505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

January 27, 2025

Justine Woodland Uber Technologies, Inc. 1515 Third Street San Francisco, CA 94158 jwoodland@uber.com

Subject: TNC Access for All Advice Letter 29 Disposition

Dear Justine Woodland,

Pursuant to Commission Decisions D.20-03-007, D.21-03-005, D.21-11-004, and D.23-02-024, the Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division (CPED) of the California Public Utilities Commission has processed your recent Advice Letter (AL) filing and is returning an AL status certificate for your records. This status certificate indicates:

Advice Letter Number
Name of Filer
CPUC Corporate ID number of Filer
Subject of AL Filing
Date Filed
Disposition of Filing (Approved, Rejected, Withdrawn, etc.)
Amount of Approved Offsets by County
Effective Date of Filing

CPED did not receive any protests against AL 29.

Please review your advice letter filing with the information contained in the attached AL status certificate and the Appendix for a description of the AL, protest, and staff's disposition. If you have any questions on this matter, please contact CPED Staff via email at tncaccess@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Terra Curtis

Director, Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Advice Letter Status Certificate

Status of Advice Letter 29 as of January 27, 2025

Uber Technologies, Inc. (TCP 38150)

Attention: Justine Woodland

1515 Third Street

San Francisco, CA 94158

Advice Letter Subject: Offset for Q3 2024 in compliance with Decisions D.20-03-007,

D.21-03-005, D.21-11-004, and D.23-02-024

Division Assigned: Consumer Protection and Enforcement

Date Filed: 10-15-2024

Disposition: Approved Effective Date: 1-27-2025

Approved Offsets:

| COUNTY | APPROVED OFFSETS (\$) |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | \$1,503,598.20 |
| SAN FRANCISCO | \$549,458.00 |
| TOTAL OFFSET AMOUNT APPROVED | \$2,053,056.20 |

CPUC Contact Information: tncaccess@cpuc.ca.gov

TNC Contact Information: Justine Woodland

jwoodland@uber.com

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Appendix: Staff Review and Disposition

Background

In accordance with D.20-03-007, D.21-03-005, D.21-11-004, and D.23-02-024 Uber, Inc. (Uber) filed advice letter (AL) 29 on October 15, 2024 to request offsets against quarterly Access Fund payments for amounts it spent during the Third Quarter (Q3) of 2024 to improve wheelchair accessible vehicle (WAV) service. No parties filed protests or responses.

This disposition evaluates Uber's compliance with offset requirements based on the dataset provided.

To qualify for an offset in a geographic area, a Transportation Network Company (TNC) must report the following in its quarterly AL filing: (1) presence and availability of WAVs; (2) improved level of service; (3) outreach efforts; (4) accounting of funds expended; (5) training and inspections; and (6) complaints related to WAV service. D.21-11-004 replaced the interim Offset Time Standard (OTS) framework adopted in D.20-03-007 (See Table 2.) and replaced the Trip Completion Standard (TCS) framework adopted in D.21-03-005 (See

Table 3.). Table 1 below summarizes the evaluation criteria adopted in D.20-03-007, D.21-03-005, D.21-11-004, and D.23-02-024:

Table 1: Criteria for Evaluating Offsets

| Evaluation Criteria | Must Demonstrate | Satisfied By |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1. Presence and availability of WAVs | (a) the number of WAVs in operation - by quarter and aggregated by hour of the day and day of the week, and (b) the unique number of WAVs in operation – by quarter and by hour of the day and day of the week; and (c) the number and percentage of WAV trips completed, not accepted, cancelled by passenger, cancelled due to passenger no-show, and cancelled by driver – by quarter and aggregated by hour of the day and day of the week; (d) the total WAV trips requested and completed | Satisfied By Submission of the relevant data |
| | broken out by Census Tract; and | |
| | (e) operating hours for each geographic area | |
| 2a. Improved level of | Both the Offset Time and the Trip Completion | Achievement of the |
| service (on-demand | Standards are satisfied: | Offset Time |
| WAVs) ¹ | | Standard ² and Trip |

¹ D.21-11-004 Ordering Paragraph 1-3, 6, and 7

² D.21-11-004, Ordering Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4



| Evaluation Criteria | Must Demonstrate | Satisfied By |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | (a) (1) Offset Time Standard & WAV Response | Completion |
| | Times: Meet or exceed both the relevant Level 1 | Standard ³ |
| | and Level 2 Offset Time Benchmarks for a given | |
| | quarter in a given geographic area within the Offset | |
| | Response time Benchmarks (ORTB). The schedule | |
| | shall advance each quarter, regardless of whether | |
| | a TNC submits an Offset Request in that quarter. | |
| | (b.1) Trip Completion Standard: Meet or exceed the applicable minimum percentage of trip requests | |
| | completed, and | |
| | (b.2) Either (i) a greater number of completed trips | |
| | than in the immediately prior quarter, or (ii) a | |
| | greater number of completed trips than in the | |
| | immediately prior year's same quarter, if sufficient | |
| | data is available. A TNC may elect to be compared | |
| | to this prior quarter or prior year's same quarter, if | |
| | applicable. The schedule shall advance each | |
| | quarter, regardless of whether a TNC submits an | |
| | Offset Request. | |
| 2b. Improved level of | Both the Pickup Delay Benchmark and the Trip | Achievement of the |
| service (pre-scheduled | Completion Standards are satisfied: | Pickup Delay |
| WAVs) ⁴ | · | Benchmark and the |
| • | (a) Pickup Delay Standard within the Pickup Delay | Trip Completion |
| | Benchmark ⁵ : Meet or exceed both the relevant | Standards |
| | Response Time Benchmarks for a given quarter in | |
| | a given geographic area within the Pre-scheduled | |
| | Pickup Delay Benchmarks (PDB). The schedule | |
| | shall advance each quarter, regardless of whether | |
| | a TNC submits an Offset Request in that quarter | |
| | (b.1) Pre-scheduled Trip Completion Standard ⁶ : | |
| | Meet or exceed the applicable minimum | |
| | percentage of trip requests completed, and | |
| | (b.2) Either (i) a greater number of completed trips | |
| | than in the immediately prior quarter, or (ii) a | |
| | greater number of completed trips than in the | |
| | immediately prior year's same quarter, if sufficient | |

 $^{^{\}rm 3}$ D.21-11-004, Ordering Paragraphs 6, 7, and 8

⁴ D.23-02-024 Ordering Paragraph 1-5

⁵ D.23-02-024 Ordering Paragraph 4

⁶ D.23-02-024 Ordering Paragraph 5



| Evaluation Criteria | Must Demonstrate | Satisfied By |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------|
| | data is available. A TNC may elect to be compared | |
| | to this prior quarter or prior year's same quarter, | |
| | if applicable. The schedule shall advance each | |
| | quarter, regardless of whether a TNC submits an | |
| | Offset Request. | |
| 3. Efforts to publicize | Evidence of outreach efforts such as a list of | Achievement of the |
| and promote available | partners from disability communities, how the | outreach efforts |
| WAV services ⁷ | partnership promoted WAV services, and | provided in their |
| | marketing or promotional materials of those | annual outreach plan |
| | activities including but not limited to: | and submission of |
| | (a) Submitted an annual outreach plan (due no | relevant data |
| | later than July 1 of each year), | |
| | (b) Information about disability access and WAV in | |
| | general marketing campaigns, | |
| | (c) Submit a quarterly report for each offset | |
| | county on the following: Progress made towards | |
| | implementing the outreach plan; The number of | |
| | entities contacted; The method, nature, outcome | |
| | of the contact; the number of partnerships | |
| | developed; Efforts to publicize and promote WAV | |
| | service in each offset county and whether efforts | |
| | were accessible to people with disabilities and | |
| | limited English proficiency; Educational materials | |
| | developed and distributed; and outcome of TNCs | |
| | efforts to outreach and engage wheelchair users. | |
| | Quarterly Report shall also address the following | |
| | questions: | |
| | What methods of engagement did the TNC | |
| | find most effective and why? | |
| | 2. What common concerns/questions came | |
| | up during the engagement process? | |
| | 3. What challenges have you encountered? | |
| | How do you plan to overcome them? | |
| 4. Full accounting of | Qualifying offset expenses are: | Submission of the |
| funds expended ⁸ | (a) reasonable, legitimate costs that improve a | relevant data |
| | TNC's WAV service, and | |
| | (b) incurred in the quarter for which a TNC requests | |
| | an offset, and | |

 $^{^{7}}$ D.20-03-007 Ordering Paragraph 9, and D.23-02-024 Ordering Paragraph 16

⁸ D.20-03-007 Ordering Paragraph 10

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



| Evaluation Criteria | Must Demonstrate | Satisfied By |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | (c) on the list of eligible expenses⁹ attached as Appendix A (d) net of fare revenues collected from WAV service delivery in the quarter for which a TNC requests an offset¹⁰. | |
| 5. Training and inspections ¹¹ | (a) certification of WAV driver training completion within the past 3 years, ¹² (b) WAV driver training programs used per geographic area, and the number of WAV drivers that completed WAV training in that quarter, and (c) Certification of WAV inspection and approval ¹³ | Submission of the relevant data |
| 6. Reporting complaints ¹⁴ | (a) number of complaints related to WAV drivers or services – by quarter and geographic area, and broken out by category ¹⁵ | Submission of the relevant data |

The Commission adopted standards for demonstrating improved level of service in D.20-03-007, D.21-03-005, D.21-11-004 (see Table 2 and Table 3 below). The Commission in D.23-02-024 expanded outreach efforts a TNC must demonstrate (see above table "Efforts to publicize and promote available WAV services") but did not set qualifying standards for the four other evaluation criteria. As long as a TNC satisfies both the Offset Time and Trip Completion Standards for improved level of service, achieved outreach efforts, and submits all the required data showing WAV presence and availability, accounting of expended funds, training and inspections, and complaints related to WAV service, it is eligible to receive offsets and its advice letter will be approved.

¹⁰ D.21-11-004 Ordering Paragraph 9

⁹ D.20-03-007, Appendix A

¹¹ D.20-03-007 Ordering Paragraph 13 and 15(f), 15(g), and 15(h)

¹² Must include: sensitivity training, passenger assistance techniques, accessibility equipment use, door-to-door service, and safety procedures, D.20-03-007, Ordering Paragraph 13.

¹³ Should state that WAVs conform with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Specifications for Transportation Vehicles within the past year, D.20-03-007, Ordering Paragraph 13.

¹⁴ D.20-03-007 Ordering Paragraph 14

¹⁵ Categories include securement issue, driving training, vehicle safety and comfort, service animal issue, stranded passenger, pickup, drop off, and others, D.23-02-024, Ordering Paragraph 13.



Table 2: On-Demand WAV Offset Response Times and Offset Time Standard

| Geographic Area/County | Level 1 WAV Response Time (mins) | Level 2 WAV Response Time (mins) |
|---|--|--|
| Group A | 15 | 30 |
| San Francisco | | |
| Group B San Diego, Santa Clara, Alameda, Sacramento, Contra Costa, Ventura, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Santa Barbara, Solano, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Imperial, Madera Los Angeles, Orange County, San Mateo | 25 | 50 |
| Group C Riverside, San Bernardino, Fresno, Kern, Sonoma, Tulare, Monterey, Placer, Merced, Marin, Butte, Yolo, El Dorado, Napa, Humboldt, Kings, Nevada, Sutter, Mendocino, Yuba, Lake, Tehama, San Benito, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Siskiyou, Amador, Glenn, Del Norte, Lassen, Colusa, Plumas, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono, Trinity, Modoc, Sierra, Alpine | 30 | 60 |

| Offset Time Standard (OTS) | Level 1 | Level 2 |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| | Offset Service | Offset Service |
| 1 st Quarter Submission | 50% | 80% |
| 2 nd Quarter | 54% | 81% |
| 3 rd Quarter | 57% | 83% |
| 4 th Quarter | 61% | 84% |
| 5 th Quarter | 64% | 86% |
| 6 th Quarter | 68% | 87% |
| 7 th Quarter | 71% | 89% |
| 8 th (and subsequent) Quarter | 75% | 90% |

Table 3: On-Demand WAV Trip Completion Standard

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



| Trip Completion Standard | County | County | County |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| | Group A | Group B | Group C |
| 1 st Quarter Submission | 50% | 50% | 50% |
| 2 nd Quarter | 54% | 53% | 51% |
| 3 rd Quarter | 57% | 56% | 53% |
| 4 th Quarter | 61% | 59% | 54% |
| 5 th Quarter | 64% | 61% | 56% |
| 6 th Quarter | 68% | 64% | 57% |
| 7 th Quarter | 71% | 67% | 59% |
| 8 th (and subsequent) Quarter | 75% | 70% | 60% |

| | Must meet at least one of: | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Trip Completion Standard | Number of Completed | Number of | |
| | Trips | Completed Trips | |
| | (Option 1) | (Option 2) | |
| | | Improvement | |
| Beginning Q2 2022 | | (higher) than prior | |
| | Improvement (higher) | year's same quarter | |
| | than prior quarter | if sufficient data is | |
| | | available. | |

Table 4: Pre-scheduled WAV Pickup Delay Benchmark and Standard

| Geographic Area/County | Pre-scheduled WAV Response Time (mins) |
|---|--|
| Group A | 8 |
| San Francisco | |
| Group B | |
| San Diego, Santa Clara, Alameda, Sacramento, Contra Costa, Ventura, San | 13 |
| Joaquin, Stanislaus, Santa Barbara, Solano, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, | 13 |
| Shasta, Imperial, Madera, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Mateo | |
| Group C | |
| Riverside, San Bernardino, Fresno, Kern, Sonoma, Tulare, Monterey, Placer, | 15 |
| Merced, Marin, Butte, Yolo, El Dorado, Napa, Humboldt, Kings, Nevada, | 13 |
| Sutter, Mendocino, Yuba, Lake, Tehama, San Benito, Tuolumne, Calaveras, | |
| Siskiyou, Amador, Glenn, Del Norte, Lassen, Colusa, Plumas, Inyo, Mariposa, | |
| Mono, Trinity, Modoc, Sierra, Alpine | |

Pre-scheduled Pickup Delay Standards (PDS)

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



| Percentage of Completed Trips under Pickup Delay Benchmarks | | |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 st Quarter Submission | 80% | |
| 2 nd Quarter | 81% | |
| 3 rd Quarter | 83% | |
| 4 th Quarter | 84% | |
| 5 th Quarter | 86% | |
| 6 th Quarter | 87% | |
| 7 th Quarter | 89% | |
| 8 th (and subsequent) Quarter | 90% | |

Table 5: Pre-scheduled WAV Trip Completion Standard

| Pre-scheduled Trip Completion Standard | County | County | County |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| | Group A | Group B | Group C |
| 1 st Quarter Submission | 90% | 80% | 65% |
| 2 nd Quarter | 90% | 81% | 67% |
| 3 rd Quarter | 90% | 82% | 70% |
| 4 th Quarter | 90% | 83% | 73% |
| 5 th Quarter | 90% | 84% | 76% |
| 6 th Quarter | 90% | 86% | 79% |
| 7 th Quarter | 90% | 88% | 82% |
| 8 th (and subsequent) Quarter | 90% | 90% | 85% |

Discussion

A. Offset Requirements

To qualify for an offset, a TNC must demonstrate improved level of service by satisfying both the Offset Time Standard (OTS) and Trip Completion Standard (TCS) established in Decisions D.20-03-007, D.21-03-005, and D.21-11-004. Ordering Paragraph 1 in D.21-11-004 provides the requirements that must be satisfied to meet the OTS:

To demonstrate improved level of service for offset eligibility, a Transportation Network Company (TNC) must demonstrate that it met or exceeded both the relevant Level 1 and Level 2 Response Time Benchmarks for a given quarter in a given geographic area. The 1st quarter percentages shall apply to the first quarter that a TNC submits an Offset Request in a given county. Once the schedule begins for a TNC in a given county, the schedule shall advance each quarter, regardless of whether a TNC submits an Offset Request in that quarter.

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



This means that a TNC must demonstrate first that it meets Level 1 and 2 response time benchmarks for that county (first test), and second, it must meet the minimum percentage of completed trips beginning the first quarter that a TNC submits an Offset Request in a given county (second test). Once the schedule begins in a given county, the schedule will advance each quarter regardless of whether a TNC submits an Offset Request for that quarter.

Ordering Paragraph 6 in D.21-11-004 replaced the TCS framework adopted in D.21-03-005, effective starting the second quarter of 2022 (applicable to this advice letter), which requires a TNC to meet the minimum percentage of trip requests completed (third test), and increase the number of completed WAV trips (fourth test):

To demonstrate improved level of service for offset eligibility, a TNC must demonstrate that it met or exceeded:

- (a) The applicable minimum percentage of trip requests and completed, and
- (b) Either: (a) a greater number of completed trips than in the immediately prior quarter, or (b) a greater number of completed trips than in the immediately prior year's same quarter, if sufficient data is available.

A TNC may elect to be compared to the prior quarter or prior year's same quarter, if applicable.

B. Review of Offset Requests

Uber's AL 29 requested offsets for on-demand WAV service in Q3 2024 totaling \$2,053,056.20 in two counties. Table 6 and Table 7 below summarize the Q3 2024 Offset Time Standard (response times and OTS percentages), while Table 8 and

Table 9 summarizes the Trip Completion Standard (percentages and numbers) reported for each geographic area eligible for offsets.

The review of AL 29 showed that Uber satisfied both the first and second tests for on-demand WAV service as its response times and OTS percentages for on-demand WAV service in Los Angeles and San Francisco counties met the Level 1 and 2 benchmarks (see Table 6 and Table 7). It also satisfied the third and fourth tests in both counties as the percentage of trip requests that were ultimately completed met the minimum benchmarks, and the number of completed trips in both counties resulted in a greater number of completed trips compared to the previous quarter and the prior year's same quarter (see Table 8 and

Table 9).

Finally, Uber satisfied the other requirements by submitting the required information regarding WAV presence and availability, outreach efforts, full accounting of funds expended, complaints related to WAV service, and training and inspections.

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Uber did not request offsets for pre-scheduled WAV service.

C. Disposition of AL 29

After review of AL 29, Staff concludes that Uber complied with all offset eligibility requirements for ondemand WAV service in D.20-03-007, D.21-03-005, and in D.21-11-004 for the counties of Los Angeles and San Francisco, as summarized in Tables 6-13 below. Uber did not provide pre-scheduled WAV service and did not seek offsets. Therefore, Uber's AL 29 is approved, effective January 27, 2025. The approved total offset amount is \$2,053,056.20. Consistent with D.20-03-007, Uber shall submit the Q3 2024 Quarterly Report for the counties of Los Angeles and San Francisco within 7 days following the issuance of this disposition.

Table 6: Uber's On-Demand WAV Level 1 and 2 Response Times (minutes) by County in Q3 2024

| County | Bench (minւ | | Q3 2024 (minutes) | | Within |
|---------------|----------------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------------------|
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 1 | Level 2 | Benchmark? |
| LOS ANGELES | 25 | 50 | 17.3 | 24.4 | Yes (Level 1 and 2) |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 15 | 30 | 10.0 | 13.7 | Yes (Level 1 and 2) |

Table 7: Uber's On-Demand WAV Level 1 and 2 Offset Time Standards (percent) by County in Q3 2024

| County | # Quarter | Bench (OTS | | Q3 2024 (OTS %) | | Meeting or |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|
| | Submission | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 1 | Level 2 | Exceeding %? |
| LOS ANGELES | 6 th | 68% | 87% | 76.6% | 96.1% | Yes (Level 1 and 2) |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 9 th | 75% | 90% | 80.8% | 98.3% | Yes (Level 1 and 2) |

Table 8: Uber's On-Demand WAV Trip Completion Standards by County in Q3 2024 (part b.1)

| County | # Quarter Submission | | chmark CCS) | Q3 2024 (TCS %) | Meeting the Minimum %? |
|---------------|-------------------------|--------|----------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | Submission | County | TCS (%) | (103 %) | iviiiiiiiiiiiiii 70 ! |
| LOS ANGELES | 6 th | В | 64% | 64.4% | Yes |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 9 th | Α | 75% | 76.1% | Yes |

Table 9: Uber's On-Demand WAV Trip Completion Standards by County in Q3 2024 (part b.2)



| County | Option 1 or 2 | (1) # of completed trips previous quarter | (2) # of completed trips in the immediately prior year's same quarter | (1) # of completed trips this quarter | (2) # of completed trips this quarter | Meeting or Exceeding #? |
|---------------|------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | 1 | 13,573 | 9,782 | 14,433 | 14,433 | Yes (1 & 2) |
| SAN FRANCISCO | 1 | 3,256 | 2,677 | 3,718 | 3,718 | Yes (1 & 2) |

Table 10: Uber's Pre-scheduled WAV Response Times (minutes) by County in Q3 2024

| County | Benchmark (PDB minutes) | Q3 2024 (minutes) | Within Benchmark? |
|---------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | NA | NA | NA |
| SAN FRANCISCO | NA | NA | NA |

Table 11: Uber's Pre-scheduled WAV Pickup Delay Standards (percent) by County in Q3 2024

| County | # Quarter Submission | Benchmark (PDS %) | Q3 2024 (PDS %) | Meeting or Exceeding %? | |
|---------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| LOS ANGELES | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| SAN FRANCISCO | NA | NA | NA | NA | |

Table 12: Uber's Pre-scheduled WAV Trip Completion Standards by County in Q3 2024 (part 2b. b.1)

| County | # Quarter Submission | | nmark 'CS) | Q3 2024 Meeting the (PTCS %) Minimum % | |
|---------------|-------------------------|--------|---------------|--|------------------|
| | Subillission | County | TCS (%) | (F1C3 /6) | Willilliuiii /0: |
| LOS ANGELES | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| SAN FRANCISCO | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |



Table 13: Uber's Pre-scheduled WAV Trip Completion Standards by County in Q3 2024 (part 2b. b.2)

| County | Option 1 or 2 | (1) # of completed trips previous quarter | (2) # of completed trips in the immediately prior year's same quarter | (1) # of completed trips this quarter | (2) # of completed trips this quarter | Meeting or Exceeding #? |
|---------------|------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| SAN FRANCISCO | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |