BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on Regulations Relating to Passenger Carriers, Ridesharing, And New On-Line-Enabled Transportation Services	R.12-12-011 (Filed December 20, 2012)

SAN FRANCISCO'S MOTION TO STAY RESOLUTION APPROVING AUTHORIZATION FOR WAYMO AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE PASSENGER SERVICE PHASE 1 DRIVERLESS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

JEFFREY P. TUMLIN
Director of Transportation
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
One South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 646-2522
jeffrey.tumlin@sfmta.com

TILLY CHANG
Executive Director
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 522-4832
tilly.chang@sfcta.org

RICH HILLIS
Planning Director
San Francisco Planning
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(628) 652-7411
rich.hillis@sfgov.org

Dated: August 16, 2023

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission" or "CPUC") Rules of Practice and Procedure, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA"), the San Francisco County Transportation Authority ("SFCTA"), and the San Francisco Planning Department (collectively "San Francisco") submit this motion to stay the authorization granted in Resolution TL-19144 (the "Resolution") allowing Waymo LLC to initiate commercial service in Autonomous Vehicle ("AV") Passenger Service Phase I Driverless Deployment Program in San Francisco with no limitations on geographic area, service hours and fleet size; San Francisco does so to preserve the status quo pending a decision by the full Commission on San Francisco's forthcoming application for rehearing. And at the same time San Francisco is filing a similar motion for a stay as to the companion resolution for Cruise LLC ("Cruise").

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 10, 2023, the Commission approved Waymo's Tier 3 Advice Letter to allow Waymo to initiate commercial driverless AV Passenger Service in San Francisco throughout the entire city—including its downtown core, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week—including peak travel hours, with no limit on fleet size. Waymo's Advice Letter was granted despite the Commission's acknowledgement that the performance of Waymo's driverless AVs, currently in testing, have interfered with passenger and public safety, including through street interference incidents with first responder operations, public transit, street construction workers, and the flow of traffic generally.[1]

The continual occurrence of AV incidents indicates that the technical issues that have caused these incidents have not been resolved and are likely to increase as AV companies scale their operations. Waymo claims that it has over 100,000 sign-ups for its waitlist.[2] Though it has stated that it intends to scale incrementally, it has not explained what its expansion plans are, even when asked directly by CPUC Commissioner Houck.[3] But the authorization of fared service with no limitations

[1] Resolution, at 12-13.

[2] Waymo, Waymo's next chapter in San Francisco, (updated Aug. 11, 2023), https://waymo.com/blog/2023/08/waymos-next-chapter-in-san-francisco.html.

[3] Reporters' Transcript, Order Instituting Rulemaking on Regulations Relating to Passenger Carriers, Ridesharing, and New-Online Enabled Transportation Services, Status Conference ("First Responder Status Conference Transcript"), August, 7, 2023 at. 50-51.

on geographic area, service hours and fleet size incentivizes expansion and it is reasonable to assume that Waymo will seek to expand at scale. This could lead to a significant increase in the numbers of driverless AVs on San Francisco streets and this would likely increase driverless AV incidents that interfere with passenger and public safety, including through street interference incidents with San Francisco first responder operations, public transit, street construction workers, and the general flow of traffic. Given that this unlimited expansion in fleet size will also allow AVs to operate fared driverless services during peak hours in the City's most active transportation corridors, it is fair to assume that the number and impact of incidents will at least increase in proportion to the increase in fleet size.

As described below, San Francisco will suffer serious harms from this expansion of driverless AV operations that will outweigh any potential harms from a minimal delay in commercial deployment Waymo may experience. Further, San Francisco is likely to prevail on the merits in its forthcoming application for rehearing because, as San Francisco has discussed in previous filings,[4] the Commission has abused its discretion in two ways. First, it approved the Resolutions without any further conditions of approval tied to AV performance that would address and improve admitted public safety hazards. Second, as indicated in the Commission's own record, several thousand AVs operating at one time without restriction in San Francisco may result in significant environmental impacts; yet the Commission failed to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq., "CEQA").

San Francisco continues to share the Commission's hope that automated driving may at some point improve street safety and offer other benefits to San Francisco travelers in terms of expanding the menu of transportation choices available in the city and enhancing equitable and accessible mobility for a wide population. San Francisco does not make this Motion lightly, but respectfully requests the Commission preserve the status quo and stay the Resolutions during the pendency of its consideration of San Francisco's forthcoming application for rehearing.

[4] *See* San Francisco Comments on the Draft Resolution Approving Authorization for Waymo Autonomous Vehicle Passenger Service Phase 1 Driverless Deployment Program, filed May 31, 2023, at 5-6, 19-23.

II. APPLICABLE LAW

When ruling on a motion for a stay the Commission will consider: (1) whether the moving party will suffer serious or irreparable harm if the stay is not granted; (2) whether the moving party demonstrates a likelihood of success of prevailing on the merits; (3) the balance of harms to the public interest or to the other interested parties;[5] and (4) any other factors relevant to a particular case.[6] This is essentially the same standard California courts apply when deciding whether injunctive relief is appropriate.[7] When a moving party is able to make a "strong showing on one of the factors, less of a showing is necessary on the other factors."[8] The Commission's authority to provide injunctive relief "is firmly rooted in the California Constitution, the Public Utilities Code, and case law."[9]

III. ARGUMENT

San Francisco seeks a motion to stay the authorization granted in Resolution TL-19144 to allow Waymo to initiate service in AV Passenger Service Phase I Driverless Deployment Program pending a decision by the full Commission on San Francisco's forthcoming application for rehearing. This Motion meets each of the Commission's four criteria for a stay.

A. San Francisco Will Suffer Serious Harm if the Stay is Not Granted.

To satisfy the first prong of the test, a moving party must proffer specific facts demonstrating irreparable harm.[10] Demonstrating that a Commission decision could result in "substantial costs,

---

[5] *Id.* at 8.

[6] *See* O*rder Granting Motion for Stay of Decision 08-01-031, Denying Rehearing, and Ordering Defendant to Answer the Complaint* (2008) Decision 08-04-044, 2008 Cal. PUC LEXIS 155*, at 13, (Commission stayed default judgment where moving party alleged that notice of complaint was served on improper agent. Commission held that allegations raised due process concerns providing a "reasonable basis to grant a stay independent of any other factor we might otherwise consider").

[7] 2009 Cal. PUC LEXIS 423, at * 8.

[8] *Id.*

[9] *Opinion: Decision Granting the Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order Regarding San Diego Gas & Electric Company's Power Shut-off Plan* (2009), Decision No. 09-08-030, 2009 Cal. PUC LEXIS 423, at * 6-7 (citing D. 01-1-046, at 12-13).

[10] *Order Modifying D. 08-04-055, and Denying Rehearing of Decision, As Modified, and Denying Request for Stay* (2008) Decision 08-09-044, 2008 Cal. PUC LEXIS 414, *, at 35-36, (moving parties failed to provide fact based affidavits establishing that challenged decision threatened viability of business enterprise), citing *North Shuttle Service* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 386, 392.

burdens, and risks to the people and communities" affected by the decision is sufficient to show the threat of serious or irreparable harm.[11] In such a case, the Commission will act to preserve the status quo until such time that the Commission can issue a decision on the challenged issues.[12]

San Francisco will suffer serious harm if Waymo is allowed expansion in the City with no limitations on geographic area, service hours and fleet size. It is foreseeable that driverless AV operations will significantly expand in the near-term.[13] And, as the Commission has acknowledged, the performance of Waymo's driverless AVs currently in testing has interfered with first responder operations, public transit, street construction workers, and the flow of traffic generally.[14] These impacts have come under a relatively limited scale of deployment, where AVs are not providing commercial driverless services in the entirety of the City's downtown core or during peak travel hours. An unplanned stop (a regular occurrence) that interferes with other street users is now significantly more likely to happen in the middle of a busy downtown arterial road at peak travel hours, snarling traffic for hours at the expense of San Francisco's residents, commuters, and visitors, particularly those reliant on public transit.

Since the reported launch of driverless operation, members of the public and city employees have reported more than 600 incidents of driverless AV operation that interfere with street operations.[15]

---

[11] 2009 Cal. PUC LEXIS 423, at * p. 8.

[12] *Id.*

[13] General Motors Company Q2 2023 Earnings Conference Call (July 25, 2023), https://investor.gm.com/events/event-details/general-motors-company-q2-2023-earnings-conference-call; Joe Eskenazi, *'Blanket the city:' CEO says SF can handle 10x more Cruise driverless vehicles*, Mission Local, https://missionlocal.org/2023/08/cruise-origin-waymo-robotaxi-driverless-car-autonomous-vehicle-california-public-utilities-commission/ (last visited August 11, 2023).

[14] Resolution, at 12-13.

[15] As Commissioner Shiroma observed at the CPUC's August 10, 2023 Voting Meeting, "the Commission lacks, at present, sufficient information to evaluate in any comprehensive fashion the safety aspects of this mode of transportation, especially insofar as driverless AVs impact the ability of our first responders to carry out their lifesaving duties. No federal or state regulations require Cruise or Waymo to report street interference incidents or the subset of those incidents that reflect emergency response interference events. The reporting fails to provide a complete picture of AV performance and there are likely many more incidents. Cruise and Waymo do not use the same definitions in discussing their performance, making industry representations of limited utility."

1. Harm to San Francisco's First Responder Agencies

Unfortunately, many of these incidents involve interference with emergency response operations. In the period between April 2022 and the date of this filing, the San Francisco Fire Department ("SFFD") alone logged nearly 60 written reports of driverless AVs impeding their activities.[16] This likely represents an undercount of the number of times an AV has interfered with SFFD emergency responses as incidents may go unreported and AV companies are not mandated to report any of these occurrences to state or federal regulators.[17] The documented incidents include obstructing ingress or egress from fire stations, obstructing firefighter travel to emergency sites, contact or near misses between AVs and SFFD personnel or equipment (including hoses, in violation of California Vehicle Code ("CVC") Section 21708), and unpredictable operations near a response zone.[18]

For example, SFFD personnel witnessed a driverless Waymo AV that simply stopped on a high speed roadway in front of a Fire Department vehicle, rather than yielding the right of way and pulling to the right. There have also been at least two incidents where a driverless Waymo AV stopped within 15 feet of a fire station driveway (in violation of CVC § 22500). On both occasions, the driverless AVs blocked fire vehicles from being able to leave their garages and respond to calls. On April 25, 2023, a Waymo vehicle blocked a narrow street where a fire truck was travelling, en route to an emergency call.[19] The Waymo vehicle did not yield to the SFFD vehicle, and forced the fire truck to back up and take an alternate route to the emergency, delaying the response time. In situations such as these, SFFD has to call for assistance from other SFFD vehicles that are further away from the emergency. The resulting delays can have serious repercussions for both fire suppression, medical responses, and the lives of the people involved. One report noted that it took over eight (8) minutes to

[16] *See* Declaration of Darius Luttropp in Support of San Francisco's Motion to Stay Resolution Approving Authorization for Waymo Autonomous Vehicle Passenger Service Phase 1 Driverless Deployment Program and San Francisco's Motion to Stay Resolution approving Authorization for Cruise LLC's Expanded Service in Autonomous Vehicle Passenger Service Phase I Driverless Deployment Program ("Luttropp Decl.) at ⁋ 10 and Exhibit A.

[17] *Id.* at ⁋ 12.

[18] *Id.* at ⁋⁋ 15-16, and 19 -21.

[19] *Id.* at Exhibit A, at 15.

have a driverless AV moved from blocking a station. And Waymo testified at the recent Status Conference/All-Party Meeting that the average response time to resolve their own count of 58 Vehicle Retrieval Events is ten (10) minutes.[20] Every minute is critical in responding to a medical emergency and fires can double in size in just one minute, making even a one-minute delay dangerous and potentially life-threatening. [21] In another incident, on August 5, 2023, a Waymo driverless AV entered an active firefighting scene at the Legion of Honor.[22] The Waymo driverless AV got in the way of firefighters holding a hose line and actively fighting a fire. Rather than recognize the ongoing emergency and leave the scene, the Waymo driverless AV stopped between the fire engine and the source of the fire (a vehicle fire). SFFD personnel had to be diverted from actively responding to the emergency in order to take over the Waymo vehicle and move it out of the way.[23] These incidents are serious and negatively impact public safety.

To date, although Waymo has represented that it is taking steps to remedy these issues in the short-term, the number of incidents with first responders continues to rise. Despite this increase, the Resolution does not impose any conditions requiring the company to improve its performance or otherwise mitigate the impact on San Francisco residents and visitors. It is foreseeable that incidents such as the ones cited will occur more frequently with expansion and lead to similar (or possibly more serious) harms. SFFD is concerned that interference with SFFD emergency responses will only increase as the number of driverless AVs on San Francisco streets increase.[24]

Moreover, as Commissioner Genevieve Shiroma observed in her comments at the CPUC's August 10, 2023 voting meeting, authorizing commercial deployment of driverless AV service at this time without addressing the ongoing street interference incidents is short-sighted. Passengers and the public should not be endangered. No passenger wants to be in a driverless AV that is interfering with

[20] First Responder Status Conference Transcript, at 27, 29. Waymo has not explained what methodology was used to determine this average response time. It is unclear if the count starts the second the unexpected stop occurs or only after it is determined that manual retrieval is necessary.

[21] *Id.* at ⁋⁋ 17-18.

[22] *Id.* at Exhibit A, at 55.

[23] *Id.* at ⁋ 16.

[24] Luttropp Decl. at ⁋ 13.

first responders, transit, street workers or traffic generally. First responders should not be delayed or prevented from doing their jobs, or forced to divert resources to deal with unpredictable driverless AVs. As noted by leading experts, it is premature to make broad claims about driverless AV safety; AV providers have not driven enough miles to make any conclusions about their safety compared with human drivers.[25] The Commission's current New AV Data proceedings are a step in the right direction, toward requiring reporting of street interference safety incidents.

2. Other Harms from AV Incidents

In addition to some of the concerning incidents of interference with emergency response operations discussed above, driverless AV operation has also harmed San Francisco in other contexts. The Commission is aware that it is not collecting sufficient data, nor has it set the metrics and benchmarks to understand the impacts poor driverless AV performance is having on public safety.[26] This is evident from Commissioner Shiroma's issuance of the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling on Development of New Data Reporting Requirements for Autonomous Vehicles Driverless Deployment Program and last week's status conference on driverless AV incidents with the San Francisco's first responders.

Earlier this year, a driverless Waymo AV encroached on in-street construction areas, potentially putting on-street workers at risk. On January 13, 2023, the driverless AV drove into the middle of a construction site and stopped right before rolling into an open trench where San Francisco city employees were working.[27] This June, driverless Waymo AVs also recently stalled at two

[25] Dr. Phillip Koopman, Written Testimony of Dr. Phillip Koopman, IDC Subcommittee Legislative Hearing (July 26, 2023) https://users.ece.cmu.edu/~koopman/pubs/Koopman2023_EC_Testimony_AV_Safety.pdf ("False: Claim [that] current data proves that computer drivers are safer with regard to fatalities. The industry needs 100 million more miles (at least) to support such a claim." at 10; "Q: Are computer drivers safer than human drivers? A: We have 1 or 2 or 3 million miles of robotaxi operation now, depending on the company. At 100 million miles or more between human driver fatalities, it's another 97 million or more miles before we might confirm computer drivers are safer – assuming there are zero fatalities before then." at 12.

[26] SFCTA, TNCs 2020: A Profile of Ridehailing in California, (last accessed Aug. 16, 2023), https://www.sfcta.org/projects/tncs-2020-profile-ride-hailing-california

[27] Phil Mayer, Self-driving car stops at SF construction site, Waymo responds, KRON 4 (January 16, 2023) https://www.kron4.com/news/bay-area/self-driving-car-stops-at-sf-construction-site-waymo-responds/ (last visited August 16, 2023).

intersections seemingly due to road closures related to the 2023 Pride Parade.[28] These stops contributed to already heavy traffic (there was also a San Francisco Giants game nearby), impacting transit and other road users.

B. The Balance of Harms Weighs in Favor of a Stay.

The second factor to which the Commission looks in determining whether a stay is warranted balances the harm that will be faced by the moving party if no stay is granted against the potential harm faced by the non-moving party if the stay is granted. When weighing these factors, the Commission "generally appl[ies] a public interest analysis which balances harm to the application (or public interest) if the stay is denied and the decision is later reversed, against the harm to the other parties (or public interest) if the stay is granted and the decision is affirmed."[29]

The harm to Waymo is minimal. A stay of the Resolution would allow the status quo to continue for the relatively short time that it takes for the Commission to consider San Francisco's forthcoming application for rehearing. There would be no impact on the ability to test and collect data in San Francisco, no reduction of the driverless AVs already on the road in San Francisco, and would not impact Waymo's operations in, or expansion to, other cities. A stay would only result in delaying Waymo's commercial deployment of driverless AVs in San Francisco, a city where Waymo tests extensively.[30] A delay of further expansion in San Francisco will not shut Waymo's business down or stunt the development of Waymo's self-driving technology.

In summary, as described above, considering past performance, commercial expansion into the San Francisco's densest corridors and peak traffic hours will greatly exacerbate the harms to first responder operations, public transit, street construction workers, and the flow of traffic generally.

---

[28] J.R. Stone, 2 Waymo self-driving cars stall at SF Pride Parade street closures during heavy traffic, ABC 7 News (updated June 26, 2023), https://abc7news.com/waymo-stalled-self-driving-car-sf-pride-robotaxi/13427435/.

[29] *In the Matter of the Application of Sierra Pacific Power Company for an Order Authorizing the Construction of a Tie-In Line Between Two Existing Transmission Lines Near Hirschdale, in Nevada County, California* (2007), Decision 007-08-034, 2007 Cal. PUC LEXIS 458, * at 16.

[30] Waymo, First Million Rider-Only Miles: How the Waymo Driver is Improving Road Safety, (updated Feb. 28, 2023), https://waymo.com/blog/2023/02/first-million-rider-only-miles-how.html.

These harms outweigh whatever impacts Waymo might face from a relatively brief delay in expansion in San Francisco.

C. San Francisco is Likely to Prevail on the Merits of the Forthcoming Application for Rehearing.

The third prong of the Commission's inquiry is whether the moving party can demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits of the underlying claim. In San Francisco's forthcoming application for rehearing, it will demonstrate that the Resolution abuses the Commission's discretion by failing to consider demonstrated public safety impacts and violating CEQA. Although these arguments shall be discussed in more detail in the forthcoming application, San Francisco provides a brief summary here.

1. San Francisco is Likely to Prevail on its Argument that the Commission Abused its Discretion Approving the Resolution without Considering Public Safety Impacts.

Section 5352 of Public Utilities Code, the Passenger Charter-Party Carriers' Act ("TCP Act") expressly vests the CPUC with jurisdiction over public safety: "It is the purpose of [the TCP Act] . . . to promote carrier and public safety through its safety enforcement regulations." The Commission itself has acknowledged this responsibility and its broad mandate to protect public safety.[31] As the Commission observed in its Phase I Decision on Transportation Network Companies, under the TCP Act the "Commission's responsibility to public safety in the transportation industry should [not] be ignored and/or left for individual companies or the market place to control."[32] This jurisdiction over public safety is concurrent with the California Department of Motor Vehicles ("DMV") and the DMV's recent letter to the Commission does not state otherwise.[33]

As Commissioner Shiroma observed at the Commission's August 10, 2023 voting meeting, nothing in the CVC prevents the Commission, as a regulatory body that has jurisdiction over AVs acting as permitted charter-party carriers, from engaging in necessary fact gathering activities and providing prescriptive suggestions to ensure the safety of driverless AV operations, including public

[31] Resolution, at 1, 8-9, 11, 12, 14, and 17.

[32] CPUC Decision 13-09-045, at 12.

[33] *See* Letter from DMV to CPUC dated August 4, 2023 Re: Rulemaking 12-12-011.

safety. The Commission's reliance on DMV acquiescence as a basis for declining to evaluate driverless AV performance and its effects on public safety is unreasonable and an abuse of discretion. Specifically, the Commission cannot rely on the DMV approval of Waymo's operational design domain ("ODD") to justify foregoing any limits on Waymo's deployment.[34] The Commission may narrow the Waymo ODD when Waymo seeks to operate as a charter-party carrier. The DMV approval of the Waymo ODD sets a ceiling on Waymo driverless commercial deployment; it does not set a floor. Nor does it foreclose the CPUC from imposing additional reporting requirements or public safety measures, as may be necessary under its authority to regulate charter-party carriers and ensure the safety of passengers and the public. Approval of the Resolution to allow for deployment with no limitations on geographic area, service hours and fleet size, despite evidence of numerous street interference incidents between driverless AVs and first responder operations, public transit, street construction workers, and the flow of traffic generally ignores the mandates of the TCP Act's mandate that the Commission promote public safety through its safety enforcement regulations and constitutes an abuse of the Commission's discretion. A failure to "consider an important aspect of the problem" is arbitrary and capricious. *California v. Bernhardt* (N.D. Cal. 2020) 472 F. Supp. 3d 573, 610 (citing *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of U.S., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.* (1983) 463 U.S. 29, 43; *Greater Yellowstone Coal., Inc. v. Servheen* (9th Cir. 2011) 665 F.3d 1015, 1030 (agency cannot ignore evidence "pointing in the opposite direction" from its conclusions) (internal citations omitted)).

2. San Francisco is Likely to Prevail on its Argument that the Commission Abused Its Discretion by Failing to Conduct Environmental Review Under CEQA.

The Commission's continued refusal to conduct environmental review as required by CEQA also constitutes an abuse of discretion. Noncompliance with CEQA is subject to the abuse of discretion provisions in the Code of Civil Procedure, which establishes abuse of discretion where an agency has not proceeded in the manner required by law, the order or decision is not supported by the

[34] Resolution, at 12.

findings, or the findings are not supported by the evidence.[35] The Commission's Resolution violates CEQA's mandate to study the environmental impacts that may result from its discretionary decisions.[36] This is not a hard standard to meet; it is not necessary that the evidence show that impacts will result, but that they may.[37] This is basic, black-letter CEQA law. However, despite the fact that its own files and research in this very proceeding contain substantial evidence that the expansion of driverless AV ride-hailing fleets may result in significant environmental impacts, the Commission has declined to consider this evidence as required under CEQA. Consequently, the Commission's failure to consider relevant evidence is contrary to law and San Francisco is likely to prevail in a CEQA challenge to the Resolution.

Substantively, the initiation of commercial driverless AV Passenger Service throughout all of San Francisco—during all hours of the day and night, including peak travel hours, with no limit on fleet size—goes well beyond the limited scope of the Commission's Phase I approval in the Deployment Decision. But rather than acknowledge its effective initiation of Phase II (which is scheduled to start no later than June 6, 2025, three years after the approval of Cruise's Tier 3 Advice Letter by Resolution TL-19137), the Commission's Resolution treats Waymo's initiation as a "Phase I.A", characterizing it as "one of the steps toward gathering the information necessary to performing CEQA review —if indeed CEQA review is needed."[38]

The Commission's approach is tantamount to permitting operation of a project to determine how the project will adversely impact the environment. This is exactly the opposite of what CEQA requires. The Commission may not forgo environmental review or defer it until after it acts. The approach undermines CEQA's objective to inform decisionmakers and the public of a project's environmental effects before approval so that significant effects can be avoided or reduced when it is

[35] CEQA, § 21168 [incorporating "the provisions of Section 1094.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure" in a CEQA challenge].)

[36] CEQA, § 21065; see also, *id.* § 21080(d) ("If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that the project *may* have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report shall be prepared." [Emphasis added].)

[37] CEQA Guidelines, § 15064(f); *Friends of B Street v. City of Hayward* (1980) 106 Cal.App.3d 988; *No Oil Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68.

[38] Resolution, at 19.

feasible to do so.[39] Once environmental impacts occur, they cannot be undone. In fact, had the Commission undertaken CEQA review of its Deployment Decision in 2020, many of the impacts we are witnessing now may have been avoided or minimized. CEQA does not demand perfect information regarding a project's environmental impacts, but adequacy and completeness, but it does require a good-faith effort at full disclosure.[40] The Commission has failed to meet even this low bar.

Moreover, by "incrementally" expanding Phase I without ever conducting any CEQA review, the Commission has failed to consider the "whole of [its] action," including the Commission's iterate discretionary approvals.[41] CEQA "mandate[s]" that "environmental considerations do not become submerged by chopping a large project into many little ones—each with a minimal potential impact on the environment—which cumulatively may have disastrous consequences."[42] Here, San Francisco has identified the following potential environmental impacts of the Commission's action that require analysis under CEQA.

Emergency Access Impacts: Among the environmental impacts required to be studied under CEQA is a project's potential to result in "inadequate emergency access" or "impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan."[43] The SFFD—one of the busiest in the nation and a responsible entity for San Francisco's Emergency Response Plan[44]—has already logged nearly 60 written reports of driverless AV interference with fire department operations since April of 2022. Unplanned stops by driverless AVs can impede ingress and egress at stations or access to the scene of an emergency. According to City records, these stops take minutes and sometimes hours to clear as emergency personnel coordinate with the AV operators' customer service, remote

[39] CEQA Guidelines, § 15004(a) ("Before granting any approval" each lead agency shall consider the appropriate level of CEQA review.)

[40] See *Sierra Club v. County of Fresno* (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, 522.

[41] CEQA Guidelines, § 15378(a), (c).

[42] *Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Com.* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 263, 283–284.

[43] CEQA Guidelines, Appen. G.

[44] Luttropp Decl. at ¶ 5; City & County of San Francisco. Emergency Response Plan. An Element of the CCSF Emergency Management Program. (updated May, 2017), https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-06/CCSF%20Emergency%20Response%20Plan_April%202008%20-%20updated%20May%202017_Posted.pdf.

advisors, and field support. There is no dispute that driverless AV street interference stops and other improper interactions with first responders create hazards that violate the CVC—indeed, the Resolution acknowledges these conflicts in its findings.[45] And yet, despite this uncontested evidence, the Commission neglected to perform the legally required analysis of these impacts.

Air Quality and Transportation Impacts: Additionally, research regarding Transportation Network Companies operating ride-hailing fleets similar to Waymo indicates that these services actually induce and increase vehicle trips by 43 percent, as they shift people away from transit, bicycling, or walking, or facilitate a trip that would otherwise not be made at all.[46] These additional trips increase greenhouse gas emissions[47] and, even in zero emission vehicles degrade air quality by generating unregulated particulate matter, including from brake wear, tire wear, clutch wear, and road dust resuspension. The additional driverless AV trips could also result in increased congestion that leads to transit delays. These potential air quality and transportation impacts are clearly environmental impacts within the scope of CEQA.[48] Despite the clear evidence in the record that this proposal may result in these impacts, the Commission's Resolution authorizes additional commercial driverless AV trips without having analyzed any of these associated environmental impacts. That the precise scope of these impacts may be difficult to quantify does not relieve the Commission of its legal obligation to prepare environmental review early enough in the planning process to enable environmental considerations to influence the project program and design.[49]

The record before the Commission is replete with evidence of the reasonably foreseeable physical changes in the environment that may result from the broad expansion of driverless AV

[45] Resolution, at 21 (Finding 15).

[46] SFCTA, TNCs & Congestion, Final Report (updated October 2018), https://www.sfcta.org/sites/default/files/2019-05/TNCs_Congestion_Report_181015_Finals.pdf.

[47] If the vehicles are not zero emission, as the law does not currently require them to be zero emission. San Francisco Planning Department. TNCs and Land Use Planning, (updated June 2022), https://sfplanning.org/sites/default/files/documents/citywide/TNCs-land-use/TNC_Land_Use_Study_2022.pdf

[48] *See* CEQA Guidelines, Appen. G, Air Quality (impacts would result if the project would "expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations"); Transportation (a project would result in impacts if it would "conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.")

[49] CEQA Guidelines, § 15004(b).

operations throughout San Francisco, without any limitations on geography, hours of operation, or fleet size. The Commission's decision approving this expansion without the analysis of these impacts, as CEQA requires, is an abuse of discretion likely to be enjoined by a court.

D. Other Factors Also Support Staying the Decision.

The Commission is aware that its previous decisions[50] have not required AV companies to provide it with sufficient data to accurately analyze driverless AV performance as evidenced by the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling on Development of New Data Reporting Requirements for Autonomous Vehicles Driverless Deployment Program filed on May 25, 2023, and the associated workshop on June 22, 2023. Similarly, the Commission is aware that driverless AV deployment has interfered with first responder operations as shown by the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Setting Status Conference/All Party Meeting to Address Safety Issues Regarding Driverless Autonomous Vehicle Interactions with First Responders filed on July 26, 2023, and the associated status conference held on August 7, 2023. San Francisco appreciates these efforts and the concerns motivating them are well-founded and at odds with the Commission's approval of the Resolution here. Further, the testimony at the status conference showed clear impacts to emergency response operations that the Commission has been on notice of for over a year and has declined to study under CEQA.

Additionally, as San Francisco has discussed previously, it is unable to issue citations for moving violations to driverless AVs under the CVC because citing drivers for a moving violation is a type of arrest and that arrest comes with a number of procedures that assume the presence of a human driver.[51] These generally involve the delivery and signing of a written notice to appear so the driver can be released from arrest.[52] An automated driving system can neither be arrested, sign a notice to appear, nor appear in court as compared to a human driver who could be arrested for a sustained obstruction of first responders at an emergency. As a result, San Francisco cannot use one of its key

[50] Decision (D.) 20-11-046 as modified by D.21-05-017 (Deployment Decision); D. 18-05-043

[51] An exception to this is a violation captured by a red-light camera pursuant to CVC 21455.5 which allows issuing a citation through the mail. Similarly, under CVC 40202, a parking citation may be served by attaching it under the windshield wiper or in another conspicuous place.

[52] See e.g. CVC Sections 40500 and 40504.

measures for enforcement to mitigate the harms caused by these CVC violations, making more measured deployment informed by accurate data reporting and performance benchmarks all the more important.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Commission knows that there have been serious performance issues with driverless AVs operating in San Francisco under its previous AV decisions (D. 20-11-046 as modified by D. 21-05-017 ("Deployment Decision"); D. 18-05-043 ("Testing Decision"). San Francisco's streets, for reasons of history, geography, and weather, are some of the nation's most challenging transportation environments.[53] Approval of the Resolution will likely exacerbate these problems and this motion to stay should be granted. This Resolution was approved despite the above documented violations of the CVC where compliance is required by CPUC General Order (G.O.) 157-D. Generally, failure to comply with the terms of a permit should lead to suspension or revocation of that permit, not expansion of its terms.

San Francisco is requesting the Commission comply with CEQA. Not only is it required by law, it is good government. CEQA would inform the Commission of the environmental impacts of the proposed permits and identify permit conditions that address those impacts before they occur.

Based on the foregoing, San Francisco respectfully request that the Commission preserve the status quo and stay the implementation of the Resolution pending the outcome of San Francisco's forthcoming application for rehearing of Resolution TL-19144.

[53] Rachel Swan, Waymo says dense S.F. fog brought 5 vehicles to a halt on Balboa Terrace street, San Francisco Chronicle (updated April 11, 2023), https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/san-francisco-waymo-stopped-in-street-17890821.php.

Dated: August 16, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID CHIU
City Attorney
MISHA TSUKERMAN
Deputy City Attorney
(415) 554-4230
Misha.Tsukerman@sfcityatty.org

By: *Misha Tsukerman*
MISHA TSUKERMAN

Attorneys for
SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY, SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, AND SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on Regulations Relating to Passenger Carriers, Ridesharing, And New On-Line-Enabled Transportation Services	R.12-12-011 (Filed December 20, 2012)

DECLARATION OF DARIUS LUTTROPP IN SUPPORT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S MOTION TO STAY RESOLUTION APPROVING AUTHORIZATION FOR WAYMO AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE PASSENGER SERVICE PHASE 1 DRIVERLESS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM AND SAN FRANCISCO'S MOTION TO STAY RESOLUTION APPROVING AUTHORIZATION FOR CRUISE LLC'S EXPANDED SERVICE IN AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE PASSENGER SERVICE PHASE I DRIVERLESS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

I, Darius Luttropp, being duly sworn, declare:

1. My name is Darius Luttropp and I currently serve as Deputy Chief of Operations for the San Francisco Fire Department ("SFFD" or "the Department"), a role I have held since July 2023. I serve with two other deputies immediately below our Chief, Jeanine Nicholson, and I am her second in command.
2. I submit this declaration in support of San Francisco's motions to stay the resolutions by the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") from August 10, 2023. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein, and if called as a witness could testify competently thereto.

3. I joined SFFD in 1998. Since joining, I have held a variety of roles, including serving as a firefighter at Rescue Squad 2, where I provided fire suppression and technical rescue responses and was part of SFFD's technical rescue training cadre. I was later promoted to Lieutenant, and also worked as the Captain of Engine, Truck, and Rescue Companies. I have served as a Captain in the Sunset at Engine 18, and as Captain of In Service Training, where I oversaw the introduction of a live fire training program. I served as Battalion Chief in the Bayview, SOMA, and Mission Districts. Immediately prior to my current role, I was the Assistant Deputy Chief of Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond Project Management.
4. In my current position as Deputy Chief of Operations, I oversee fire suppression, meaning I oversee all firefighters, up their chain of command. Among other things, I also oversee the division of training, the Fire Marshall, emergency communications, and SFFD special operations.
5. SFFD is one of the busiest fire departments in the nation. It is a responsible entity for San Francisco's Emergency Response Plan—the City's plan for when disasters, like major earthquakes, occur.
6. It is part of my job to know about incidents with autonomous vehicles ("AVs") that impact SFFD activities and emergency responses.
7. I oversee a system that SFFD has in place to log and report interactions with AVs that negatively impact SFFD activities in the field. Since approximately April 2022, our firefighters have been instructed to fill out a form to report when they have an interaction with an AV that changed what they would have normally done in the field, or which they perceived as dangerous. Since June 5, 2023, these reports have been called Autonomous

Vehicle Incident Reports. Prior to that, firefighters were instructed to send Unusual Occurrence forms to report information about interference by AVs. Unusual Occurrence forms are a more generic form used in the Department, through which firefighters can report incidents in the field, but because of the high volume of AV-specific incidents and the Department's desire to streamline reporting of AV incidents, we adopted the AV-specific form. Filling out and submitting reports up the chain of command is a standard operating procedure for SFFD, whether about AV incidents or other matters of departmental concern. I am responsible for maintaining AV incident reports.

8. Whether submitting an Usual Occurrence form or an Autonomous Vehicle Incident Report regarding AV interference, firefighters are instructed to provide complete information about the incident, including the date, time, location, specific SFFD emergency incident number (if applicable), the AV company involved and any information about the vehicle, and details about what happened and how SFFD operations were impacted. Only firefighters can access the form portal to submit these reports.

9. Firefighters are instructed to submit these reports in a timely fashion. Most of the time, this means after the conclusion of the emergency, incident, or drill, although on some occasions it may be a few days later.

10. All reports of AV interference come to me, after others in the chain of command review them as well. As part of my duties as Deputy Chief of Operations, I have read all of the nearly 60 reports of AV interference that firefighters have filed between April 2022 and Friday, August 11, 2023. True and correct copies of those reports are attached hereto as **Exhibit A.**

11. In the incident reports, references to "code 3" mean that the SFFD vehicle was responding to call with its lights and siren on. Virtually every time SFFD receives a call, several SFFD vehicles of different types will be dispatched to respond and will operate their lights and sirens. References to "T[number]" are to a fire truck, identified by number. SFFD fire trucks are long vehicles that have a tractor-drawn aerial ladder component. References to "E[number]" are to SFFD engines, identified by number. Engines are the shorter vehicles that pump water and carry SFFD hoses. There are 44 engines in San Francisco. References to "B[number]" are to battalion SUVs or "buggys," which Battalion Chiefs drive. SFFD also has ambulances, which respond to about 80% of calls in the City. SFFD ambulances are dynamically deployed, meaning they move around the City during their shift. Trucks, engines, and battalion SUVs return to SFFD stations after responding to a call.

12. Because firefighters are often called to emergency situations, or need to attend to other more pressing operational concerns after an incident or emergency concludes, I believe the nearly 60 incident reports included in **Exhibit A** represent an undercount of the actual number of AV-interference incidents our firefighters have experienced.

13. The volume of incidents in which AVs have interfered with SFFD operations is concerning. I am very concerned that these incidents will become more common and widespread now that the companies have a profit motive to put more AVs on the road at all times. I understand that the CPUC has authorized Cruise and Waymo to expand their operations to take passengers for a fare at any time and in any part of San Francisco, with no limitations on the number of vehicles that can be deployed. Because SFFD has seen so many incidents to date based on the limited number of Cruise and Waymo AVs on San

Francisco streets, I am very concerned that the number of incidents will increase dramatically with this new authorization and that SFFD operations will be even more negatively impacted.

14. It is vital that all vehicles, whether driven by humans or autonomous technology, follow the Vehicle Code and avoid interfering with first responders. It is essential to our operations that cars on the road yield to SFFD vehicles on route to a medical or fire incident, most importantly by getting out of the way and stopping along the right-hand side of the road to let us pass safely and quickly.

15. There have been several incidents where Cruise and Waymo AVs failed to yield to SFFD engines, trucks, and/or battalion vehicles that were responding to a medical or fire call. In some instances, SFFD vehicles had to back out of streets blocked by Cruise or Waymo vehicles and take an alternate route to the call, causing a several-minute delay. It is concerning to see so many incidents where a Cruise or Waymo AV failed to yield to a SFFD vehicle, because the cars do not seem to hear or respond to our sirens, lights, and commands. We can tell human drivers to pull over and get out of the way, and they almost always listen to us. But on numerous occasions, AVs have failed to yield or comply with directions from SFFD personnel.

16. AVs have also caused delays by blocking SFFD vehicles in their stations by stopping in front of fire station driveways. When our vehicles are blocked like this, or blocked by AVs out in the field, it is common for us to call for a replacement vehicle of the same type from a different location. This replacement vehicle will almost always come from somewhere farther away from the emergency location than the vehicle originally called. This causes delay.

17. Every minute is critical in responding to a medical emergency, especially when a person is experiencing a cardiac arrest or heart attack, has trouble breathing, or is overdosing. SFFD paramedics are often the geographically closest medical personnel able to respond to a medical call. Even a one-minute delay can be dangerous and potentially life-threatening.

18. Similarly, responding immediately to fire calls is essential. Fires can double in size in just one minute in San Francisco, given the dense urban landscape and the amount of furniture that San Francisco residents often have. It is more difficult and more dangerous to fight a larger fire.

19. On numerous occasions, Cruise AVs have driven over SFFD fire hoses. Not only is this illegal, it is dangerous. If an uncharged hose (meaning, a hose that is not filled with water) is run over by a car, the hose can get caught in the car's wheel and axel and pull the hose, sweeping nearby firefighters off their feet. This happened to an SFFD firefighter in recent years, and the hose (caught in the vehicle's axel) knocked the firefighter to the ground, where he hit his head and suffered a traumatic brain injury. It was not an AV vehicle that caused that specific accident, but it highlights the danger of having AVs run over SFFD hoses. If a car runs over a hose that is charged (meaning, is full of water), it can burst the hose and stop the flow of water to the fire. This is dangerous because it diminishes our ability to fight the fire. But even short of stopping the flow of water, a car that runs over a charged hose can cause the hose to roll or move around, and this is dangerous to first responders, too. Additionally, whenever a car rolls over a hose, serious damage to SFFD equipment can occur. Recently, a Cruise AV ran over SFFD fire equipment, causing significant damage to a gorter and wye, two vital (and

expensive) pieces of equipment that allow for multiple smaller hoses to be deployed. Thankfully, that incident occurred during a drill, but had it occurred during an active firefight, the AV's actions could have caused catastrophe.

20. On other occasions, Cruise and Waymo AVs have entered active emergency scenes, getting in the way of firefighters who were trying to put out a fire or otherwise respond to hazards (like downed trees or overhead wires). With human drivers, our personnel can tell drivers where to go or simply put up cones or other barriers to indicate that drivers must go elsewhere. But this has not worked for AVs; in numerous incidents, Cruise and Waymo AVs failed to comply with these directions, signs, and signals.

21. There are also a number of reported incidents where AVs interfered with SFFD operations by behaving in unpredictable ways, seemingly threatening to enter emergency scenes or harm our members or equipment, causing our personnel to devote time and attention to the AVs, potentially at the expense of other tasks. Human drivers usually do not cause this kind of interference because the drivers respond to commands or avoid emergency scenes altogether.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the California that the foregoing is true and correct, executed this 14th day of ~~August, 2023~~ in San Francisco, California.

~~DARIUS LUTTROPP~~

8/14/23

Exhibit A

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/11/2022

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On the morning of April 5, 2022, at 0406am, Box 5165, Incident number 22043125, while responding with lights and sirens heading east on 17th Street, Engine 12 encountered a stopped Recology truck in our lane.
2. The driver was out of the truck collecting trash.
3. Normally I would have gone around the stopped truck, but at the same time, a "self-driving" car from the company Cruise with no human in the driver's seat, drove up in the opposing lane heading west and STOPPED exactly next to the Recology truck.
4. Engine 12 was dead in the water until the Recology driver came running and moved the garbage truck, at which time we were able to continue on to the working fire.

Workflow	From		To	
04/11/2022	[redacted]	Forwarded	E12	
04/12/2022	[redacted]	Acknowledged	B05	
04/12/2022	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	[redacted] requested this report. Please ensure he receives a copy.
04/12/2022	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Deputy, I believe this is somethin we need to investigate. Importantly, this incident mentioned was E12 trying to respond to the Upper Terrace fire. I have also long envisioned a scenario at a red light with two self-driving cars next to each other that would not go through a red in response to red lights and sirens behind them.
04/12/2022	[redacted]	Info Only	Law,C	Your copy. Also sent to CD2
04/13/2022	[redacted]	Contents Noted	Cofflin,K	please address this with MTA. These are becoming a nuisance
04/15/2022	[redacted]	Workflow End		City staff will work with Cruise and gather additional information.
04/18/2022	[redacted]	Info Only	Law,C	

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

06/06/2022

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On June 6, 2022 at 0410 hours, E09 was dispatched to a report of an outside fire at 101 S/B and Cesar Chavez under the freeway.
2. While enroute code 3, we encountered a potentially unsafe situation with a Cruise driverless car at the intersection of Precita Ave. and Bryant St.
3. While traveling South on Bryant, a driveless car proceeded through a stop sign in our direction and continued to move into the intersection towards the engine.
4. E09 driver continued with due regard and caution until the driverless vehicle came to a complete stop in the intersection, and we proceeded to the incident.
5. The location of the Cruise vehicle in the intersection created an unsafe environment in the event multiple units were to respond.
5. I notified B10 of the incident in the morning at Station 9.

Workflow	From		To	
06/06/2022	[redacted]	Forwarded	B10	
06/06/2022	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D3	Contents Noted
06/06/2022	[redacted]	Workflow End		Duplicate UO

A3

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

06/13/2022

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On June 12, 2022 at 23:50 hours Engine 14 was the supply engine at a working fire incident # 22075217.
2. E14 had charged large lines lying across the street supplying E31 down Funston Ave. from the Anza St. intersection.
3. An autonomous vehicle heading west on Anza approached the charged large lines and came to a complete stop before accelerating up to approximately 10-15 mph as it proceeded over hose leads and on to the Park Presidio street light.
4. The crew of E14 and an SFPD Officer controlling traffic observed this unoccupied self driving vehicle perform this hazardous driving behavior.
5. Battalion 7 Chief McGuire was notified of this observed occurrence.
6. No fire department property or personnel were harmed by this occurrence.

Workflow	From		To	
06/13/2022	[redacted]	Forwarded	B07	
06/13/2022	[redacted]D	Contents Noted	D2	Additional statements are available for this incident if required. Contents noted.
06/13/2022	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
06/13/2022	[redacted]R	Acknowledged	[redacted]	Another Cruise mishap. These things are going to hurt someone. Please forward to appropriate person.
06/13/2022	[redacted]R	Info Only	CD1	
06/21/2022	[redacted]X	Info Only	[redacted]	Please communicate the gravity of this situation to Cruise's Judy Lee when speaking with her next.
06/21/2022	[redacted]	Workflow End		

Cruise scene hose

54

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

01/24/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On 24 Jan 2023 at Laguna and Hayes streets (#23011518) my crew was extinguishing an outside fire on the sidewalk.
2. E36 was parked in the middle of the street with all of its' emergency lights on.
3. A "Cruise" driverless vehicle rapidly approached us and stopped between the Engine and my crew.
4. We were unable to move the car and it was stopped on top of our hoseline.
5. I was able to speak to the operator via the car intercom and they were able to move the car after an additional 5 minutes.
6. there was no damage to the hose reel or any injuries.

Workflow	From		To	
01/24/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E36	
01/24/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	
01/24/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3	Increasing incidents of autonomous vehicles either entering our scenes or hindering responses
01/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
01/25/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	these things should not be allowed. too many problems
01/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	please forward to Ramon and have it addressed. Totally unacceptable and should be grounds to stop the program
01/25/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	
01/26/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	

Cruise Scene Nose

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

03/11/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On March 11 at approximately 22:05 Truck 3 was returning from a call going westbound on the 800 block of Geary Street, and encountered two autonomous Cruise vehicles blocking the road.
2. Geary is one way with two traffic lanes and cars parked on both sides. Several cars were double parked on the left side. This is becoming a more common problem in itself.
3. The autonomous vehicles were in the red painted bus lane on the right side, opposite the other double parked cars on the left. I believe one of the autonomous cars was very slowly moving or repositioning when we were approximately half a block back. Truck 3 was not using any code 3 lights or the siren. The space between the double parked cars on either side was not enough for Truck 3 to safely pass. I rang the officer's bell several times hoping for someone to move. I then gave a very short blast of the airhorn. At least one of the Cruise vehicles moved slightly (inches), but not in a deliberate fashion, and it did not clear the road. The Cruise vehicles were midblock with no other vehicles in front of them. They were not waiting for a red light. I climbed out of Truck 3 and approached the two vehicles. Neither car had a driver or passenger. The vehicle in the rear started to move before the vehicle in the front. It pulled out slowly toward me as if to go around the other Cruise vehicle and then stopped. Eventually both vehicles moved, but there was not a deliberate attempt to leave the road clear in the first place or a deliberate attempt to get out of the way when prompted by Truck 3's bell or horn. Both vehicles started with slow jerky movements as if they didn't know what to do.

Workflow	From		To	
03/11/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	T03	
03/11/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B04	
03/12/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D2	Contents noted
03/12/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
03/13/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD1	I'm sending this to [redacted] as well
03/13/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	This needs to be sent to the appropriate people
03/20/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	Please forward to City AV representative.
03/21/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

03/21/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On 03/21/23 I was responding to incident #23038973 as B10. While responding to the incident I encountered a driverless Waymo vehicle license plate 53595F3 at 1128 hours. I was driving westbound on Palou Ave with lights and siren on when a driverless Waymo vehicle traveling eastbound on Palou Ave proceeded to make a left hand turn directly in my path onto Newhall St. and stopped directly in front of my vehicle. With lights and siren on continuously the car refused to move blocking my response path. After approximately 1 min the car moved and pulled over. At this time the incident had been canceled and I proceeded to the driverless vehicles drivers side window in order to notify the monitoring company that their car was malfunctioning. I knocked on the window numerous times and no one ever responded. I moved away from the vehicle and it immediately drove off to continue its route.

Workflow	From		To	
03/21/2023	[redacted]J	Forwarded	D3	
03/21/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Forwarding UO from Battalion 10 regarding driverless Waymo vehicle impeding the flow of traffic and emergency response of Battalion 10 on March 21, 2023.
03/22/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	second event that needs to be documented and addressed
03/22/2023	[redacted]R	Acknowledged	CD1	FYI, prevention notified for documentation and follow up
03/22/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

87

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

03/21/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On 03/21/23 I responded to Incident #23039343 as B10. While responding code 3 with lights and siren on traveling south on Dolores St. in the left lane at approximately 1719 hours I encountered a driverless Waymo vehicle. The Waymo vehicle was directly in front of me traveling south on Dolores St. As I approached it with lights and siren it began to move over to the right lane enough for me to pass. As I was passing the vehicle appeared to turn sharply into my direction and accelerated towards my right rear quarter panel. Upon noticing this in my rearview mirror I accelerated to avoid being hit by the driverless vehicle. As I passed the vehicle continued to come all the way over into my lane and appeared to accelerate towards my rear bumper. I then further accelerated to get away from the vehicle as quickly as possible.

Workflow	From		To	
03/21/2023	[redacted]J	Forwarded	D3	
03/21/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Forwarding 2nd UO from Battalion 10 regarding driverless Waymo vehicle affecting the emergency response of Battalion 10 and almost making contact with the Battalion 10 buggy.
03/22/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	another driverless issue to document
03/22/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	BFP notified to document
03/22/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

03/24/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On March 21st, 2023, (on Incident # FD23039379) at 706 Missouri, I was the officer of Engine 25 and encountered several Waymo cars that were driverless and posed a risk to fire personnel.
2. Engine 25 responded to a downed tree on a vehicle. Upon arrival, Engine 25 noted there were no wires down, a large tree was blocking Missouri street and there were no occupants/victims in the damaged vehicle.
3. After trimming tree limbs, putting up caution tape and clearing a lane on Missouri for traffic, Engine 25 noted a vehicle driving northbound on Missouri at a fast rate of speed. Engine 25 attempted to slow down the vehicle by shining their box light on the driver as there were fire service personnel working in the area.
4. The vehicle was a driverless Waymo vehicle and finally stopped last minute a few feet from Engine 25 (Engine 25 had it's Code 3 lights on). The officer of Engine 25 noted another vehicle coming the same direction at a fast rate of speed and tried to slow it down. It was also a driverless Waymo vehicle that slowed down last minute and swerved to it's left to avoid crashing into the 1st Waymo vehicle. This 2nd Waymo vehicle stopped a few feet from the officer of Engine 25.
5. Luckily we had just finished working on the tree and had the fire engine to create a barrier between us and the Waymo vehicles if needed. Had we been working on the downed tree in the dark and those two Waymo vehicles came down the hill (northbound on Missouri) at their fast rate of speed, I am unsure those driverless vehicles would have stopped in time to avoid hitting fire service personnel.
6. Thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Aziz Syed
Lieutenant- Engine 25

Workflow	From		To
03/24/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E25
03/24/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B10
03/24/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3

Waymo Scene

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

03/24/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On March 21, 2022, Engine 41 responded to multiple calls of trees, and wires down, due to the extreme weather.
2. Many of these calls were along Clay street from Polk to Jones, where multiple downed trees had brought down Muni "trolley" high voltage overhead wires.
3. Muni responded at Engine 41's request, and was able to de-energize the lines, mitigating the electrical hazard.
4. The lines still possessed a physical hazard as they lay on the ground in some locations, and then returned to the next pole in an arc.
5. Engine 41 cordoned off multiple intersections to keep traffic from driving up streets into the low hanging muni wires.
6. One of the streets closed off, with Caution tape and Caution sandwich boards, was the 1400 block of Clay street, between Hyde and Leavenworth.
7. At 21:56 incident # <23039567>, Engine 41 responded to the Intersection of Clay/Leavenworth for an "electrical hazard".
8. Upon arrival we discovered two Cruise driverless vehicles had driven up Clay street, through our caution tape at Hyde, continued on, hit the low hanging muni wire and entangling the wire on their roof elements. The two Cruise vehicles continued up Clay through our second set of caution tape at Leavenworth. As they continued up the street, rise in elevation increased the tension of the wire on the roof, and the two vehicles finally came to a stop in the intersection of Clay and Leavenworth.
9. Two Cruise employees arrived on scene. We had them take over manual control of the vehicles. We had to back the vehicles half a block back down Clay street to release the tension on the wire, to remove it from their roof elements.
10. This incident raises many serious concerns about the safety of these Cruise driverless vehicles. The need for these vehicles to recognize a road closed by caution tape, and caution sandwich boards is imperative. Secondly, the vehicle failed to recognize the large gauge Muni line hanging in its path. If this wire had still been "hot" this would have been much more hazardous. It is also of note that the vehicle did not recognize when it hit the heavy wire, or that it was being dragged on its roof top for half a block.
11. I have attached pictures. Note the caution tape and sandwich board wrapped around the vehicle. The Muni wire can also been seen on the roof.

Workflow	From		To	
03/24/2023	[redacted],T	Forwarded	E41	
03/24/2023	[redacted],T	Contents Noted	B01	
03/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	Contents Noted
03/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	

Cruise Scene

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

03/30/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. 3/29/23 Incident #23043573 3909 Mission: Self driving vehicle "CRUISE" stopped approximately 8' behind E32. Couple minutes later it moved about 5'. I knocked on the window and attempted to make contact. Took several minutes for the window to roll down, and I was able to speak to Customer Care. After the incident, the vehicle moved but stopped in the intersection , proceeded to make a right turn but into the oncoming lane. It corrected itself and got into the correct lane and drove off.

Workflow	From		To	
03/30/2023	[redacted]	Draft	[redacted]	Form created as draft. Select Apply Changes to begin workflow.

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/14/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On April 14, 2023 while conducting a hoseline drill in front of Fire Station 14, a self-driving car traveled past a hoseline in operation. The car pulled to the right and stopped while it attempted contact with it's monitoring company.
2. Batt. 07, who was observing the drill spoke via car phone with the company and reported the occurrence to them and that there was no damage to the car.
3. Prior to the drill, traffic cones were placed to create a safe working area with several members monitoring traffic in front of Fire Station 14.

Workflow	From		To	
04/14/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	T14	
04/14/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	B07	
04/14/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	B07	
04/14/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B07	Contents noted.
04/14/2023	[redacted]	Returned	E14	returned
04/14/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

DE 12

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/17/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1.On Sunday 4/16/2023 at approximately 23:53 Engine 5 was responding to a full Box at 2488 Geary Blvd.
2.Engine 5 was the supply engine and drove around the block to back down from the Lyon street side.
3.As we were approaching Geary Blvd from Lyon St we were blocked by a Cruse self driving vehicle.
4.The self driving vehicle would not move and this created an obstacle for water supply.
6.Luckily this was a false alarm and the members on scene were able to improvise.
7.Vehicle information: Cruse vehicle is license #751145P3.

Workflow	From		To	
04/17/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E05	
04/17/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B05	
04/17/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	Contents noted
04/18/2023	[redacted]	Returned	E05	Take out #7
04/18/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B05	
04/19/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	Forwarding up Chain with requested edit.
04/19/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Resubmitted after edited as per D2 Storti request.
04/20/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	this is becoming a daily problem. These things must be taken off the road
04/20/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	This is becoming a daily issue. We should consider a formal letter to the state requesting an end to the program
04/24/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

Cruise Scene

NF 13

San Francisco Fire Department

General Form

04/18/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Assistant Deputy Chief - Fire Prevention and Investigation

Subject: Autonomous Vehicle Incident

Reference: E mail

1. On 4/18/23 incident #23052651 we were operating at a working fire at 1597 Howard st.
2. E36 was on the 12th st side with a supply led from them to E29 supplying on the NW corner.
3. A "Cruise" autonomous vehicle drove N on 12th and stopped in our scene approximately ten feet from tailboard of E36 and twenty feet from intersection while still an active operation. All FD apparatus had C3 lights on.
4. We attempted to disable the vehicle
5. Car sat for approximately ten minutes and then drove off on its own accord prior to our ability to take photos or get plate number.

Workflow	From		To	
04/18/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	D3	xxxx
04/18/2023	[redacted]B	Contents Noted	CD2	contents noted
04/18/2023	[redacted]R	Contents Noted	CD1	This is becoming a problem at every incident. Drivers can't be expected to put out cones or flares at every working incident to educate the autonomous vehicles. I'll forward to Cofflin
04/19/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

Cruise Scene

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/20/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. At incident #23053861 at approx. 1530 hours on 04/20/23 at a working fire along the corner of Sacramento and Presidio Blvd., a CRUISE driverless vehicle license plate # 74169C3 came into an active fire scene at 3249 Sacramento St..
2. When this driverless car first came into the block at Sacramento and Presidio, it stopped initially next to E51, and then began to jut forward incrementally proceeding east towards the fire scene itself at 3249 Sacramento.
3. As it proceeded, it came into close contact with the driver of E51 who was supplying the main engine in front of the fire building, other firefighters proceeding to the command post, and also hose supplying the lead engine in front of the fire building.
4. To stop its forward movement, I had the driver of E51 place chalk blocks on the CRUISE vehicle driver front tire, stopping its forward movement.
5. RC 2, Cpt. Salan then gave me the emergency contact number to CRUISE to try to make contact with the company concerning this vehicle.
6. With contact with the company, the operator after about 8-10 minutes (and with my assistance stopping traffic) was able to back the car out from the fire scene and the car proceeded north along Presidio Blvd.

Workflow	From		To	
04/20/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	[redacted]	forward
04/21/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	This erratic behavior continued as the vehicle drove away impeding MUNI travel.
04/21/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	We need this addressed, and moved up the priority list. Its becoming a daily problem
04/21/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	yet another
04/24/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

cruise Scene

15

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/25/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On 04/25/2023 at 1025 hours T11 was responding code 3 to Box 8217 at 442 Arlington St. Incident #23056225
2. Enroute T11 turned left onto Roanoke St from Chenery St. Approaching from the opposite direction was a driverless Waymo Jaguar vehicle. The vehicle continued to approach until within 10 feet and stopped. Roanoke is a single lane street with parallel parking on both sides. The vehicle remained blocking the street. We approached the vehicle on foot, the windows went down and we heard a voice of the operator monitoring the vehicle. I informed the monitor that the vehicle was blocking a SFFD vehicle's response to a SIB Box and that they needed to direct the vehicle into the driveway adjacent to the car. The monitor responded "yes, I understand." The Waymo vehicle however did not move. I directed the T11 driver to back up T11 onto Chenery and continue to the call on the next available street wide enough for the truck, Bosworth St.
3. Battalion 6 was notified as to the reason for our delay. B06 had already cancelled the Box before we arrived on scene.
4. On our route back to the firehouse we saw another Waymo vehicle that had a operator in the vehicle. I informed them of what occurred. He stated he would report it and recommend the area to be blocked for their vehicles as the streets are to narrow for them to operate.

Workflow	From		To	
04/25/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	Hoo,E	
04/25/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	B06	Waymo blocking T11 response to Box 8127
04/25/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D3	A civilian put a picture of this Waymo incident on Twitter.
04/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Contents Noted
04/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD1	
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	Cofflin,K	
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	Cofflin,K	
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/25/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. At approximately 21:53 on April 25, 2023 Truck 3 was in route to a building alarm at 1177 Market Street (Incident #23056522) going Code 3 with lights and siren.
2. Truck 3 was travelling south on Polk Street, and as we approached Geary Street a Cruise autonomous vehicle was in the right lane west bound on Geary. All traffic was stopped on Polk and Geary except that the Cruise vehicle was lurching forward in uneven movements toward the intersection. The vehicle came too close to Truck 3's path. It seemed that if the driver of Truck 3 had slowed down the Cruise vehicle might have continued in front of us. We were going approximately 5-10 mph after first controlling the intersection.
3. We could not see a driver or passenger in the vehicle.

Workflow	From		To	
04/25/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	T03	
04/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B04	
04/26/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	noted
04/26/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	As mentioned, driverless car incidents are dangerous and frequent.
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD1	another
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

17

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/26/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. At 18:08 on April 26, 2023 I arrived on scene at 2396 Pine Street (Incident #23056929).
2. Engine 38 positioned in front of the apartment building, just past the entrance.
3. A Cruise autonomous vehicle was behind Engine 38 when they arrived. The Cruise vehicle stopped approximately 10-15 feet behind the engine.
4. I wanted the vehicle to move so that Truck 5 would be able to stop behind Engine 38 for a good aerial shot. I tried waving my arms, and walking at the vehicle from the sidewalk side to encourage it to go around the engine. Eventually the vehicle moved forward to within approximately 6 feet of Engine 38's tailboard. This made things worse because it was close to compromising a hose lead from 38, and it would have been hard for the vehicle to turn enough to pass Engine 38 going forward. I would also be uncomfortable with crew members working at the tailboard as I have seen these vehicles lurch unexpectedly. I don't trust what might happen with hoses and ladders being carried very close to the sensors of the vehicle.
5. Around this time Truck 5 arrived. I motioned for the driver to pull up behind the Cruise vehicle with code 3 lights, hoping the vehicle would move out of the way. I was standing on the sidewalk side of the vehicle to make it possible for the vehicle to go out into traffic. This did not work.
6. The crew of Truck 5 assisted me with poking and prodding the vehicle, and pounding on the windows until the driver's window rolled down. This happened a couple minutes after the vehicle initially stopped. I went to the window and communicated with someone. The individual apologized for the "inconvenience", and said a team was working on moving the car. Even after talking to him the car did not immediately get moved from the scene. I informed him that this time it was an "inconvenience", but if someone needed to be rescued by the Truck it could have been a life and death situation.
7. If the same situation occurs behind an aerial truck it may be difficult or impossible to remove wooden ladders.

Workflow	From		To	
04/26/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B04	
04/26/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	Forwarded
04/26/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	This is an increasing problem. I believe there are many more incidents that are not being reported. Instructing BCs to make sure crews are reporting these for a more accurate picture of this to report to company and powers that be.
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	another
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	number 3 today!
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

cruise scene

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

04/26/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On 4/26/2023 Truck 5, Engine 5 and Battalion 4 were dispatched to a building alarm 1425 Fillmore, Incident # 23057047
2. Both Engine and Truck were facing North in the Southbound lane leaving one lane for through traffic.
3. As we exited the rigs to gather equipment a "Cruise" autonomous vehicle attempted to squeeze past both rigs. When the driver of the Truck 5 stepped in front of the vehicle it honked at us and completely froze blocking any through traffic. There were three passengers in the back seat who were unable to control the vehicle. I made my way to the window spoke with an operator over the intercom and explained that this vehicle needs to either wait for all members of the fire department crews to safely exit the area or pull to the curb. The vehicle was remotely taken over and guided past our emergency vehicles.
4. As these autonomous vehicles are learning traffic patterns they have become more aggressive with first responder units and their attempts to navigate around them. They could potentially delay fast, aggressive hose leads as well as impede ladder and tool removal from trucks.
5. This was our second such interaction today. First was UO submitted by Battalion 4 Incident # 23056929

Workflow	From		To	
04/26/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B05	
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	Contents noted
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	More Cruise
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	another
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD1	another
04/27/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

3A 19

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/03/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On the morning of 04/29/2023 E44 responded to a medical dispatch at 162 Tioga Road at 01:29 am.
2. Upon arrival there was a male passenger in the back seat of a WAYMO ride share vehicle.
3. The passenger was finally awakened and was able to open the door.
4. The passenger who had a smell of etoh declined any medical attention.
5. When the passenger left the vehicle FF Loh from E44 gained access to the drivers seat and a ride share technician came onto audio.
6. It was stated that the WAYMO vehicle was blocking a narrow street and we needed access to the car to move it and park it out of the way.
7. The WAYMO representative stated that we were not granted access to move the car and that a technician needed to come out and move the car.

Workflow	From		To	
05/03/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E17	
05/03/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	
05/03/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	It is very concerning that we do not have the ability to manually takeover and move these cars.
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Forwarding driverless vehicle UO from CPT Murphy on 5/3/2023.
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	Please forward to City AV representative to report to Waymo.
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

20

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/03/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. I respectfully submit this Unusual Occurence to document a Waymo vehicle that suddenly stopped in front of D3's Buggy as D3's emergency lights were applied while attempting to back into the Quarters of Station 7.
2. This incident occurred on May 3, 2023 at approximately 2110 hours when D3 was returning from a Box. The license # was 15104H3.
3. A video clip has been emailed to the deputy Chief of Operations as it could not be uploaded to this UO on HRMS.

Workflow	From		To	
05/03/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	D3	
05/03/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Chief, The video clip has been emailed to you as it would not upload on HRMS In Box.
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	Video emailed to you
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	is this all going to [redacted] in prevention?
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	fyi
05/12/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

27

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/05/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On May 4, 2023 at 2141 hours Engine 36 was dispatched to Incident #23060822 at 1161 Mission St. for the Building Alarm.
2. Engine 36 went enroute at 2142.
3. While attempting to leave the apparatus bay of Station 36 to respond to the Alarm, Engine 36 became blocked in the station by a driverless vehicle.
4. The crew of Engine 36 exited the engine and approached the driverless vehicle that had stopped in front of the apparatus bay in attempt to get the driverless vehicle to move.
5. While attempting to get the driverless vehicle to move Battalion 2 was notified by Engine 1 that the building alarm was set off in relation to Engine 1's Incident #23060819 a dumpster fire.
6. Battalion 2 canceled the Incident, Engine 36 going AOR at 2145 while Engine 36 was still attempting to get the driverless vehicle to move.
7. With the incident being canceled, Engine 36 backed into quarters.
8. Not until Engine 36 backed into the apparatus bay did the driverless vehicle drive away from blocking the apparatus bay of Engine 36.

Workflow	From		To	
05/05/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	T06	
05/05/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B02	contents noted
05/05/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3	B2 was notified this morning of an unusual occurrence involving a driverless vehicle blocking the apparatus bay during a dispatch. Engine 36 was cancelled from the incident before it was able to notify responding units of delay. Pictures of vehicle are enclosed.
05/05/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	we should be able to issue a citation with this info
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

29

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/08/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On May 6, 2023 B01 responded to a Building Alarm at 1060 Bush, Inc# 23061787.

2. E41 was parked in the Number 1 lane. B01 parked behind E41 in the Number 1 lane.

3. Approximately 2-3 minutes after B01 had parked a Cruise Driverless car pulled up directly behind B01 in the Number 1 lane and stopped.

4. The Cruise Driverless car remained behind B01 for the duration of the call and then after sitting still for 20 minutes it pulled into the Number 2 lane, narrowly missing a firefighter on E41 as he was putting gear back into the Engine.

5. Per a request form Division 2 I am submitting the Unsual Occurrence Form with attached photos through the Chain of Command to Deputy Chief Robert Postel..

6. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call.

Workflow	From		To	
05/08/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	D2	Driverless Cruise vehicle photos
05/10/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Close call again. CRUISE
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	another
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Returned	[redacted]	for flores
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		
05/12/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	

Cruise Scene

25-23

San Francisco Fire Department

General Form

05/09/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief - Battalion 05

Subject: Autonomous Vehicle, Obstruction of Fire Apparatus

Reference:

1. The following event occurred on May 9th, 2023 at 11:13
2. Reference Waymo Autonomous vehicle with no attendant; License Plate 40489F3
3. While travelling southbound on Webster and returning to quarters, Truck 5 "swung out" to align the trailer for backing into quarters.
4. Even though Truck 5 had all emergency lights operating, a Waymo vehicle as described above approached the rear of Truck 5 and stopped in a location that prevented our rearward travel. It continued to creep forward until I turned it's drivers-side mirror forward and pounded on the window.
5. After leaning into the vehicle to call an attendant on the telephone, and being connected, I was informed that there is no way to move the vehicle. The attendant was unable to move the vehicle backward, and told me that I would be unable to move the vehicle myself. The vehicle then tried to roll the windows up while I was leaning in and talking to the telephone attendant.
6. I was then informed that we would have to wait for a Waymo person to arrive to move the vehicle.
7. Truck 5 abandoned it's efforts to back into quarters and drove around the block so the Waymo car could move out from in front of the Fire Station.
8. The Waymo vehicle moved over to the side of the street after Truck 5 had cleared the street for it, and then drove off before anyone came to assist or we were able to make additional contact with Waymo personnel regarding the car.

Workflow	From		To	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	T05	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B05	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		This should be an Unusual Occurrence

24

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/09/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On May 9th 2023 at 1555hrs in front of Station 2 a Cruise autonomous car failed to stop and ran over several lengths of hose that were laid out in the street. The car ran over the gorter/wye. The car stopped when it was approached by members of E2.
2. The SFPD were notified and officer Tang Badge # 877 responded. Incident # 230322078
3. Vehicle information : License # 74073C3, orange and white Cruise car.
4. Driver info: No driver present in vehicle..
5. Cruise was notified by cellphone. They arrived at 1315 hrs. Carina Contrares Gudino Cell phone # 415 314 1554 was the cruise representative.
6. A equipment request for a replacement gorter and Wye was submitted via HRMS.
7. There were no injuries connected with this incident.
8. Pictures of the incident were sent to Div 2 .

Workflow	From		To	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E02	
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B01	Information reviewed.
05/09/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	D2 Contacted and pictures of incident forwarded via Cell phone.
05/10/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	CRUISE
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD1	Appears a gorter shutoff and wye were damaged. That is several thousand dollars of damage
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	did you hear who we are supposed to submit the damage costs to?
05/11/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	BE	FYI
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	Please see attached unusual Occurrence. Cruise contact person, regarding insurance claim (Marissa 702-790-5180).

Cruise hose

2R 25

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/19/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On 16 May 2023 at 0915 hours (#23066112) IFO 109 Oak st 3 driverless vehicles caused traffic to back up.
2. The driverless vehicles were all "Cruise" License # 750140P3, 2531953, (the 1st vehicle license plate # was not recorded).
3. Traffic went from 3 lanes down to 1 because of a vehicle accident.
4. Each one of these three "Cruise" driverless vehicles stopped and blocked traffic both before passing the Fire Engine and immediately in front of the Fire Engine.
5. This caused already slow traffic to come to a standstill and the drivers of the other vehicles became frustrated and were honking their horns trying to coerce the driverless vehicles to move through the green lights.
6. These events were witnessed by the crew of E-36, B-2 and the responding SFPD Officer.

Workflow	From		To	
05/19/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E36	
05/19/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
05/23/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	Hickey,J	
05/27/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	Contents Noted
05/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	
05/30/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	
05/30/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
06/01/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted],D	
06/01/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	Kajaloa,S	
06/01/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
06/01/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

256 24

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/27/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On Friday May 26 I responded to 99 Grove as the Officer of E36 to a call for service CAD#23070893.
2. At approximately 2215hrs we approached the intersection of Polk and Grove to find a driverless vehicle stopped in the intersection
3. The position of the vehicle was in such a position that the engine driver had to maneuver around in heavy traffic to obtain apparatus placement
4. The AV company involved was Cruise, one vehicle involved, California license plate number 25653S3
5. There was no call to the company for assistance, once we maneuvered around the vehicle and positioned the vehicle drove away
6. I recommend these companies work to ensure the vehicles pull over appropriately and not stop their vehicles in the middle of intersections

Workflow	From		To	
05/27/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E36	
05/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B02	
05/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3	Contents Noted
05/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
05/30/2023	[redacted]	Returned	D3	if the links on the bottom of the form are attachments, they are not able to be opened. Please use the proper attachment process. If they are something else, what are they and why are they in the report?
05/30/2023	[redacted]	Returned	[redacted]	Chief, Please see my corrected version of the attachments. Thank you.
06/01/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D3	Corrected attachments
06/02/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	links corrected as requested
06/02/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	
06/02/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	CD1	
06/05/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

27

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/30/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On May 30, 2023, at 11:39 hours, I (B06) was dispatched to Incident # 23072355 with E11 and T11 for a building alarm at 1220 Noe Street.
2. When I arrived on scene, I parked my vehicle across the street from the incident address and noticed a driverless Waymo vehicle, traveling southbound on Noe had stopped approximately 15 feet from the corner of 25th Street. The Waymo vehicle was driverless, however there was a third party female passenger in the back seat. Her purpose was "testing" and she stated she was not a Waymo employee.
3. I approached the Waymo vehicle, license plate #53499F3 and could hear the female passenger speaking to a Waymo representative. I told the Waymo representative that he needed to move the vehicle out of the way immediately. He stated that he was unable to do it, that a human had to move it and that he had roadside assistance dispatched and their ETA would be approximately 3 minutes.
4. In the meantime, I observed the Waymo vehicle move approximately 5 feet forward, reversed to the end of the block and made a 3 point turn on Noe Street in order to head Northbound on Noe Street.
5. It took approximately 6 minutes for the vehicle to move out of the way of the incident.

Workflow	From		To	
05/30/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	D3	
05/30/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
05/31/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	FYI
05/31/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	CD1	
06/01/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

3R 28

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

05/31/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On 5/31/23 B10, E29, T7 were o/s of incident #23072652 at 693 Vermont St. E29 and T7 were parked directly in front of this address in the northbound traffic lane with code 3 lights on.
2. While members were getting ready to put equipment back on apparatus a Cruise vehicle traveling northbound on Vermont St. began approaching the incident. License #83047R3 with the name of Carnation on the bumper. The vehicle slowed to an almost stop approximately 15' from E29s rear bumper. The car then began to continuously creep towards E29 while starting and stopping. At this point the car was approximately 3' from E29 and I felt the members were not safe to put away their equipment. As we have been instructed I moved the rectangular object mounded on the passenger side where the rear view mirror is typically. The car stopped for a moment and showed "Carnation reported a collision" on all 4 screens in the car. The care then got within 18" of E29s bumper and turned into the opposing southbound lane parking next to E29. The vehicle then stopped for a few minutes with the collision message on all 4 screens. Doors were locked, windows up, and no controller on the speaker attempting to talk to us. The vehicle then suddenly cleared the collision message, a map appeared and then the vehicle drove off.

Workflow	From		To	
05/31/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	D3	
05/31/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
05/31/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD1	sending to [redacted] also
05/31/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	
05/31/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
06/01/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

Cruise Scene

3A 29

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

06/05/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

1. On June 5th, 2023 at 08:08 hours E02 was dispatched to 766 Vallejo Code 3(23075083) for SOB.
2. The Engine bay was blocked by a driverless Waymo car with a passenger in the back. License Plate 53521F3.
3. The passenger got out and walked away leaving the car still blocking the firehouse.
4. I got in the car and was talking to someone from Waymo remotely telling them they needed to move the car ASAP for our Code 3 call. The employee from Waymo was flustered and was trying to override the car and have it moved. It took over 2 minutes for the car to finally move.
5. E02 was than able to respond. Battalion 1 was notified when back in quarters.

Workflow	From		To	
06/05/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B01	
06/06/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	[redacted] notified of other needs regarding UO Report. It was a code 3 call so there was no time for photographs or other id info on the vehicle.
06/06/2023	Thompson,M	Contents Noted	CD2	Contents noted. I can't find the autonomous car forwarding drop down.
06/07/2023	[redacted]	Returned	D2	The correct form is the first one under General Form on the drop down menu. Please resubmit on the proper form
06/08/2023	[redacted]	Returned	B01	
06/08/2023	[redacted]	Returned	[redacted]	See return comments.
06/09/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

30

San Francisco Fire Department

General Form

06/07/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Subject: Failure to Complete Assignment (Waymo)

Reference: Section 4101, Rules and Regulations

1. Medical Call 23076009, 491 Chestnut St #3 for the Fall
2. 07:47 Hours
3. June 7th, 2023
4. Engine 2 blocked in Quarters due to driverless Waymo car parked in front of Engine Bay.
5. Notified Radio E02 delayed. Knocked on windows of car. Windows rolled down pressed DISP button on dash.
Connected with Waymo employee remotely. Took over 8 minutes to have car put in manual mode to move.
6. Notified B01. Called Scott Campbell, First Responder Ambassador Waymo of situation.

Workflow	From		To	
06/07/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B01	
06/07/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	SFFD Inc. # 23076009; Waymo vehicle license plate (CA) # 40693F3.
06/08/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Waymo form also submitted
06/08/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

31

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence

06/11/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1128

Unusual Occurrence - Autonomous Vehicle

1. On Sunday, June 11, 2023 at 22:31, Truck 3 was responding with emergency lights and siren to a building alarm at 711 Post Street. Incident # 23078275.
2. Truck 3 was mostly in the center lane and somewhat in the left lane, heading East on Post Street. We drive in both lanes to avoid holes and bumps in the road.
3. We crossed the intersection of Leavenworth Street against the red light after gaining control of the intersection. Vehicles with drivers stopped before entering the intersection in the right and left lane on Leavenworth. The unusual occurrence was that a Cruise autonomous car was coming from further down the hill in the center lane. The autonomous vehicle did not slow down until it entered the intersection, and barely stopped a few feet from the tiller wheels of Truck 3. Truck 3 was moving at approximately 10 miles per hour through the intersection. Any vehicle coming up Leavenworth had plenty of time to react to the emergency lights on the truck, but the cruise vehicle did not react until almost colliding with the back of the trailer in the middle of the intersection.
4. No pictures were taken as we were responding to an emergency.

Workflow	From		To	
06/12/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	T03	
06/12/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B04	
06/12/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	Autonomous vehicle form unable to forward through chain.
06/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
06/26/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
06/26/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

32

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/12/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	06/06/2023
Time	16:25
Incident No	
Location	2750 Jackson Street
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	2
Licence Plate(s)	Jingle and Milky Way (16773F3)
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

1. Sorry for late notice. I forgot about the incident when trying to concentrate on building alarm and broken sprinkler.
2. Engine 38 and Truck 5 were both double parked on Jackson facing Westbound in front of said address. Two cruise autonomous vehicles were coming from opposing directions in the one available open lane. Engine 38 had emergency lights on, Truck 5 did not, Battalion 4 buggy did not. When the autonomous vehicles met head on they froze. It took a bit of time before Jingle backed up awkwardly, and Milky Way was able to pass by.
3. Had this been a full box and other rigs were arriving then the open lane would have been rendered useless.
4. I would like to suggest that the company program the vehicles to avoid an emergency scene by going around the block, and avoid the area if possible. Most people do this in order to stay out of the way and avoid a traffic jam.

Workflow	From		To	
06/12/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B04	
06/12/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	
06/21/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	CD2	More incidents
06/22/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		
06/22/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	

Cruise Scene

33

San Francisco Fire Department

Unusual Occurrence - Accident

06/13/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Chief of Department

Reference: Rules and Regulations, Section 1127

1. E18 was involved in a non injury traffic accident on 6/12/2023 at 2200 hours.
2. E18 was clearing the scene of a vehicle accident response at the intersection of 25th and Lincoln Way.
3. E18 was backing down Lincoln way West bound in the East bound lanes. East bound lanes were closed by SFPD. While both the members of E18 were backing the driver in the appropriate positions the officer was stopping traffic on Lincoln Way in the West bound direction. All drivers in their personal vehicles complied and were stopping for an E18 an emergency vehicle. A Cruise self driving car failed to yield and was driving directly toward the officer. One of the backers turned their attention from backing the engine driver to the officer and the self driving car. The officer was moving out of the way of the self driving car to avoid being struck. Without the direction of that backer E18 struck a non occupied parked car, parked on Lincoln Way.
4. E18 immediately stopped moved to a safe location notified Batt 8 and SFPD and went out of service to document the backing accident.
5. Had it not been for a self driving car not yielding to an emergency vehicle, the backer and officer's attention would not have been changed from backing E18 to the hazard of a not yielding self driving car.
6. An accident report has been filed.

Workflow	From		To	
06/13/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E18	
06/13/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B08	
06/13/2023	[redacted]	Returned	E18	Please correct grammar.
06/13/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B08	
06/13/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	Self Driving Car UO
06/13/2023	[redacted]	Returned	B08	Please have the Officer complete the new Autonomous Vehicle Incident Report on HRMS instead of this UO. Thanks.
06/13/2023	[redacted]	Returned	[redacted]	See Notes from Div2.
06/23/2023	[redacted],D	Contents Noted	B08	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		Resubmitted on correct form 6/23/2023.

37 34

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/15/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	06/15/2023
Time	05:00
Incident No	06/15/2023 04:52 - 231660297 - 1 280SB TO 101SB XR - 82C2
Location	280 NB @ Alemany
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	UNK
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

As we were responding to an incident using freeway 280, we approached a driverless vehicle with our lights on. The vehicle stopped on the freeway. We switched off our c3 lights to allow the vehicle to proceed. A car that comes to a stop on the freeway poses a great hazard to oncoming traffic.

Workflow	From		To	
06/15/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B10	
06/15/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3	
06/15/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Forwarding E25's Waymo incident on 280. E25 was unable to obtain CA plate on waymo vehicle as they were traveling at freeway speed.
06/19/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	
06/20/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

QR 35

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/15/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: U/O reports for driverless vehicles email

Incident Date	06/15/2023
Time	20:18
Incident No	
Location	15th Street/Julian Ave
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	did not get license plate number
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	n/a
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

Rescue 2 was dispatched to incident #23080111 and was responding code 3 to assist SFPD with a medical aid. While traveling down the narrow Julian Ave, a Waymo vehicle came to a stop. There were three occupants in the vehicle. All occupants exited the vehicle. The vehicle blocked our route to the medical aid. Rescue 2 backed down Julian Ave to 16th Street to use an alternate route. The incident with the Waymo vehicle caused approximately a 4 minute delay in response time.

Workflow	From		To	
06/15/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B06	
06/16/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D3	The GF meets all required policy guidelines.
06/16/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	Forwarding Autonomous Vehicle Incident form for RS2.
06/19/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]	
06/19/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	CD1	
06/20/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/17/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	06/17/2023
Time	0134
Incident No	06/17/2023 01:32 - 231680158 - 430 TURK ST - 52C1G
Location	Post/Hyde
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

1. Truck 3 was responding to a building alarm, following Engine 3.
2. When making the right-hand turn from Post onto Hyde, a Cruise vehicle had stopped in the right lane at the very beginning of the block.
3. The driver of Truck 3 makes this turn at least 5-10 times a day. Hyde Street provides 3 lanes to turn into, but because of the Cruise vehicle frozen on the corner we only had two lanes. This surprised the driver, and slightly slowed our response.
4. As the officer, I leaned out the window to check our clearance. I was shocked to see someone in the driver's seat of the Cruise vehicle. He waved and smiled, but he did not bother to move the vehicle forward so we could clear the back of the car.

Workflow	From		To
06/17/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B04
06/18/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2
06/19/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2
06/19/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	[redacted]
06/20/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End	

XR 37

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/19/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: None

Incident Date	06/19/2023
Time	20:55
Incident No	
Location	1050 17Th Street
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	75102P3
Contacted Company?	Yes
AV Company Response Time	They never did respond while we were there. More than 10 mins
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

1. After a working fire, I noticed a Cruise car in front on E29 from the Cruise parking lot on 17th street.
2. E29 was blocked in and could not get out because T4 was behind us during fire operations.
3. The Cruise parking lot had tech-guys on scene but they said, "that they could not move the car from their location and a member from their main campus had to come out to move it".
4. After T4 moved back a couple of feet, that gave us enough room to get around the Cruise car.
5. A member from the main campus never did arrive on scene while we were stuck.

Workflow	From		To	
06/19/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B02	
06/21/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3	xxxx
06/22/2023	[redacted]B	Contents Noted	CD2	
06/22/2023	[redacted]D	Workflow End		Will forward to C[redacted]
06/22/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	Starting to forward you these info only. We can sit down and go over expectations. Thank you for agreeing in principle sir.

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/23/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: none

Incident Date	06/22/2023
Time	12:40
Incident No	
Location	Station 11
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	53516F3
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

While truck 11 was backing in to the station with spotters stopping traffic, the automated vehicle stopped and then tried to drive around the spotters. The spotters moved to block the vehicle and it tried to go around the spotters again.

Workflow	From		To	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B06	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D3	B06 is aware of this situation and is monitoring.
06/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
06/26/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	This is the type of incident that does not likely trigger an "emergency response" notation on their end. A question for the Truck would be "lights on or off."
06/26/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/23/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	06/22/2023
Time	2215
Incident No	06/22/2023 22:04 - 231733400 - 130 COLLINGWOOD ST - 10D4
Location	130 Collingwood
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	
Contacted Company?	Yes
AV Company Response Time	10
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

1. no physical contact, blocked one way street
2. no damage to city property
3. Passangers dropped off 1 block away prior to incident
4. 10 minutes for driverless to clear roadway

Workflow	From		To	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	E24	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B06	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D3	Somewhat confusing narrative; the point of this from is to notify the chain of command that the roadway was blocked by the vehicle.
06/25/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
06/26/2023	[redacted]	Info Only	[redacted]	
06/26/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/23/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	06/12/2023
Time	2000
Incident No	06/12/2023 21:22 - 231633164 - LINCOLN WY/25TH AV - 29B5
Location	25th AVE and Lincoln Way
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	none
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	none
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

1. E18 was involved in a non injury traffic accident on 6/12/2023 at 2200 hours.
2. E18 was clearing the scene of a vehicle accident response at the intersection of 25th and Lincoln Way.
3. E18 was backing down Lincoln way West bound in the East bound lanes. East bound lanes were closed by SFPD. While both the members of E18 were backing the driver in the appropriate positions the officer was stopping traffic on Lincoln Way in the West bound direction. All drivers in their personal vehicles complied and were stopping for an E18 an emergency vehicle. A Cruise self driving car failed to yield and was driving directly toward the officer. One of the backers turned their attention from backing the engine driver to the officer and the self driving car. The officer was moving out of the way of the self driving car to avoid being struck. Without the direction of that backer E18 struck a non occupied parked car, parked on Lincoln Way.
4. E18 immediately stopped moved to a safe location notified Batt 8 and SFPD and went out of service to document the backing accident.
5. Had it not been for a self driving car not yielding to an emergency vehicle, the backer and officer's attention would not have been changed from backing E18 to the hazard of a not yielding self driving car.
6. An accident report has been filed.

Workflow	From		To	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B08	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B08	
06/23/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D2	Resubmitting on correct form.

4x 41

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/24/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Rules and Regulations: Article 1128 Unusual Matters & 1112 Response to Alarms

Incident Date	06/24/2023
Time	12:55
Incident No	06/24/2023 12:55 - 231751618 - 4TH ST/MISSION ST - 31D2
Location	2 Falmouth Street
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	40687F3
Contacted Company?	Yes
AV Company Response Time	N/A
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

1. E01 was returning back to quarters on Falmouth Street when a Waymo blocked our route and delayed our response to Incident #23084135. The street has 2 way traffic, but is narrow.
2. Waymo had 2 passengers in the vehicle. E01 members turned on the lights to stop the vehicle from attempting to continue its route head on towards E01. Then E01 members proceeded to get out and make contact with the vehicle. The passengers inside Waymo pressed a button in the interior of the vehicle for assistance. E01 requested the Waymo Support Team back the vehicle up, but the Waymo Support Team was unbale to back the vehicle remotely. E01 turned off our lights to make the situation less complicated for the Waymo vehicle.
3. While attempting to deal with this issue, E01 was dispatched to 4th & Mission, Incident #23084135 for a medical Unconscious Abnormal Breathing. E01 had to backup the Engine to Shipley Alley and then proceed to 6th Street to respond.
4. The Waymo vehicle had no reaction to being on a tight street with E01, but to stop and be a barrier that would not move. E01 was delayed responding and can see incidents like this occurring frequently with SFFD vehicles due to the tight streets in San Francisco.

Captain [redacted]

Workflow	From		To	
06/24/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B02	
06/24/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3	Noted B2

42

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

06/28/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	06/28/2023
Time	17:10
Incident No	
Location	Haight/Steiner
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	N/A
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

While suppling E6 at the Working Fire a Waymo Vehicle was going to run over charged 3" hose line. The driver of E36 stopped the Waymo Vehicle by standing in front of it. The vehicle then started to creep forward, the driver of E36 banged on the window and tried to get the car to respond The car did not respond to verbal commands. So the Driver of E36 put a chalk block under the tire of the Waymo vehicle, so it would not drive over the hose lines. The Waymo vehicle then drove over the chalk block and made a u-turn and left the scene.
Incident # 23086097

Workflow	From		To	
06/28/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B02	
06/28/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	
06/29/2023	[redacted]M	Contents Noted	D3	xxx
06/29/2023	[redacted]B	Contents Noted	CD2	
06/30/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

Waymo Scene

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/03/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: G.O. 23 A-34 San Francisco Fire Department FEMA CA-TF3

Incident Date	07/02/2023
Time	19:58
Incident No	07/02/2023 19:43 - 231832706 - 350 GOLDEN GATE AV - 53A2
Location	IFO Station 03, 1067 Post St.
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	N/A
Contacted Company?	Yes
AV Company Response Time	1 Day
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

After returning from Inc.# 23088039 on 07/02/2023, T03 was preparing to back into Quarters with warning lights on and operating properly and 2 FF's, as spotters, set up on Post St. to stop cars from attempting to go around the Truck as it was backing up. One of the vehicles that stopped in the street was an unoccupied autonomous Waymo vehicle.

As T03 started to go in reverse, the Waymo vehicle lunged forward a few feet and then stopped, nearly striking one of the FF's in the street who was in front of the autonomous vehicle. I, as the Officer, had T03 continue to back into Quarters as I walked up to the Waymo vehicle that was still stopped on Post St. I directed the other vehicles that were stopped on Post St. to continue on as I carefully approached the vehicle on the "driver's side" and knocked on the window, saying, "Roll down the window.". The "driver's side" window rolled down and I leaned in and asked to talk to a representative. A person's voice spoke up and at that time I opened the "driver's side" door and leaned in so as to hopefully prevent the car from moving any more and I could hear the Waymo representative better. I had a very brief conversation with the Waymo representative and described what had happened and stated that it was not ok.

After the brief conversation, I closed the door and returned to Quarters. The Waymo vehicle drove away without further incident. This whole incident lasted about 3-4 minutes.

At approximately 13:30hrs on 07/03/2023 I received a phone call on the SFFD Main Line from another representative of Waymo asking for details on the incident. I politely informed this person that I would not be able to talk to him about this and that the SFFD has a procedural process regarding autonomous vehicles. I asked for his contact information and let him know someone would contact him if necessary. The Waymo representative's name is, Scott Campbell and his phone number is, 916-862-1306.

44

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/14/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	07/14/2023
Time	03:50
Incident No	07/14/2023 03:53 - 231950282 - 1030 POST ST - WF
Location	1030 Post
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

Truck 5 approaching fire building, west bound on Post from Larkin. Fire blowing out the top floor streetside window of a fully occupied apartment building in the early morning. Cruze vehicle stopped in the middle of the lanes with emergency blinkers on. Cruze vehicle was blocking either of the two possible aerial ladder placements available to truck truck 5. Truck 5 stopped and waited for 30 seconds and the Cruise vehicle did not move. With no ability to throw the aerial ladder because of the Cruise vehicle, Truck 5 moved off the the far side of the street from the fire and began to go to work. Once Truck 5 had moved out of the way of the Cruise vehicle, it continued on its way and left the scene. No photos, we were going to work at a working fire. Our inablility to get an aerial placement due to the autonous vehicle was reported immediately to the incident commander.

Cruise Scene

SR 45

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/14/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	07/13/2023
Time	23:10
Incident No	07/13/2023 22:51 - 231943820 - 440 GEARY ST - 52C3S
Location	IFO 1067 Post
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

Upon returning to Quarters from a building alarm, T03 had stopped IFO Quarters to allow spotters out and then proceeded forward with all warning lights on and flashing. At that time a "Cruise" vehicle was approaching us on Post St and had just crossed Polk. This vehicle was in the left hand lane (drivers's side of the Truck) and was not slowing down. T03 slowly proceeded forward to be in position to reverse into Quarters.
At that point the spotter realized the unmanned autonomous vehicle was not going to stop and got out of the way and attempted to verbally warn the Truck Driver of the uncontrolled vehicle.
The autonomous car narrowly missed the spotter and shot past T03 as it was preparing to reverse into Quarters and never slowed down or stopped.
This could have been a major tragedy if the spotter was distracted or looking another direction or if the Truck driver hadn't heard the spotter's warning and adjusted the Tractor's position.

SA 66

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/16/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	07/15/2023
Time	22:59
Incident No	
Location	1900-2000 block of 9th Avenue
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

After staging for SFPD to clear a scene on 9th Avenue, a Cruise autonomous vehicle entered the scene and found no way through. All of the SFFD apparatus including ambulance, RC, and Truck 18 heading southbound were blocked a few hundred feet away when the vehicle tried to problem solve and turn around. It did not respond to initial attempts to stop it, pulling door handles, etc. and continued to move small increments forward and back, left and right, in an attempt to get through somehow. After we moved all personnel, equipment, and patient away from the area of the vehicle(approximately 10 minutes) it found a driveway and moved itself into a parallel parked position allowing emergency vehicles through.
No contact between AV and city vehicles.
No property damage
No passengers at the time

CRUISE Scene

47

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/26/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Email - 06/06/2023 from [redacted]

Incident Date	07/26/2023
Time	0130
Incident No	
Location	18th ave/Balboa
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

1. On the morning on Wednesday July 26, 2023, E34 was dispatched to a working fire at 1625 Balboa St (#23098958).
2. E34 was 3rd due and approached the fire scene from 18th Ave and Balboa. E34 backed down to E14 and dropped a supply then lead out to 18th Ave hydrant. FF O'Toole was the engine operator.
3. FF O'Toole stated that while he was performing his duties as a supply company, a self driving "Cruise" vehicle drove up Balboa and stopped right next to the fire engine at the intersection where he was maneuvering large diameter hose.
4. The driverless car remained in that position for approximately 30 minutes before it drove away down 18th Ave. The driverless car impacted FF O'Toole's operations and created more of an unsafe evolution. FF O'Toole overcame the obstacle and completed all tasks needed to suppress the fire.

Cruise Scene

48

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/27/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: None

Incident Date	07/26/2023
Time	22:35
Incident No	07/26/2023 22:26 - 232073356 - 2ND ST/HOWARD ST - 23D1G
Location	2nd/Minna
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

1. No physical contact between AV and any city property
2. No city property damage
3. 2 passengers in AV
4. No passenger pick up or drop off was occurring during incident but passengers exited car shortly after AV blocked roadway
5. AV turned off 2nd St onto Minna where E35 and RC1 were providing pt. care. AV backed up and stopped at corner of intersect in the middle of the roadway blocking Minna St from 2nd St for approx. 5 minutes. This blockage of the roadway caused M86 to have to park on 2nd St. AV moved to the side of street approx. 2 minutes after M86 parked on 2nd St.

49

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/28/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Email dated 5/11/23 from CD2

Incident Date	07/27/2023
Time	20:42
Incident No	07/27/2023 20:42 - 232083167 - 1242 19TH AV - WF
Location	1242 19th ave
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

1. At 20:41 E40 was dispatched to a working fire at 1242 19th ave . E40 was second due . We were traveling west bound on Irving and turned the rig around at 19th and Irving to facilitate a supply line. A cruise vehicle was behind the rig in our path of travel. Because 19th ave has 3 lanes we were able to back up around the stopped vehicle.
2. There were spotters present while the engine was reversing.
3.We were not able to disarm the vehicle due to the working fire.
4. The driver informed me that a Cruise rep was on scene to deal with the vehicle in about an hour.
5. Due to the position of the vehicle our response time was slightly delayed.

SD

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/28/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	07/28/2023
Time	09:25
Incident No	
Location	IFO Fire Station 5, Webster side
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	25672S3
Contacted Company?	Yes
AV Company Response Time	7 Minutes from phone call
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

Truck 5 was parked IFO the fire station on the Webster Street side, partially strattling the North bound left turn lane and painted median (where we always park.) Traffic cones had been placed alongside the apparatus so as to notify traffic that the vehicle was parked and to allow the crew to work around the appartaus to conduct our morning checks.At approximately 09:25, a Cruze vehicle as above approached the front of the apparatus in a manner that showed it was not able to identify the nature of the activities being conducted around Truck 5. One of the crew members who was nearby approached the vehcile, which did not move or make any attempt to correct the behavior. In the name of safety of the Truck 5 crew working around the Truck, a traffic cone was placed on the hood of the Cruise vehicle and the emergency phone number of Cruise was called.
The phone call took 5 minutes and Cruise repsonded with a person to move the vehicle in about 7. While the Cruise representative, Clinton, suggested we remove the cone so that a person could move the car remotely, for the safety of the Truck 5 crew, I opted to leave the cone on the hood of the Cuise vehicle until a live person was present to move the vehicle.
Problem resolved at approximately 09:42

Workflow	From		To	
07/28/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B05	
07/28/2023	[redacted]G	Acknowledged	D2	Contents noted
07/28/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	

51

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/26/2023

From: [redacted] - E51

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Email - 06/06/2023 from AC Rabbitt

Incident Date	07/26/2023
Time	0130
Incident No	
Location	18th ave/Balboa
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	unable to obtain
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	N/A
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

1. On the morning on Wednesday July 26, 2023, E34 was dispatched to a working fire at 1625 Balboa St (#23098958).
2. E34 was 3rd due and approached the fire scene from 18th Ave and Balboa. E34 backed down to E14 and dropped a supply then lead out to 18th Ave hydrant. FF O'Toole was the engine operator.
3. FF O'Toole stated that while he was performing his duties as a supply company, a self driving "Cruise" vehicle drove up Balboa and stopped right next to the fire engine at the intersection where he was maneuvering large diameter hose.
4. The driverless car remained in that position for approximately 30 minutes before it drove away down 18th Ave. The driverless car impacted FF O'Toole's operations and created more of an unsafe evolution. FF O'Toole overcame the obstacle and completed all tasks needed to suppress the fire.

Workflow	From		To	
07/26/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	[redacted]	
07/26/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	[redacted]	Form filled out....in the INCIDENT NO.....box tried multiple times to put the incident information in through the search box and was not able to input information once "applied changes" was applied to the electronic form.
07/26/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
07/27/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

52

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

07/27/2023

From: [redacted] - E16

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: None

Incident Date	07/26/2023
Time	22:35
Incident No	07/26/2023 22:26 - 232073356 - 2ND ST/HOWARD ST - 23D1G
Location	2nd/Minna
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	75108P3
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	0
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

1. No physical contact between AV and any city property
2. No city property damage
3. 2 passengers in AV
4. No passenger pick up or drop off was occurring during incident but passengers exited car shortly after AV blocked roadway
5. AV turned off 2nd St onto Minna where E35 and RC1 were providing pt. care. AV backed up and stopped at corner of intersect in the middle of the roadway blocking Minna St from 2nd St for approx. 5 minutes. This blockage of the roadway caused M86 to have to park on 2nd St. AV moved to the side of street approx. 2 minutes after M86 parked on 2nd St.

Workflow	From		To	
07/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	B03	
07/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	D3	I have reviewed this Vehicle Incident
07/27/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
07/28/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

53

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

08/01/2023

From: [redacted] T03

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	08/01/2023
Time	14:48
Incident No	08/01/2023 14:47 - 232131789 - 170 OFARRELL ST - 9E2
Location	Polk Street between Geary and O'Farrell
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	[redacted]

Impact (Description of Event)

1. While enroute to 170 O'Farrell for a medical call an unmanned Cruise vehicle stopped in the center of Polk Street going southbound. There were no vehicles to the right of the Cruise vehicle. There was plenty of room to move out of the way, but it just stopped.
2.This forced Truck 3 to either pass on the right side or against oncoming traffic on the left side.
3. I did not obtain any other information because we were enroute to a Code 3 Medical call.

Workflow	From		To	
08/01/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B04	
08/02/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D2	Contents noted
08/02/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
08/02/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		

54

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

08/03/2023

From: AL4177 Alba,Katherine L - H 20 - FB3

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	08/03/2023
Time	2122
Incident No	08/03/2023 21:19 - 232153399 - 233 PARKER AV - BOX
Location	Parker and Anza intersection
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	35984R3
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

While E21 was backing down to the 1st in engine a Cruise vehicle was stopped in the crosswalk and was in our way resulting in a delay. There was no damage to any property. There weren't any passengers. The Cruise Vehicle never cleared the crosswalk for us.

Workflow	From		To	
08/03/2023	Alba,K	Forwarded	B05	
08/04/2023	Maloney,M	Acknowledged	D2	Contents Noted
08/04/2023	Yee,K	Contents Noted	CD2	
08/04/2023	Luttropp,D	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

55

08/05/2023

From: AY2066 Ayers,John J - H 30 - E10

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference:

Incident Date	08/05/2023
Time	1106
Incident No	08/05/2023 11:06 - 232171029 - 100 34TH AV - 71B1
Location	Legion of Honor
AV Company	Waymo
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	UNK
Contacted Company?	Yes
AV Company Response Time	25 mins
Supervisor ID	AY2066 Ayers,John J

Impact (Description of Event)

1. E14/T14 responded to a car fire at Legion of Honor. Firefighting efforts were conducted using force entry tools and stretching a 150' ready line.
2. During fire operations, a Waymo car turned southbound on 34th Ave entering the fire operations scene and stopped moving. This action impacted our suppression efforts negatively due to members having to walk around the Waymo with a charged hose line and fight active fire. The car was positioned between the car on fire and the fire engine.
3. Law enforcement was requested to assist with traffic control.
4. T14 members entered the Waymo and placed it in manual mode and moved it to a safe location.
5. Waymo staff arrived and reprogrammed the Waymo and both cars left the scene.

Workflow	From		To	
08/05/2023	Ayers,J	Forwarded	B07	
08/05/2023	Styles,R	Contents Noted	D2	Contents noted
08/05/2023	Yee,K	Contents Noted	CD2	
08/06/2023	Luttropp,D	Workflow End		

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

57

08/06/2023

From: CH1691 Choy,Arnold M - H 30 - E08

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Rules and Regulations, section 1128

Incident Date	08/06/2023
Time	03:59
Incident No	
Location	Cesar Chavez/Kansas
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	452572
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	none
Supervisor ID	CH1691 Choy,Arnold M

Impact (Description of Event)

-E09 responded to Incident #23104117 at approximately 0359 hours, an MVA involving an SFPD officer.
-E09 blocked 1 east bound lane of Cesar Chavez traffic with the apparatus to protect the scene and members rendering ~~cure.~~ cave
-SPFD created a traffic block on the west bound lanes of Cesar Chavez and North bound lanes of Kansas
-While rendering aide to both the SFPD officer and driver of the second car, an AV vehicle attempted to drive through the scene.
-The AVE Vehicle was identified by the SFPD conducting traffic control on Cesar Chavez as Cruise license plate# 452572, side badging "Tap Dance"
-The SFPD officer attempted to make contact with the AV company and after an attempt the resolution was for the SPFD officer turn off all warning lights to move the squad car that was protecting the incident scene so the AV could reset and adjust for a turn on to Kansas. It is unknown if the SFPD officer was in contact with the AV company at the time of resolution.
-This incident created multiple unsafe conditions 1. AV attempting to enter scene, 2. To resolve issue the Squad car protecting scene and diverting traffic was moved for the AV to rest and 3. Units on scene had to turn off warning lights so the AV could reset.

Workflow	From		To	
08/06/2023	Choy,A	Forwarded	B10	
08/06/2023	Pereira,J	Contents Noted	D3	
08/06/2023	Rabbitt,P	Contents Noted	CD2	Forwarding AV Incident report from CPT Choy.

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

57

08/06/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Rules and Regulations, section 1128

Incident Date	08/06/2023
Time	03:59
Incident No	
Location	Cesar Chavez/Kansas
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

-E09 responded to Incident #23104117 at approximately 0359 hours, an MVA involving an SFPD officer.
-E09 blocked 1 east bound lane of Cesar Chavez traffic with the apparatus to protect the scene and members rendering cure.
-SPFD created a traffic block on the west bound lanes of Cesar Chavez and North bound lanes of Kansas
-While rendering aide to both the SFPD officer and driver of the second car, an AV vehicle attempted to drive through the scene.
-The AVE Vehicle was identified by the SFPD conducting traffic control on Cesar Chavez as Cruise license plate# 452572, side badging "Tap Dance"
-The SFPD officer attempted to make contact with the AV company and after an attempt the resolution was for the SPFD officer turn off all warning lights to move the squad car that was protecting the incident scene so the AV could reset and adjust for a turn on to Kansas. It is unknown if the SFPD officer was in contact with the AV company at the time of resolution.
-This incident created multiple unsafe conditions 1. AV attempting to enter scene, 2. To resolve issue the Squad car protecting scene and diverting traffic was moved for the AV to rest and 3. Units on scene had to turn off warning lights so the AV could reset.

58

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

08/07/2023

From: [redacted]

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: Department email from CD2, Postel

Incident Date	08/06/2023
Time	11:29
Incident No	
Location	604 Waller St
AV Company	Cruise

Impact (Description of Event)

E6, T6, and B5 responded to a building alarm at 604 Waller St, incident # 23104231. B5 and E6 arrived on scene and positioned apparatus. Before T6 arrived on scene autonomous cruise vehicle pulled behind E6 and stopped because of the flashing warning lights. During the course of the building alarm, the vehicle kept reversing backward and then moving forward in the same area. T6 was unable to position its apparatus in the appropriate position. The vehicle finally made its way around E6 before information could be gathered about the vehicle.

San Francisco Fire Department

Autonomous Vehicle Incident

08/10/2023

From: [redacted] - T12

To: Deputy Chief of Operations

Reference: No Reference

Incident Date	08/10/2023
Time	12:49 pm
Incident No	
Location	Lincoln way between 4th and 3rd Avenues
AV Company	Cruise
Number of AVs Involved	1
Licence Plate(s)	15849T3
Contacted Company?	No
AV Company Response Time	
Supervisor ID	

Impact (Description of Event)

While proceeding eastbound on Lincoln Way T12 encountered a Cruise vehicle completely stopped in the middle lane of three lanes. T12 was not displaying any Code 3 lights at the time. T12 stopped approximately 15 feet behind the vehicle but in the right lane not knowing what the vehicle would do next. The Cruise vehicle stayed in the middle lane stopped. T12 then slowly proceeded eastbound in the right lane and as we started passing the vehicle on the right side it started moving forward and getting closer to T12. At this point the driver of T12 stopped, thinking that the Cruise vehicle would collide with the truck. The vehicle then slowly proceeded forward then cut directly in front of T12 and drove off.

Workflow	From		To	
08/10/2023	[redacted]	Forwarded	B05	
08/11/2023	[redacted]	Acknowledged	D2	Contents noted
08/11/2023	[redacted]	Contents Noted	CD2	
08/11/2023	[redacted]	Workflow End		