosick *	D6	Yes
Steve Gelb	D7	Yes
Vacant	D8	No
Anar Salayev	D9	Yes

*This board member appeared remotely.

**This board member arrived after the roll was called.

Item 2: Approval of the Meeting Minutes (Action)

Vice Chair Salayev asked the Mobility Board to review and approve the minutes from its March 4, 2026 meeting.

There were no public comments on this item.

Action: Upon a motion by Harry Bubbins and a second by Haylee Ann Rea, the Mobility Board voted to approve the March 4, 2026 meeting minutes with all members in attendance voting “yes” to approve the meeting minutes.

Item 3: Non-Agenda Public Comment

One non-agenda public comment was received via the web-portal. It was not read into the record during the meeting but is reflected here. The commenter noted that they appreciate all of the work that's being

done to expand transit and active transportation options in San Diego, but believe that by removing parking and loading zones, a disservice has been done to disabled community members. Many businesses don't have any sort of drop-off or pick-up area nearby so it's hard for people with limited mobility to access businesses.

Item 4: Bicycle Master Plan Update (Information)

Staff from the City Planning Department shared an overview of the Bicycle Master Plan Update including a recap of engagement completed to date, an overview of the methodology used to develop the draft bicycle network, an overview of the draft bicycle network social pinpoint webpage and City of San Diego webpage, and next steps for the for the project.

There were three public commenters on this item. The first speaker noted that protected bikeways (Class IV facilities) are the best way to increase ridership and meet the City's Vision Zero and mode-share goals. They noted that the Adams Ave. class III enhanced facility is not appropriate for Adams Ave. because the ADT is too high. They suggested upgrading this facility to a Class IV facility. The second speaker noted that many of the proposed Class III Enhanced facilities in the draft network would not allow for appropriate traffic calming. They challenged staff to look closely at these facilities and note why these changes are proposed for these facilities. A final public speaker noted that there are several key network gaps that will be filled with Class IV facilities. They also expressed concerns about Class III facilities being proposed in areas where they are not appropriate due to vehicle speed and volumes. They asked staff to revisit recommendations made for Class III facilities on high-speed roads.

Board member discussion touched on the future classification of Friars Road and the use of striped bike lanes on high-speed roads. City Planning staff noted that it's not desirable for high-speed roads to have striped bike lanes but there may be some included in the Plan. The Board also asked about the inclusion of the analysis from the recently adopted Speed Management Plan. Staff noted that analysis for the bicycle network was based on speeds available at the time of network development and over the summer the team will review the network in light of the recommendations in the Speed Management Plan. The Board discussed the safety enhancements of parking-separated bikeways, where Class II bike lanes are curb-adjacent, increasing safety for the rider. The Board discussed the need for a bicycle facility near 6th Ave and Robinson Ave. and on N. Torrey Pines Road, where cars are moving quickly. The Board was supportive of the Class IV facility proposed for Pacific Highway since this is a critical missing link in the bicycle network. The Board discussed the need for enhanced wayfinding, funding for maintenance, and inclusion of bike parking in the Plan and encouraged staff to review the placement of Class III-enhanced facilities on higher speed and volume roads.

Item 5: San Diego E-Bike Share Feasibility Study (Information)

J.D. Weidman shared some preliminary research on bikeshare in North America, project goals for a proposed docked, regional e-bike-share system, the economic impact of bikeshare, bikeshare safety, and preliminary cost estimates for a docked e-bike service in San Diego.

There were two public commenters in support of the item. One commenter noted that the station selection process should be done by the City and not by Community Planning Groups.

The Board also expressed strong support for this concept and noted that existing policy and code written for previous the bike-share program may need to be amended to successfully implement such a project.

Item 6: Subcommittee Updates (Discussion/ Possible Action)

6.a. ATI Workplan Subcommittee Activities

Vice Chair Salayev shared two recommendation letters for the Mobility Board to vote on. The first letter encourages the City of San Diego to prioritize bringing bikeshare to San Diego. The second letter expresses concerns with omitting safe bicycle infrastructure on Governor Drive.

There were no public comments on this item.

Mobility Board discussion focused on revising the bikeshare letter to recognize the City’s current budget constraints at the beginning of the letter. The Board also discussed a balanced approach for bikeshare, ensuring any potential future project is deployed to serve all communities.

Action: Upon a motion by Steve Gelb and a second by Michael Donovan, the Mobility Board voted to approve both letters with one amendment to the bikeshare letter to recognize the City’s budget constraints. All members in attendance voted “yes”.

6.b. Budget Subcommittee Activities

There were no updates from the Budget Subcommittee.

Item 7: Staff Updates

Staff shared that the SANDAG Flexible Fleets grant program will be shared to the Board via email and the draft City budget will be released April 15.

There were no public comments on this item.

Item 8: Updates from Members

Chair Daniel Reeves noted that he has been invited to represent the Board at a quick-build demonstration event hosted by AARP and America Walks later in the month. Harry Bubbins noted his support for the recent adoption of the City’s Speed Management Plan. Steve Gelb noted that the Urban Collaborative project will host their annual transportation exposition on Saturday, April 11. Bike SD and Circulate San Diego are doing a bike audit on Saturday, April 4th in North Park.

There were no public comments on this item.

Item 9: Schedule for Future Meetings

Staff will reconnect with the Chair on the May agenda and will be reaching out to the Port of San Diego to reschedule their item.

There were no public comments on this item.

Future Meeting Dates:

- May 6, 2026
 - June 3, 2026
- July 1, 2026
August 5, 2026

Item 10: Adjournment

Vice Chair Salayev adjourned the meeting at 5:38 pm. The next Mobility Board meeting is scheduled for May 6, 2026.



Naomi Chavez
Interim Director
Transportation Department
202 C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Feedback on the Bicycle Master Plan Update

Dear Interim Director Chavez,

We are writing to provide feedback on the City's Draft Bike Master Plan Update. As the plan is finalized, we urge the Department to adopt the feedback below to ensure that the final adopted plan sets a bold vision for safe mobility in San Diego.

1. The City must treat this plan as a vision for cycling in San Diego.

This plan is an opportunity for the City of San Diego to update its bike master plan to reflect our mobility, climate, and equity goals. This plan should be treated as a statement of the City's vision for cyclists. It should reflect the city's commitment to ensuring cyclists can ride safely and making the infrastructure investments necessary to achieve our modeshift goals.

2. This updated plan must remain consistent with the City's stated "Class IV First" approach.

The initial draft of the bike network proposed under this plan had substantially more Class IV bikeways than the current draft published for community feedback.¹ The initial draft identified appropriate facilities according to NACTO guidance. After staff review, the majority of Class IV facilities were stripped out. This change runs counter to both NACTO guidance and the City's own "Class IV First" approach.

Class IV Bikeways are for the exclusive use of micromobility users, such as bicyclists, and include physical vertical separation from traffic. Class IV bikeways allow cyclists to enjoy the safety of a separated lane, with the efficiency of on-road travel. The City acknowledges that Class IV bikeways provide a safer experience for cyclists, even committing to a "Class IV First" approach as it implements bike networks. Moving away from this commitment as the City crafts its updated bike master plan is a significant step back in making San Diego a safe and easy place to bike, and runs counter to the City's own stated approach.

¹ City of San Diego Planning Department, Bicycle Master Plan Update Mobility Board, (April 1 2026), available at https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2026-04/item4-bike-master-plan_4.1.26.pdf, last visited April 22, 2026.

A Class IV first approach must mean doing all we can to ensure the safe facilities are built. This means taking a hard look at how to make Class IV facilities work, even if it comes at a cost to existing street parking or travel lanes for motor vehicles.

3. Apply objective standards when selecting facility type.

When presenting the draft network, City staff identified a number of reasons for deviating from the ideal bikeway facility type as determined by NACTO's Urban Bikeway Design Guide. These reasons included curb width, emergency vehicle access, driveway density, and potential parking impacts. While some of these considerations can be applied consistently based on existing data, others cannot, including parking considerations. The final plan should either find a way to objectively measure and do a cost benefit analysis of the parking impact of each bikeway, or ignore parking concerns altogether to create a plan that is not influenced by bias or public perceptions around parking availability.

Any instance where a Class III bikeway is proposed, particularly on corridors that would otherwise call for greater protection based on traffic volume, posted speeds, or a history of crashes resulting in injury or death, must include a documented explanation justifying the downgrade. This requirement creates accountability and ensures that deviations from higher-protection standards reflect genuine constraints, not convenience or political pressure.

Additionally, the placement of Class II and Class III bikeways must as a rule avoid placing cyclists within door zones of parked vehicles. The Bike Master Plan should establish this as a baseline design requirement, not an afterthought, and the street design manual update should reflect this standard explicitly.

4. Without an updated street design manual, this is not a realistic plan.

The City has been in the process of finalizing an updated street design manual for over one year. Without an updated street design manual, a new bike master plan cannot be taken seriously as is. Guidance in the street design manual underpins determinations on the types of facilities the City plans for. Without this updated guidance, the City cannot justifiably determine which facilities are appropriate where.

5. A good plan is crafted to be implemented.

Too often, good City plans remain as plans. To give this planned network the best chance of being realized, the final plan should prioritize each of the planned bikeway facilities based on a quantitative score. Appendix A of the Mobility Master Plan provides a prioritization methodology that should serve as a model for this update.² The scoring methodology should heavily weight

² City of San Diego, Mobility Master Plan, (April 2025) [Final-mmp_april-2025-w-app_3.pdf](#), last visited April 22, 2026.



safety, mobility, sustainability, and connectivity. Facilities in locations that have seen crashes resulting in fatalities or serious injuries should be prioritized.

The plan should also propose projects to be funded annually according to the prioritization. While City budgets can be difficult to predict, transportation funding is distinct and largely flows down from federal and state governments via formula. As such, funding available to be expended on transportation infrastructure is generally predictable. Therefore, this plan should include an estimated amount available to be expended on bike infrastructure for the following ten years and prescribe projects that the city anticipates initiating using this estimated funding. The plan should also identify discretionary sources of funding that will be sought to fund additional projects.

6. Suggested network improvements.

The current draft network downgrades or completely omits bikeways included in SANDAG's 2025 Regional Plan and Bike Plan Early Action Program. These bikeways should be included in the plan, and at a class that is appropriate for the assigned roadway. Alignment with existing transportation plans is vital for continuity of the network, and consistency in facilities between jurisdictions. Some of the SANDAG projects not reflected in the draft network include Pacific Beach Bikeway, Pacific Beach to East Mission Bay, and the Balboa Transit Center Connector Bikeway. A full list can be found in Appendix A.

Additionally, the current draft network fails to connect communities to each other, resulting in isolated segments of separated facilities that do not create a cohesive bicycle network. Each neighborhood should have at least one separated facility (Class I or IV) connecting it to each neighboring community.

Further, The current draft network contains many Class IV or Class I bikeways that strand cyclists on their trip. This plan should avoid creating Class IV or Class I facilities that immediately convert into Class III facilities at one or both ends. This plan should outline a bike network that is comfortable for all ages and abilities, and stranding cyclists runs counter to that goal.

We have compiled a list of concerns that should be addressed in the final proposal (Appendix B). These have come from district representatives on the mobility board as well as residents across the City of San Diego.

7. Without the staff to design the proposed facilities, this plan will never be implemented.

Finally, the Mayor's draft FY 2027 City budget proposed eliminating the city engineers responsible for planning and designing bike infrastructure. Without adequate staff resources dedicated to planning and designing the network proposed in this plan, it will never become a



reality. If the City intends to finalize this plan update, it must maintain the staff required to implement it.

Sincerely,

Daniel Reeves
 Chair
 City of San Diego Mobility Board

Cc:
 Chida Warren, Director, Office of Boards and Commissions
 Heidi Vonblum, Director, Planning Department

Appendix A

Districts	Project Name
1	Ocean Beach to Mission Bay
1	Pacific Beach to East Mission bay
1	Pacific Beach Bikeway
1	North Mission Bay Drive to Rose Creek Bike Path
1	Coastal Rail Trail San Diego - Mission Bay (Clairemont to Tecolote)
1	Central Coast Corridor: Pacific Beach to La Jolla
1	Gilman Connector
1	Central Coast Corridor: La Jolla to Del Mar
1, 2	Balboa Transit Center Connector Bikeway
1, 2	Midway to Pacific Beach Bikeway
2	Rosecrans Bikeway
2	Midway to Sunset Cliffs
2	Kearny Mesa to Beaches Corridor - Clairemont Drive to Genesee Avenue
2	Kearny Mesa to Beaches Corridor - Genesee Avenue to Linda Vista Road
3	Downtown Mobility Plan Phase 2
3	Downtown to Southeast

3, 8	Golden Hill to Bayshore Bikeway
3, 8	Golden Hill to Logan Heights
3, 8, 9	Market Street Bikeway
4	South Bay to Southeastern San Diego
4	Valencia Bikeway
4	Lemon Grove to Imperial Bikeway
4, 8	Encanto to Barrio Logan Bikeway
5	Pomerado Bikeway
6	Mira Mesa Neighborhood Bikeway
7, 9	San Carlos to College and Grantville Bikeway
9	Rolando to Grossmont/La Mesa

Appendix B

District One

- **La Jolla Shores Drive** would benefit from a Class II or Class IV rather than a Class III.
- **East Mission Bay Drive** should be upgraded to a protected facility. Drivers use the road to bypass heavy traffic on I-5, exceeding speed limits and creating an unsafe environment for cyclists.
- The proposed Class IV on **Mission Boulevard** should extend through Mission Beach. This is especially important considering certain classes of bicycles can no longer be used on the boardwalk.
- **Pacific Beach** should have at least one East to West protected bikeway that connects to the Balboa Avenue trolley stop.
- **Loring Street** should have a protected facility connecting to the Foothill Blvd and La Jolla Blvd facilities.
- **Ingraham Street** from Foothill Blvd to Crown Point Dr. should be upgraded to a protected facility. This is a high-use through street frequented by drivers heading to the freeway.

District Two

- **Shelter Island Drive** sees a high volume of cars and recreational bike use by both locals and tourists. It should include a separated facility.
- The Class III gap on **Canon St** between Evergreen St and Valemont St should be upgraded to a Class I.
- **Catalina Boulevard** should be upgraded to a Class IV as it sees high volume of bike and high-speed car traffic.
- **Chatsworth Blvd** sees high volume and is a key connector. It should be upgraded. At minimum, the Class III segments should be upgraded to Class IV.
- The gap on **West Point Loma Blvd** at Sunset Cliffs Blvd should be remedied.

- The gap on **Taylor Street** between Presidio Drive and Pacific Highway should be remedied.

District Three

- **Broadway** through downtown is currently marked as a Class III. This facility should be upgraded to a Class IV. Additionally, there has been conversation about turning a lane on Broadway to a dedicated transit lane. This plan should reflect that priority.
- The **Market Street** bike lane is projected to end at 19th street. It should extend to connect to planned and existing cycle tracks to ensure continuity of protected East-West connections throughout downtown.
- **30th Street**, between Ash and Market Streets, should include a bike facility. At minimum the uphill segment should be upgraded.
- The proposed Class IV on **University Avenue** should extend to Boundary St.
- **Harbor Island Drive** sees a high volume of cars and recreational bike use by both locals and tourists. It should include a separated facility.
- **Presidio Dr and Jackson St** are major routes that are too narrow for cars to pass cyclists safely. The proposed Class III should be upgraded to a separated facility.
- The Class IV path on **Laurel St** from Harbor Dr to Union St should be continuous, without any gaps.

District Four

- **Reo Dr** should have one continuous Class II facility.
- The **Munda Rd** facility should be upgraded to Class IV.
- **Potomac St** should be upgraded to a Class II, in line with the existing facility.
- **Briarwood Rd** between Alta View Dr and Paradise Valley Rd should have consistent separated facilities.
- The gap in the Class II facility along **Skyline Dr** between Valencia Parkway and S 58th St should be addressed.
- **Logan Ave** from S 43rd St continuing onto **Olvera Ave** to Bonita Dr should be a continuous Class IV facility. This is the only continuous East-West route that does not intersect with freeway traffic and is on the SANDAG safety focus network.
- **Euclid Ave** from Imperial Ave to Federal Blvd should be upgraded to a Class IV, in line with SANDAG's Safety Focus Network.
- The gap in the Class II facility on **Jamacha Rd** between Beacon Dr and Joana Dr should be addressed
- **36th St** should be upgraded to a Class IV.

District Five

- **Bernardo Center Drive** between Camino del Norte and Duenda Road should be upgraded to a Class IV facility.

- **W Bernardo Drive** from between Bernardo Center Road and Rancho Bernardo Road should be upgraded to a Class IV facility to match conditions north of Rancho Bernardo Road.
- **Salmon River Road** between Calle de las Rosas and the 56 Bike Path should have a class II facility going uphill. This is a location where a cyclist was killed after being hit from behind.

District Six

- The facility on **Lusk Boulevard** between Vista Sorrento Parkway and Mira Mesa Boulevard should be upgraded to a Class IV.
- **Mercy Road** from Black Mountain Road and the 15 Freeway should be upgraded to a Class IV to match the condition east of the 15 Freeway.

District Seven

- The facility on **College Avenue** between Del Cerro Boulevard and Montezuma Road should be upgraded to a Class IV. (D7 and D9)
- **Camino Del Rio N** between Fairmount to Rancho Mission Road should be a continuous Class IV facility. This would ensure that SDSU students have a complete safe path between campus and Snapdragon

District Eight

- The **Palm Avenue** facility should be a continuous Class IV bikeway. The Class II facility between Hollister and the 805 should be upgraded.
- The planned Class III facility along **Chicano Park Boulevard** (formerly Cesar Chavez Parkway) should be upgraded to a Class II. This would provide a continuous Class II connection from 25th Street to the Bayshore Bikeway.
- The Class IV facility on **Dairy Mart Rd** should extend between Camino de la Plaza and W San Ysidro Blvd.
- The **J St** cycle track should extend to Sherman Elementary.
- The Class II facility on **S 32nd** Street should extend to Harbor Dr.

District Nine

- The facility on **College Avenue** between Del Cerro Boulevard and Montezuma Road should be upgraded. (D7 and D9)
- The **Adams Avenue** facility should be upgraded to a Class IV. It is an important thoroughfare and is wide enough to accommodate an upgraded facility.
- The facility on **El Cajon** should be upgraded. At minimum beginning where the Class II facility on Meade Ave ends heading east.

Attachment 3



May 6, 2026

Honorable Mayor Todd Gloria
& Honorable City Council Members
202 C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: FY 2027 Draft Budget – Mobility Board Response to Mayor’s Proposed Budget and Priorities for Council Consideration

Dear Mayor Gloria and City Council Members,

On behalf of the City of San Diego Mobility Board, I write in response to the Mayor’s FY 2027 Proposed Budget, released April 15, 2026. This letter follows the Mobility Board’s January 7, 2026 budget priorities letter, in which we outlined a focused set of safety improvements, low-cost policy actions, and planning investments appropriate for a challenging fiscal year. We write now to assess where the proposed budget responds to those priorities – and where it falls short in ways that warrant Council attention before the budget is finalized this June.

The Mobility Board appreciates the significant fiscal constraints the City is navigating, and we commend the Mayor for several investments that align directly with our stated priorities. At the same time, a careful review of the proposed budget – across the departmental detail volumes, the Transportation Capital Improvements Program, and the Independent Budget Analyst’s Report 26-11 released April 29, 2026 – reveals several decisions that we believe will cost the City more in the long run than they save today. As the IBA has noted, new revenues for infrastructure have been limited while the infrastructure needs of the City have ballooned from \$1.4 billion in unfunded capital needs ten years ago to \$7.8 billion today. That trajectory should caution us against disinvestment today that will cost us tomorrow.

Budget Priority Wins

The Mobility Board recognizes and applauds the following investments in the FY 2027 Proposed Budget:

- \$59.9 million for traffic safety improvements in the Capital Improvements Program, including allocations for traffic signals, traffic calming, sidewalks, and bicycle facilities under the City’s Vision Zero framework, including funding for improvements at the “Fatal 15” intersections and implementation of the Speed Management Plan through

Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account funds — two priorities the Mobility Board specifically called for in our January 2026 letter.

- \$89.1 million for the Street Repair Program, continuing meaningful progress toward the City’s pavement condition goals.
- New operating budget support for sidewalk repair, asphalt and cement materials, and right-of-way maintenance – investments that improve pedestrian safety and accessibility.
- Continued funding for Parking Enforcement operations, which supports safety and access management goals – although, the Mobility Board continues to urge the City’s reinvestment of parking revenues into projects that meaningfully shift mode share toward the city’s CAP goals.
- Active CIP projects that reflect prior Mobility Board priorities, including the Alvarado Canyon Road Realignment, Linda Vista/Comstock Intersection Upgrade, Barrio Logan Roundabouts, and the completion of the Market Street 47th to Euclid Complete Street project.

These investments represent real, meaningful progress, and the Mobility Board is grateful to the Mayor and Council for maintaining them in a deeply constrained fiscal year.

Areas of Concern

Despite this progress, the Mobility Board must respectfully flag three areas in the proposed budget that it believes undermine the City’s stated commitments to Vision Zero, active transportation, and climate action – and that warrant specific Council action before adoption.

1. Elimination of the Multimodal/Bike Lane Team

The proposed budget eliminates 14.5 FTE positions and \$2.6 million associated with the Transportation Department’s Multimodal Team – the operational staff responsible for designing and delivering active transportation infrastructure throughout the City.

The Mobility Board views this as the single most consequential reduction in the budget from a mobility and safety perspective. The Multimodal Team is a group of traffic engineers and experts responsible for designing complete streets improvements. When the City repaves a road, this team ensures that the lane striping, crosswalks, and bike lanes repainted on the fresh asphalt are done in a way that makes the street as safe as possible – integrating safety into infrastructure that is already being touched. This is one of the most cost-effective approaches to making San Diego streets safer, and it minimizes the disruptions that drivers experience from repeated closures. Eliminating this team while the City’s Transportation CIP shows \$119 million in planned bicycle facility investment is not true savings – it ensure that either, 1) that those investments will not be made because the personnel resources to deliver them are no longer available, or 2) that they will be made in a much less cost-effective way.

It is also important to note that eliminating this team does not free up General Fund dollars. The City's transportation budget is increasing by \$10 million this fiscal year, largely because it is funded by TransNet revenue and state and federal formula funds – funding that must be spent on transportation and cannot be redirected to other priorities. The multimodal team's salaries come primarily from these dedicated sources. Eliminating the team does not free up money for other City priorities, it simply means less capacity to deliver the active transportation improvements that those funding streams exist to support.

Furthermore, eliminating the Multimodal Team puts at risk the City's ability to compete for significant discretionary grant funding. The U.S. Department of Transportation is currently distributing \$1 billion in Safe Streets and Roads for All funds, and the California Department of Transportation is distributing \$619 million through the Active Transportation Program. Applications for these competitive programs require complete streets improvement plans – work the multimodal team would produce. The City's \$700,000 investment in updating its Bike Master Plan also becomes difficult to justify without the in-house engineers needed to design the facilities it identifies. The Mobility Board urges the Council to restore funding to the Multimodal Team, understanding that doing so is not to the detriment of the General Fund, and it protects the City's access to substantial outside funding.

2. Reduction of the Senior Traffic Engineer in the City Planning Mobility Planning Section

The City Planning Department's FY27 budget eliminates 1.0 Senior Traffic Engineer within the Mobility Planning section. This position is responsible for the long-range mobility planning work that integrates transportation infrastructure with community plans – the foundational policy work that shapes where and how future bikeway, pedestrian, and transit investments are made.

The Mobility Board acknowledges that Planning faces the same fiscal pressures as every other department, and we do not make this request lightly. However, this particular position sits at the intersection of mobility policy and capital delivery in a way that makes its loss disproportionately harmful relative to its cost. We respectfully ask the Council to evaluate whether this position can be preserved.

3. Defunding of the Climate Equity Fund

The proposed budget waives the \$7.0 million franchise fee contribution to the Climate Equity Fund and reduces its CIP allocation from \$2.4 million to \$450,000. The Climate Equity Fund has been one of the primary mechanisms for directing mobility investments to communities of concern, including bicycle facilities in historically underserved neighborhoods. Eliminating it in the coming fiscal year is at odds with the City's stated equity and Climate Action Plan commitments.

The Mobility Board urges the Council to explore whether any portion of this funding can be preserved, particularly the CIP component that enables equity-focused bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

Unfunded Safety Priorities

The Mobility Board is pleased that the Mayor’s budget includes funding for improvements at the “Fatal 15” intersections through the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account – a priority we raised in January. However, two other low-cost safety priorities from our January 2026 letter are absent from the proposed budget, and the Mobility Board believes they warrant specific Council action.

AB 43 School Zone Speed Reductions

Assembly Bill 43 empowers cities to reduce school zone speed limits to as low as 15 miles per hour. Speeding remains one of the top factors in pedestrian deaths in San Diego, and children walking to and from school are among the most vulnerable users on our streets. The policy works has been done to implement this program, however, no funding appears to be proposed for its implementation. Its absence from the budget is difficult to reconcile with the City’s Vision Zero commitments, particularly in a year when our city has endured multiple tragedies involving children. The Mobility Board urges the Council to include this appropriation going forward.

Daylighting/AB 413 Implementation

Assembly Bill 413 makes it illegal to park within 20 feet of a crosswalk, improving visibility for pedestrians and drivers at intersections. Marking and enforcing these zones costs virtually nothing relative to its safety benefit. The City began this work in prior years and the Mobility Board urged its continuation in January. There is no evidence in the proposed budget that this program is being actively resourced. We ask the Council to direct the Transportation Department to report on the current status of the daylighting program and to ensure it is adequately staffed and funded as an ongoing priority.

Both of these measures are precisely the type of low-cost, high-impact actions the Mobility Board identified in January as appropriate for a lean fiscal year. Their omission is a missed opportunity to save lives at minimal cost to the General Fund.

Remaining Unfunded Mobility Board Priorities

In our January 2026 letter, the Mobility Board deliberately focused on a set of low-cost policy and planning actions appropriate for difficult fiscal years. These items require modest appropriations or no new funding at all beyond staff time and policy direction. While we are concerned that the following priorities did not make the cut in the proposed budget, we will hold off on advocating for their implementation until future years if appropriate.

- AB 289 Work Zone Speed Safety Program coordination – requires modest staff time to engage Caltrans and pursue inclusion in the automated speed safety program.
- Flexible Fleets Request for Proposals – the Mobility Board requested only an RFP issuance, not a program commitment. This is an administrative action requiring minimal cost, however, we understand that there is no certainty of future funding availability for flexible fleets investments.
- Streetcar Planning Study – the Mobility Board continues to believe that accelerating initial planning for the streetcar project endorsed by the Mayor, Councilmember Whitburn, and all affected Community Planning Groups is a high-leverage investment for a modest cost.
- Residential Parking Permit Program Feasibility Study – a planning investment that could generate future revenue and improve neighborhood access.

Next Steps

The Mobility Board respectfully requests that the City Council consider the following specific actions in its Budget Review Committee hearings:

- Preserve or restore the Multimodal/Bike Lane Team, or at minimum the positions necessary to maintain bikeway design and project delivery capacity.
- Preserve the Senior Traffic Engineer position in City Planning’s Mobility Planning section.
- Restore or partially restore the Climate Equity Fund CIP allocation to enable equity-focused mobility investments in communities of concern.
- Fund implementation of AB 43 School Zone Speed Reductions.
- Direct the Transportation Department to report on the status of the daylighting/AB 413 program and ensure it is adequately resourced in FY27.

The Mobility Board recognizes that the Mayor and Council face difficult choices in a challenging fiscal year. But as the IBA has stated, the City’s unfunded infrastructure needs have increased by five-fold over the last ten years driven in no small part by deferred investment. Disinvestment saves money today and costs far more tomorrow. The cuts and omissions identified in this letter follow that same logic. They defer costs rather than eliminate them, and they put lives at risk in the process. Our role is to provide guidance to the Mayor and City Council on issues of mobility policy, and we believe these specific modifications represent the most important steps the City

can take to protect its long-term investments in safety, connectivity, and equity – even within a significantly constrained budget.

We look forward to presenting these priorities at the Budget Review Committee hearings and remain available to support the Council’s deliberations in any way that would be useful. Thank you, Mayor Gloria and honorable Council Members, for your continued leadership on behalf of all San Diegans.

Sincerely,



Daniel Reeves
Chair
City of San Diego Mobility Board

cc: Charles Modica, Independent Budget Analyst
Chida Warren, Director, Office of Boards and Commissions
Heidi Vonblum, Director, Planning Department
Naomi Chavez, Interim Director, Transportation Department